United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1999 No. 74

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 20, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK QUINN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Father James Nock, Senate Chaplain, State of Connecticut, Hartford, Connecticut, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, we ask Your blessing on this august body, as we come together this morning to do the work of our Nation.

Let us never forget the potential we share together, to accomplish anything we choose. For with our combined talents, abilities, and experiences, there is no limit to what we can accomplish, only the limit of our own imaginations.

And we ask this of You, who lives and reigns, forever and ever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WICKER 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.

WELCOME TO FATHER JAMES J. NOCK

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

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to extend a heartfelt thanks to Chaplain Ford for providing an opportunity for a dear friend and a pastor of mine in East Hartford, a person who has brought home and shepherds the flock on a regular basis, Dr. James Nock from East Hartford.

Father Nock was born in Hartford, Connecticut, of Italian and Irish decent. He is a graduate of Saint Bonaventure University, and he also took his graduate studies at Sulpice in Paris, France; ordained in the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris on June 26, 1964, and currently the pastor of Our Lady of Peace in East Hartford, Connecticut.

Father also has served as the Chaplain of the Connecticut State Senate, and he has always brought not only great wisdom in his remarks but a great sense of humor and a sense about the people he serves here on Earth. I want to thank Chaplain Ford so much for providing Father Nock, the parish and the community of East Hartford with this wonderful opportunity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes on each side.

CLINTON-GORE ADMINISTRATION SHORTCHANGING MEDICARE

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, the message is beginning to get through that the Clinton-Gore administration is shortchanging Medicare. Ill-advised regulations are threatening the quality of health care for our Nation's retired citizens by cutting Medicare $20 billion below the level set by Congress in the Balanced Budget Act.

In a letter this month to HHS Secretary Shalala, 20 Democratic Senators joined 21 Republican Senators in urging this administration to reverse its decision, warning that harm could come to elderly patients. This bipartisan letter warns that if regulations are not revised, we may see closings of facilities, layoffs of dedicated caregivers, reductions in access to skilled nursing services and erosion of quality of care.

I say to our President, your cuts in Medicare are unacceptable and they are not in compliance with the Balanced Budget Act. It is time for this administration to provide the resources our senior citizens require.

BIPARTISAN EFFORT FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, last year we forced a vote on reform to clean up the way congressional campaigns are conducted. In the words of the respected commentator, Mary McGrory: ''To get the bill to the floor reformers had to pry it out of the clenched jaws of Speaker Newt Gingrich by gathering signatures on a discharge petition.''

When that vote for reform finally and belatedly occurred, we found out why.

Printed on recycled paper.

Every single Republican leader voted against the bipartisan reform, supported by good government groups, and every Democratic leader voted for it. Nevertheless, Republican delay wrote the obituary for this proposal in the Senate.

This year we face the same problem. Here in this House, 196 Democrats have signed a petition to force debate on all proposals, Democratic and Republican, now. Speaker HASTERT and Mr. DELAY say wait until some time in the fall. Every Republican member who refuses to sign this petition for timely action is complicit in killing reform. Join us in a bipartisan effort. Sign now and act now.

HMO REFORM

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the record. The other night I gave a special order on HMO reform and inadvertently mentioned the NFIB. In fact, the results I mentioned were from the National Survey of Small Business Executives on Health Care by the Kaiser-Harvard Program on Public Health and Social Policy. I was correct, however, in citing the numbers.

When this group of 300 small business executives was asked if HMO reform were passed into law and would increase premiums by up to $5 a month, only 1 percent said they would drop coverage and 5 percent did not know; 94 percent would continue coverage.

This cost is in the range of what I think my legislation would affect premiums. This is borne out by the CEO of Iowa Blue Cross/Blue Shield telling me that his plan is implementing the President's commission recommendations on quality and they do not expect to see an increase in premiums from that.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of HMO reform are trying to scare people about the effects of cost on access to care. I will be happy to share this survey of small business executives with anyone who wants to see some real data.

VOTE ON SHAYS-MEEHAN BEFORE MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, with all civility, Congress is still divided between those who believe there is too much money in our campaigns and those who believe there is never enough. We sell democracy short if we think the voters are not watching our electoral behavior. They are becoming very interested in how we handle campaign financing.

Last year, the freshman campaign finance bill was used as interference in getting Shays-Meehan to the floor. With the discharge petition from both sides, we accomplished a vote. We do not need any obstructions now. Let us get on with it. Let us restore credibility to the electoral process now, not later.

Shays-Meehan needs to be voted on before Memorial Day. We can do this in a bipartisan way. I appeal to my colleagues, let us conclude this debate in a civil tone. I think it is the best for America.

BREAST CANCER COALITION

(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, did my colleagues know this year alone one in eight women will be diagnosed with breast cancer and did they know that of those positively diagnosed women 75 percent will have had no family history of breast cancer?

It continues to be the leading cause of cancer deaths for all women ages 35 to 54. My home State of Florida has the third highest rate of breast cancer. These numbers have caused champions like Jane Torres, President of the Florida Breast Cancer Coalition, to dedicate their lives on heightening awareness.

Due to the work of groups like the Florida Breast Cancer Coalition, Federal funds for research have now increased by as much as sixfold. Eager advocates like Jane, Jill Lawrence, Shelly Greenberg, Midge Blumberg-Krams, Teresa Menendez, Claudia Dobelstein and all of the members of the Florida Breast Cancer Coalition will continue to fight until this treacherous disease is eradicated. Congratulations to them.

A NATION THAT BANS GOD IS A NATION THAT OPENS THE DOOR TO THE DEVIL

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, another school shooting; this time in Georgia. Everyone is desperately searching for answers. I say the search should stop right here. Congress must look in the mirror, because in America today our students can study cults, devil worship, Hitler, but God is banned, banned from our schools. I say a nation that bans God is a nation that opens the door to the devil and to the problems that we are facing as a nation.

Congress, it is time to allow God back into our schools, and I further recommend after all the technicalities we allow God back into our Nation.

RETURN ''THE HUMAN RIGHTS'' TO THE DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest a violation of the U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights by the Clinton administration. The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution guarantees that the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated.

Mr. Ramon Saul Sanchez, the President of the Democracy Movement, has been on a hunger strike in Miami for 16 days. He began this protest on May 5 to protest the illegal confiscation of the boat, The Human Rights, by the Coast Guard, acting on orders from the Clinton-Gore White House. The small boat was confiscated for the crime of carrying copies of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on the high seas the same day that dissidents within Cuba had announced that they would peacefully be commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

That apparently seditious document for the Clinton administration reads, everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence.

Mr. President, today is Cuban Independence Day. Bring an end to the hunger strike. Return The Human Rights to the Democracy Movement.

NINE OUT OF TEN AMERICANS SUPPORT CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(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, referring to the Democratic campaign finance reform discharge petition, which has 196 Democratic signatures, a Republican recently remarked in Roll Call and I quote, ''People who sign the discharge petition are committing treason against the party. That is how strongly I feel about that. That is a dangerous position to take and we need to end that talk.''

It is no surprise the Republican Party, which outspends Democrats two-to-one, has proclaimed that supporting campaign finance reform should be a felony offense.

Mr. Speaker, our political system needs and our constituents demand campaign finance reform now. Nine out of 10 Americans support campaign finance reform. I repeat, 9 out of 10 Americans. Last year, 196 Members signed the discharge petition that led to bringing the Shays-Meehan bipartisan campaign finance reform bill to the House floor.

□ 1015

Without that petition process, the House Republican leadership would never have let that debate occur. Time is running out. In order to have enough time for the Senate to pass campaign finance reform, moderate Republicans must sign this discharge petition immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the House must act now on campaign finance reform, and pass it before Memorial Day.

THE COLD WAR IS OVER, BUT DANGEROUS ENEMIES STILL EXIST

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Cold War is over. These words we have heard repeated thousands of times since the end of Communist tyranny in Berlin in 1989, especially by leftists whose eagerness to gut our military forces was similarly obvious, even at the height of the Cold War.

But though the Cold War is temporarily over, all of human history argues that it would be foolish to let our defenses down. Dangerous enemies still exist. They do not care what treaties we sign, how much good will Americans have, and they do not care how prosperous we become.

They wish to do us harm because they resent our wealth, reject our democratic values, despise our religious traditions, and cannot maintain their tyrannies at home knowing that freedom exists in a bastion we call America. The very existence of our Nation threatens their existence.

This chart dramatically shows what happens when a Nation ignores the lessons of history. We do so at our peril.

THE BOMBING IN YUGOSLAVIA MUST STOP AND DIPLOMATIC MEASURES TOWARDS PEACE MUST BE ACCELERATED

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, last night three innocent people died and scores were injured in the bombing of a Belgrade hospital by NATO air forces.

This tragedy, taken with the NATO bombing of the Swedish Ambassador's residence, the recent NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, the NATO bombing of refugee convoys, the NATO bombing of passenger buses and trains and other civilian infrastructure, raises grave questions about the strategy and the morality of NATO's actions.

It is no longer acceptable for NATO to blithely declare that the mass of civilian casualties resulting from the bombings are unintentional and therefore simply accidental. When such accidents keep repeating themselves and result in the countless deaths of innocent people, it is time to say this must stop.

The continued bombing and the consequent catastrophic parade of innocent human carnage, and NATO's arrogant willingness to endanger innocent civilians, even to mothers giving birth in hospitals, forfeits NATO's claim to the moral high ground. The bombing must stop, and diplomatic measures towards peace must be accelerated.

URGING MEMBERS TO JOIN IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 883, THE AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

(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 in support of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Resources, and the 183 Members who are cosponsors of H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

It is time that the Congress reclaim its authority granted under the Constitution to make decisions over lands belonging to the United States.

The United Nations has absolutely no right to make land designations for America's liberty bell, our Independence Hall, or the Statue of Liberty, or for that matter, any land management decisions for our national parks like the Grand Canyon or Yosemite.

Former Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick said it best: ''What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Connecticut or Iraq or Libya have made decisions that unjustly damage his or her property rights that lie near a national park?''

It is time that this Congress reclaim its constitutional authority and it is time that America reclaims her lands. I encourage Members to join me in supporting H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back any constitutional authority we may have left.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I am speaking from the other side of the aisle to reach out to our Republican friends. Many of them have been leaders in the effort to reform our campaign finance system. I applaud them for this. Today we need their courage more than ever.

It now appears we will not be debating this issue until September, if at all. It is difficult to go against leadership. No one likes to do this. I do not, either. But some issues require us to take a stand, and this is one of those times.

Today I am asking Members to stand for what they and I and the American people believe by signing the Blue Dog discharge petition. Let us bring campaign finance reform to the floor for a debate. We need to do it now.

THE ADMINISTRATION IS AGAIN PLAYING POLITICS WITH MEDICARE

(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, whom should Americans trust more to protect the Medicare program for seniors? Let us look at the facts.

Democrats sat idly by while Medicare was on the verge of bankruptcy during the period of time that they controlled both the White House and the Congress. Then Republicans won the majority of the Congress, and almost immediately reformed and strengthened Medicare for the first time ever. Democrats then attacked Republicans for reforming a program that should have been reformed a long time ago. That is fact number one.

Now consider this. We find out that this administration is spending $20 billion less on Medicare than the law allows. Let me repeat that. This administration is spending $20 billion less on Medicare than Congress intended and as authorized by law.

Hospitals are feeling the pinch. Seniors are not getting the care they need as quickly as they need it. Why is this administration playing politics once again with Medicare? Again, I ask the question, whom should seniors trust more to protect Medicare?

TRANSPORTATION BUREAUCRATS SEEK TO PENALIZE WORKING AMERICANS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the same Federal government that wants to see our medical records, monitor our banking transactions, register our private post office box, and if the Vice President has his way, tell us where to live, now wants to tax our drive to work every day.

Transportation officials in Maryland, with the apparent support of the Federal Highway Administration, are cooking up a silly idea that will allow those who can afford it to skirt rush hour traffic by paying to drive in a special HOT or high-occupancy toll lane. Those who cannot afford or do not want to pay an additional tax on a highway their tax dollars are already paying for are welcome to sit in rush hour traffic while those in the so-called Lexus lanes speed by.

Mr. Speaker, the reason there is a rush hour is that people have to go to work. They have to go to work to support their families and to pay their taxes, which help to pay the salaries of transportation bureaucrats who come up with these lame-brained ideas like this one.

Let us put a stop to this silliness before it is too late.

ASKING ALL MEMBERS TO SUPPORT THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM DISCHARGE PETITION

(Mr. LUTHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to ask all Democrats and Republicans to sign the campaign finance reform discharge petition. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because there is no issue more important to the future of this country than this particular issue.

I ask Members to ask themselves why it seems that Congress can never get anything done. I ask Members to ask themselves why Congress cannot pass health care reform legislation, child safety legislation, or the many other pressing issues facing this country. Ask why that supplemental funding bill this week was filled with pork barrel spending, rather than dealing with national priorities like education.

A good part of the answer is the way we fund campaigns in this country, the influence of special interests. We passed this bill, we debated it last year. We can pass it again now. We do not need to wait so that it gets tied up in budget negotiations or in politics of next year's elections. We can pass it for the American people today.

THE HISTORY OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the vacuous bleatings of my esteemed colleagues on the liberal side of the aisle who invoke campaign finance reform as their latest slogan.

How truly audacious for the very people who created the current campaign finance reform to now self-righteously proclaim their outrage at the way the government makes crooks out of the truly honest people among us.

Just what is it about the liberal mindset that allows them to avoid responsibility for so many of their bad ideas and failed initiatives?

Consider the history of campaign finance. The liberals imposed absurdly low limits on the participation of Americans in the political process. It is truly amazing how this has resulted in things that were entirely predictable.

What happened? Politicians were then forced to spend almost all their time raising money, and of course money then found other ways into the political process through soft money, through issue advocacy, and, dare I mention, through the Chinese Communist friends of the White House. And of course this money, unlike direct contributions, lacks full disclosure, which is an invitation to corruption.

Why are Democrats not talking about that?

URGING COSPONSORSHIP OF THE BORDER PATROL RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to urge my colleagues to cosponsor a bill that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and I are introducing today, the Border Control Recruitment and Retention Act.

This bill will correct a longstanding problem within the INS, and begins to address some of the recruitment and retention problems we have heard so much about lately. This bill is not a cure-all. It is, however, a step in the right direction.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on legislation for comprehensive pay reform for the United States Border Patrol. Currently most Border Patrol agents are kept at the GS–9 Journeyman level, with only 30 percent of the work force actually working at GS–11, even though their work is much more comprehensive.

The bill we are introducing today states that any GS–9 with a current rating of fully successful will automatically qualify for GS–11. What does this mean? It means that on the average, Border Patrol agents will move from a salary of about $34,000 a year to a salary of about $41,000. It addresses a pay disparity. It is fitting that we introduce this legislation today and push for its passage this year, which is the United States Border Patrol's 7th anniversary.

I believe that this is the least we can do for an agency that is at the front line of the defense for this country.

TO FORMER DEMOCRAT RUDY BRADLEY, WELCOME TO THE GOP

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, there is a trend going on in America today that is not talked much about, particularly on that side, at least on the national level. It is a phenomenon of party switching, and it is party-switching going in one direction and one direction only, from Democrats to Republicans.

Over 390 elected Democrats have switched to the GOP since Clinton and Gore were elected in 1992. Well, the Republican Party would like to welcome the latest party-switcher, State Representative Rudy Bradley of St. Petersburg, Florida.

Rudy Bradley is the only black Republican in the 160-member Florida legislature, for now. Here we have a lifetime proud Democrat who has finally come to the conclusion that the Democratic Party simply does not reflect his values or the values of his constituents.

He is tired of the Democrats' constant demonizing those who disagree with them. He is tired of rhetoric that says one thing while governing as a tax and spend liberal. He is tired of the attacks on the traditional values that made America great to begin with.

Rudy, welcome to the GOP.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress knows firsthand the control that money has over our electoral process, and what is worse, the American people know firsthand the control that money has over our electoral process.

The money spent on last November's election totaled $1 billion. This is an outrageous sum that hurts our democracy and it hurts our constituents. If voters are disgusted and turned off by the excesses in campaign financing they will not vote, and make no mistake, voters are disgusted. They are turned off and they are not voting.

Our constituents deserve better. The American people deserve better. Let us ban soft money and stop the attack ads disguised as issue advocacy soft money pays for. Let us strengthen the Federal Election Commission and give it the teeth it needs to enforce campaign finance laws. This Congress must act to restore confidence and participation in our electoral system.

Last month my colleagues and I signed a discharge petition to demand that Congress take up the important issue of campaign finance reform. The very fact that as Members of Congress we must petition our government speaks volumes and is a testament to the control money has over our electoral process.

We must prove to our constituents that we are serious about real reform. We must make sure that our political system represents everyone, not just those that can afford it.

AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 180 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 180

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. 833) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands. 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 Resources. After general debate, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute

rule for a period not to exceed four hours. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 180 be amended on page 2, line 2, by striking ''833'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''883''.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike ''833'' and insert in lieu thereof ''883''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 180 would grant H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, a modified open rule, providing 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule provides for a 4-hour limit on the amendment process and provides that the bill shall be considered as read. Additionally, the rule makes in order only those amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments that are preprinted may be offered only by the Member who caused them to be printed or his designee, shall be considered as read, and may be amended.

The rule further allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 883 was reported by the Committee on Resources. The bill would restore the constitutional role of Congress in managing lands belonging to the United States, preserve the sovereignty of the United States over its lands, and protect State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands adjacent to the Federal lands.

Under Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution, Congress is vested with the authority to regulate Federal lands. Yet, over the past 25 years, an increasing expansion of our Nation's public lands have been included in various land use programs with little congressional oversight or approval. Two notable programs are the United Nations Biosphere Reserves and the World Heritage Sites, both of which are under the jurisdiction of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization or UNESCO.

There are now 47 UNESCO Biosphere Reserves and 20 World Heritage Sites in the United States. By becoming party to these international land use agreements through executive action, but without congressional authorization, the United States may be indirectly agreeing to terms to international treaties which the Senate has refused to ratify.

By consenting to international land use designations, the United States in effect agrees to impose restrictions on surrounding lands which, in many cases, include a substantial amount of private property. Subjecting private property owners to land use restrictions imposed without their consent, or even the consent of their elected representatives, is a very serious matter. It is a practice which this Congress should emphatically reject.

In response to growing concern about this situation, H.R. 883 would amend the National Historic Preservation Act to require congressional approval before any nominated property may be included in the World Heritage list. It would require the Secretary of the Interior to submit a report to Congress describing what impact inclusion on the World Heritage list would have on the natural resources associated with these nominated lands.

The bill would prohibit the Secretary of Interior from nominating a property for inclusion on the World Heritage list until the Secretary makes findings that existing commercially viable uses of the nominated land or land within 10 miles of the nomination would not be adversely affected by its inclusion.

H.R. 883 would prohibit Federal officials from nominating any land in the U.S. for designation as a Biosphere Reserve and would terminate all existing Biosphere Reserves unless, one, the Biosphere Reserve is specifically authorized in law by a date certain, two, the designated Biosphere Reserve consists entirely of land owned by the U.S., and, three, a management plan has been implemented which specifically provides for the protection of non-Federal property rights and uses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill would prohibit Federal officials from designating any land in the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such designation is specifically approved by law, and would also prohibit including any State, local, or privately owned land in any such designation, unless that designation is approved by those affected parties.

The Committee on Rules has reported a modified rule, as requested by the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) of the Committee on Resources, in order to provide Members of the House seeking to amend this legislation with the full and fair opportunity to do so.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 883.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for a modified open rule which makes in order only those amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and limits debate of the bill to 4 hours. These restrictions are wholly unnecessary. Any time one imposes an arbitrary time limit, one runs the risk of limiting full debate. I oppose the rule in its current form and note that open rules best protect all Members' rights to fully represent their constituents.

Moreover, I have significant concerns about the legislation the rule makes in order. While the bill purports to preserve U.S. sovereignty over the use of Federal lands, in reality, this measure is unnecessary and could hinder United States participation in international efforts to protect and preserve valuable lands throughout the world. Similar dubious legislation has failed in two previous Congresses, and this bill will get the same fate.

The World Heritage Convention and the Man and Biosphere Program will provide the international community with means of recognizing areas with great natural and cultural significance. These honorific programs respect each State's sovereignty and have no legal jurisdiction over countries or communities.

Since 1973, the World Heritage Convention has successfully been implemented by the United States Department of Interior. The Convention was, in fact, a United States initiative under then President Richard Nixon.

A site may be listed as a World Heritage site only if it contains cultural or natural resources of universal value, and if the national government where the site is located nominates and protects the site.

Listing an area as a World Heritage site imposes no change in U.S. law nor any requirement for future changes in domestic law. It does not give oversight, management, or regulatory authority over United States lands to any foreign and national organization.

Nor does the United States Man and Biosphere Program place any U.S. lands or resources under the control of the United Nations or any international body. In fact, this is a domestic Federal program. It, therefore, does not impose any restrictions beyond those already in place under American law.

For over 20 years, under the auspices of four Republican and two Democratic Presidents, these programs have functioned with little or no controversy. The allegations by the proponents of H.R. 883 that these beneficial programs somehow threaten the United States sovereignty are pure fantasy.

However we do have a Federal, foreign encroachment on American lands, and I am referring to the mining and mineral rights that have been leased to foreign corporations with leases that cost about an average of $2.50 per acre per year. These leases have been in effect since the days of Ulysses S. Grant. If we would like to do something to protect our own lands, and stop cheating our taxpayers. We should change this disgraceful giveaway.

Our national parks do need attention, but Congress certainly could do better than this bill, which is designed to remedy an imaginary problem, the supposed encroachment of foreign domination over our public resources.

Mr. Speaker, another community woke this morning to the horror of a school shooting. It is not as bad as Columbine we are told. We hope that these are not going to be fatal shots. But surely this House can be better spending this time, rather than spending 4 hours on this one House nowhere bill, and be working on after-school programs and try to do something about bringing guns under some control.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill by the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Resources, and the rule that brings this bill to the floor.

This bill does not prohibit or stop the United States from including land in an international land reserve. All it says is that there must first be congressional approval so that the private property rights of neighboring landowners can be protected.

What this bill is attempting to do is to allow a little more public input into this process and give the people a tiny bit of say about actions that can have tremendous impact on their land.

It really boils down to whether we still have a government of, by, and for the people, or has it become one of, by, and for unelected bureaucrats and elitists who want to control other people's land.

Jeane Kirkpatrick, our former ambassador to the United Nations, wrote to the Committee on Resources these words, ''In U.N. organizations, there is no accountability. U.N. bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters. What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya, all of which are parties to this treaty, have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park?''

Professor Jeremy Rabkin of the Department of Government of Cornell University testified in support of this bill, saying, ''The underlying problem is that international regulatory schemes now reach more deeply into the internal affairs of sovereign nations and have therefore begun to threaten internal systems of government,'' adding that ''such ventures are in some ways as much a threat to the stability of international law as they are to our own system of government at home.''

Professor Rabkin said we need this bill, not to slow this dangerous trend toward taking government further away from the people, but also, ''as a means of reasserting our own constitutional traditions.''

Professor Detlev Vagts of the Harvard Law School said international involvement in local and private land use decisions, ''pose an import problem'' in their ''tendency to shift powers and responsibilities from national and subnational units, with active, reachable legislative bodies to remote international bureaucracies.''

I realize that some opponents of this bill do not want to debate this on the merits, so they resort to childish sarcasm and try to make this bill seem less than serious by making fun of it.

But this bill deserves the support of all those who really believe in private property and limited government and the freedom that is protected by those two great traditions on which this Nation was built.

Private property is not only one of the key components of our prosperity. It is one of the main things that set us apart from the former Soviet Union and other socialist Nations.

Today almost one-third of our land is owned by the Federal Government, and another 20 percent is owned by State and local governments and quasi-governmental units. Governments at all levels are rapidly taking over additional land. Perhaps even more of a threat to freedom are the restrictions being placed by government on land still in private ownership.

We heard testimony from Steven Lindsey whose family has operated a ranch on Turkey Creek in rural Arizona since the 1860s. He was shocked to find out one day that a 60-acre private wetland on his property was now controlled by the international RAMSAR Convention agreement in addition to all the endangered species and other regulations he was already under.

□ 1045

Under Ramsar, Mr. Lindsey said, ''My rights as a private property owner are threatened and the Ramsar language can be used to violate my property rights and deprive me of the use of my land.''

He added these words, Mr. Speaker: ''The same government that promised my great, great grandfather and my great grandfather the land through the Homestead Act and pursuit of happiness is now the same government that is helping destroy these dreams.''

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, a serious bill; and people who truly believe in freedom, rather than big brother repressive government, should support it enthusiastically.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Frankly, this bill is not correctable by amendment. I think the proper disposition of it is to defeat this bill. I think it is, obviously, a great misunderstanding. I think it reflects a fear that has been translated into legislative language which is inappropriate and I think the wrong direction clearly to move, and so I do not know how I could amend it.

In the last session, Mr. Speaker, a lot of concern arose because we proposed some 60 or 70 different amendments to this bill. It touches on about 82 areas in the United States that are classified as World Heritage sites, as Man and the Biosphere program, or as Ramsar sites. There may be more sites in the United States, but those are the three principal treaties that deal with natural and cultural resources of distinction, usually within our parks or in those areas; and Man and the Biosphere programs which focus on special natural environments, other types of environments that are used for scientific research; and the Ramsar sites, which protect wetlands.

There may be other treaties and compacts that are affected, Mr. Speaker. They have not been spoken of or explored in committee. In fact, I think most of the committee meetings have been based on a lot of emotionalism and misconceptions and obviously some distaste for the United Nations, which happens to be associated loosely with some of the designations here and recognitions that have taken place.

Incidentally, when I was looking at the numbers, there are nearly 2,000 sites globally that are recognized under these programs. The United States has very few sites that we have let in the development of these treaties and programs; and, of course, to in fact renege on this presents all sorts of problems to us in terms of our global leadership in terms of the environment.

But that I think is really at the heart of this that there are those that cannot attack these parks, these wildernesses directly, so they choose to wrap themselves in American sovereignty and some displeasure I guess with the U.N., Mr. Speaker, and it is manifest in this bill that we have before us today, H.R. 883.

The rule is really unfair because we had talked and while there was some fear that we might offer 70 amendments, as I said, it is not correctable, but nevertheless the Committee on Rules gets up and suggested that it is offering an open rule, that we can offer any amendments that we want. But then they impose this time limitation on the bill.

I do not think that any of us have any visions of keeping the Congress in session all day tonight and late into the hours, especially a day when many Members would like to travel home to their districts so they can work and be back together with their families and constituents, a goal certainly that I share with them. But, nevertheless, the Committee on Rules arbitrarily sets in place this 4-hour limit.

Unfortunately, in fact I think, Mr. Speaker, that my amendment is the only amendment that will be offered and that we will pursue that and see whether or not the fidelity of this group for American sovereignty carries through to commercial uses of the property for foreign countries and entities that might want to mine, they might want to harvest trees and do other exploitative activities in the land. If there is any enthusiasm for saving American taxpayers and saving their resources for America, we will see whether or not we can sell that particular idea.

But there is no reason for putting a time limit on this bill. I think it is a reflection, unfortunately, of the circumstances and the state of affairs that exists in this Congress today, in fact, in terms of what I say, a lack of trust between us, Mr. Speaker, which I think is unneeded.

And, therefore, I will oppose this rule. I think it is not an open rule. It is a rule which has a time limitation, and I think it is unnecessary and this House should reject the rule.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 178, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—240

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—178

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—15

Blagojevich
Brown (CA)
Burton
Doolittle
Dunn
Evans
Foley
Gephardt
Gilman
Kucinich
Napolitano
Ose
Salmon
Towns
Waxman

□ 1111

Messrs. ROEMER, SPRATT and HILLIARD and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. TANCREDO and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 140 on H. Res. 180 I was unavoidably detained in an important meeting. Had I been here I would have voted ''yea.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 180 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. 883.

□ 1115

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. 883) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, with Mr. STEARNS 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 Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) will each control 30 minutes.

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

□ 1115

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, asserts the power of Congress on the Constitution over the lands belonging to the United States, and this is all this bill does.

So that everyone understands, the concern here is the Congress and, therefore, the people. They are left out of the domestic process to designate World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves.

This bill requires the participation, as the Constitution so states, that the Member of the Congress and the citizens of this Nation are in the process.

Many, many Americans from all over, sections of our country, have called my office, I am sure they have called my colleagues also, to say they are concerned about the lack of congressional oversight over UNESCO international land reserves in the U.S. and to express support for this bill. Within the last 25 years, 83 sites in the United States have been designated as Biosphere Reserves, World Heritage Sites or Ramsar Sites, all with virtually no congressional oversight and no congressional hearings. The public and local governments have not be consulted.

The World Heritage and Ramsar programs are based on a treaty. H.R. 883 does not end U.S. participation in the World Heritage or Ramsar Sites. We have domestic laws implementing these programs, and H.R. 883 proposes to change these domestic laws so that Congress must approve the sites.

The Biosphere Reserve Program is not authorized by even a single U.S. law or any international treaty. That is wrong. Executive Branch appointees, whatever their political party, cannot and should not do things that the law does not authorize, and I ask my colleagues, what is unreasonable about Congress insisting that no land be designated for inclusion in these international land use programs without clear and direct approval of the Congress?

What is unreasonable about having local citizens and public officials participate in decisions on designated land near their homes for inclusion in an international preserve?

If the boundaries of a national park are forced to change, even by a small adjustment, Congress must approve the change. However, a 15.4 million acre South Appalachian Biosphere Reserve encompassing parts of six States stretching from northeast Alabama to southwest Virginia was created by unelected bureaucrats, bypassing the Congress, and this is unconstitutional and it is wrong.

We need to reemphasize the congressional duty to keep international commitments from abridging traditional constitutional constraints. Otherwise the boundaries between our owners' lands and others or even between the government's land and private property are too easily and often ignored.

H.R. 883 will also prevent attempts by the Executive Branch to use international land designation to bypass the Congress in making land decisions and protect our domestic land use decision-making process from unnecessary international interference.

We are going to hear a lot today from the other side and those that oppose it about this bill being driven by the fear of black helicopters and catering to suspicions and conspiracy theories of extremists. We will also hear a lot about the effectiveness and importance of the wonderful programs. We are also going to be told that these programs are honorary and have no effect on the use, management or disposition of public lands. However, the World Heritage Centre says otherwise. The director of the World Heritage Centre told the Interior Department in a letter:

''Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention obligates the State Party to protect, conserve, present and transmit to future generations World Heritage Sites for which they are responsible. This obligation extends beyond the boundary of the site and Article 5(A) recommends the State Parties integrate the protection of sites into comprehensive planning programmes. Thus, if proposed developments will damage the integrity of the Yellowstone National Park, the State Party has a responsibility to act beyond the National Park boundary.''

Going beyond what Congress has set aside, I submit this decision as a responsibility of Congress, not some U.N. committee of unelected bureaucrats.

The public and local governments are almost never consulted about creating World Heritage Sites, the Ramsar Sites and Biosphere Reserves. Although proponents of these programs always keep saying the designations are made at the request of local communities, designation efforts are almost always driven by Federal agencies, usually the National Park Service. The Committee on Resources has not found one example where one of these designations was requested by a broad-based cross-section of either the public or local officials. On the contrary, these programs usually face strong local opposition. In my State the Alaska State Legislature passed a resolution supporting H.R. 883, and I will urge my colleagues to listen to the debate, make their decision, but remember their constitutional duty, and that is to make us the designees of lands use.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, when Members are speaking, charts are permitted to be displayed in the House Chamber and the Committee of the Whole; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. With the permission of the House, when the question is raised, that is correct.

Mr. VENTO. And when Members have desisted from speaking, are charts still permitted to be displayed in the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The charts are taken out of the well at that time.

Mr. VENTO. Are they permitted to be in the other portions of the House and be displayed at that time?

The CHAIRMAN. They should not be displayed anywhere in the Chamber unless they are being used in the debate.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a provision and the custom of the House is that these matters may be displayed in the Speaker's Lobby; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is permissible, with the Speaker's approval.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the Chairman for his response to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. This is not new legislation. It, I think, has, and it is a case, as I said, where we have heard this tune before for the last two Congresses, and the House has passed this after spirited debate, and the fact is that it has gone to the Senate and not received consideration in the Senate; and I think the fact is that listening to the discussion of our distinguished chairman and his debate, and he is very good at debate, but the fact is that the words here do not match the music in terms of what takes place with this legislation.

This is a bad bill. This really cuts the head off of these programs that the

United States has led in creating on a global basis over the last 25 or 30 years under President Nixon, under other Presidents that have served since then, both Democrat and Republican, Carter, Reagan, Ford; pardon me, Ford, and of course Bush and now President Clinton. These programs have been in existence, and these administrations have supported them because it is a good program. It permits the United States to provide global leadership in terms of the preservation and conservation of special areas such as World Heritage Sites, which are protected because of their natural or cultural resources, Man and the Biosphere programs which some 600-and-some sites globally, only about 47 in the United States incidentally, which are used for scientific research, these ecosystems where scientists can gain information, and of course, hopefully, we take that new knowledge and translate it into good public policy on a global basis.

And finally, of course, areas like wetlands areas like the Ramsar sites, which there are over 700 sites globally, only about 15 in the United States, again where we protect and provide areas for protection of various waterfall and other fauna and flora that happen, obviously occur in these areas.

Now my colleague and chairman, the distinguished chairman said that this is unconstitutional. Well, where is the court case? This has been in existence for 30 years. Where the court case that says that this is an action taken by one of these past administrations over the last 25 or 30 years, that says this is unconstitutional?

We had a constitutional lawyer, I believe Mr. Rufkin from Yale, that appeared before us. When he was asked that question, he was not able to come up with one court case, one decision that had been made that said that this was unconstitutional.

This is not unconstitutional. These designations are made in the United States on a voluntary basis, just as they are around the globe. These are voluntary designations. The Congress has exercised its responsibility and done it well in most Congresses with regards to land use questions. In fact, we designated parks, we have designated wildernesses, we have designated and passed on and permit the agencies to designate on their own areas of environmental concern, for instance, in the BLM and many other areas. But the Congress has jealously guarded, and I would jealously guard, the right of Congress to, in fact, identify and to designate these various lands for the purposes that we are entrusted to do so, but the fact is that what we are saying here is that these areas have already been designated.

Now the big complaint here really revolves around Yellowstone and a mine that was occurring outside of Yellowstone but in obviously the watershed of Yellowstone, and the fact of the matter is that area was designated a Man and the Biosphere area for research, and it was pointed out that if that mine occurred, that it would adversely affect the entire hydrology and watershed and other natural factors in that area. And the fact is that we think and I think that the parks and other lands have an extra boundary responsibility, that they can go and talk about activities outside the boundary of the parks, outside the boundary of a wilderness, outside boundaries. These trans-boundary issues are very important because we have to come to the realization that the de facto wilderness creation or park creation, that the areas that happen at their margin, boundaries, are causing these parks to be and these special areas that we set aside to be adversely effected.

That is what this is about. We already designated them a park. We have already designated wilderness. But not being able to attack the parks and the wilderness and the other conservation areas that we designated directly, they choose to do it through this particular claim of American sovereignty and wrap themselves in that particular issue with, I guess, a strong distaste for the U.N.

Mr. Chairman, this is one thing that the U.N. and UNESCO is doing right. This is one thing where past Presidents, both Democrats and Republicans and their administrations, have strongly supported. There are nearly 2,000 sites that have been designated and recognized by these international bodies just in these three treaty areas or protocol agreements that we have here, just in these three, but there may be others affected by this legislation. In the United States there are only 82 of those.

Our leadership has done a magnificent job here. Let us keep the United States in the forefront of it. Let us reject this bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 883 is not new legislation. The Congress first considered this idea in 1996, and then again in 1997. In both instances, the other body refused to consider this measure on the floor and the Administration indicated it would veto the measure if passed. Why? Because they don't have visions of blue helmets dancing through their heads.

H.R. 883 is misguided because it is aimed at the symbols of a federal policy when, what the supporters of the legislation really oppose, is the underlying policy itself. While some of my colleagues and I might like to see us doing even more, this country has set as a national policy goal—the long-term preservation of our environmental resources. The commitment this Nation has made to this preservation/conservation/restoration policy sometimes demands that certain activities which threaten these resources be prohibited, and/or tightly limited by us and no one else. The reality of the circumstance regarding these voluntary agreements is that no blue helmets will come parachuting behind national park lines in black helicopters to seize control of American lands all in the name of preservation or conservation. Besides, after today we may have made a statement as to a crack missile defense system to thwart any and all attempts to seize the sovereignty of our great Nation by those international agents of evil.

Any and all land use the restrictions in place are functions of U.S. law, not an international treaty or protocol. Our participation in the World Heritage Convention, the Ramsar Convention and the Man and the Biosphere program is emblematic of this underlying policy and the symbolic value and importance the U.S. places on its natural resources, our natural legacy. The twenty sites we have nominated under the World Heritage Convention are listed because Congress chose to enact policy and law to protect them, and establish special land managers to regulate and enforce such law. To address a specific example that gave rise to this bill, the problem with the New World Mine was that it was, in fact, too close to Yellowstone National Park, not that it was too close to a World Heritage site. If we want to debate the basic principles of environmental protection, that's fine. But, we should not waste our time passing legislation that seeks to abolish the programs which grow out of these basic principles which have evolved over 200 years of American land use ethic. Quite simply, this legislation turns logic on its head.

Let's be clear—the goal of H.R. 883 is to abandon these programs, not simply to regulate them. To require an Act of Congress for each and every parcel of land to be considered, is to effectively stop all future nominations and designations.

This legislation sends a signal around the world that our nation, the United States of America, which forged the policy path to institute the World Heritage Convention, is undercutting the values and benefits of international recognition for important cultural and environmental sites. At a time when the United States is thrust into a role as the dominant power and an essential role as a world leader in so many areas—why would we voluntarily abdicate perhaps the most important leadership position we occupy—that of a leader in the effort to make life on this planet sustainable. This would convey to the hundreds of nations part of the conservation treaties and protocol agreements, that domestic political considerations come first. If the U.S. cannot even permit recognition to be accorded, why should other nations?

Why are we pursuing legislation that is misdirected and misguided and based solely on gross misinformation? Each agreement covered by this bill states on its face that it contains no provision that affects, in any way, the authority or ability of a participating nation to control the lands within its border. These programs give the UN no more control over land in this country than the awarding of a gold medal gives the U.S. Olympic Committee control over an American athlete. To claim that these international programs somehow infringe on the sovereignty of this nation is simply factually inaccurate.

Finally, the largest threat to this nation's sovereignty isn't even addressed. Any foreign company or their subsidiary is still given full and free access for any and all of America's valuable natural resources. Each year we watch $1.8 billion worth of gold and silver stream out of our ports and into the coffers of foreign owned companies. What's worse, while we debate this phantom legislation, foreign nations are cashing in big-time, and

laughing all the way to the bank with our resources. I will introduce an amendment to correct this situation and bring balance back to the management of our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, this is an issue of takings, not of private property, but of the stripped international recognition and esteem the citizens of the United States, and the world place on some of America's most stunning and ecologically important natural resources. Teddy Roosevelt ushered in a new era of conservation and respect for the natural heritage of the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century. How ironic it is that nearly a century later this Nation may come full circle and, if this legislation passes, denounce the importance of those very parks and resources on which the heritage of this nation is based.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 883.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 883, and I thank the chairman and the committee staff for getting this bill done in such good form and to the floor so quickly.

I am glad that I am speaking right after the gentleman from Minnesota because he made the statement that we all know this is about Yellowstone National Park, and I represent Wyoming which has the most of Yellowstone National Park, and he said that the U.N. is doing a good job by these designations, that the reason that Yellowstone was designated, because a mine was going to be developed north of Yellowstone that might affect the watershed.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues the rest of the story. For 2 years an environmental impact statement had been going on, and professional scientists were not able in 2 years time to determine whether or not that developing that mine would put Yellowstone National Park in jeopardy.

□ 1130

They were working toward that, but they still had more work to do before they professionally could say that was true.

In 3 days' time, the United Nations came in. Three days later they determined that this indeed was an area in jeopardy, and then it was designated an area in jeopardy. So if that is what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) thinks is a good job, I certainly would have to disagree with him.

I do agree with him, however, on the fact that what this argument boils down to are these transboundary issues. As far back as 1818, the United States Supreme Court ruled in the United States v. Bevins that a State's right to control property within its borders was an essential part of its sovereignty, and I think that H.R. 883 is yet another affirmation of that principle. What was done when this designation was made around Yellowstone was it virtually built a buffer zone around Yellowstone.

It is something the administration had been trying to do for a long time but they could not get it done legislatively, even though it is clearly legislative responsibility to designate public land use. So they went around the back door and had the U.N. committee in 3 days make that designation.

This is a good bill. This is something that Americans have the right, the Congress has the right and the responsibility to make these designations, and all we are asking is that these designations be approved by the Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 883.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in total opposition to this bill because there is absolutely nothing out there that is broken that needs fixing. This addresses a problem that does not exist.

Let me say I know something about this issue because I own land that is designated by this. I own an inholding in the University of California property in Big Sur, California. We are proud of this designation. One cannot get a designation unless the landowner, in this case it would be the Federal Government for National Parks or for Bureau of Land Management lands, or in our case a private owner, has to request the nomination. That is the only way it can come is from the owner of the land to say we would like to participate in the program.

The program is essentially an international way of being able to have a common database about measurement of environmental factors, so that we can see whether there are like kind of factors around the world, there are like kinds of problems or are the problems that are developing in an area significant to that area.

To go out and say that we should have congressional approval for these designations is so ludicrous. I mean, why do we not have congressional approval and oversight for accreditation of universities? That is not done by Congress, or by any government. Why do we not have the AAA, the guides that go around and say that one can sleep in these hotels and motels, we do not have any congressional oversight of that. We do not have any congressional oversight of TV Guide or the motion picture movie ratings. We do not have any oversight of the Good Housekeeping or Consumer Reports Magazine. We do not demand that we have to look at these things.

Why? They are not a problem where one wants to involve congressional action in this thing.

To say that we should have Congress telling our local communities and States that they cannot have their property so designated, I think, is totally wrong. It is a usurpation of local control.

If the chairman would like to have Alaska properties and have Glacier National Park and have the Denali National Forest exempted, then he can do that for the State of Alaska, but for California we have community local water districts in Marin County; we have private lands in California; we have State parks in California. All of those requested to be part of this system because we want to be better informed, we want to be educated. We are not part of this flat earth society that is afraid of learning about something.

So this bill would deny our ability to get that nomination because one would have to go through this incredible congressional process. We cannot even pass legislation here to keep the country running. How are we going to make decisions on whether somebody should be able to voluntarily be placed in an international information system?

This is a ludicrous bill. Please defeat it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who just spoke, who is a dear friend of mine, that the landowner in Yellowstone did not request that participation in the World Heritage Program. In fact, she opposed it and unfortunately she was not listened to.

In our hearings in New York, we had people that came to the committee and said that, yes, the Federal Government was trying to implement Heritage sites in their districts and they adamantly opposed it. It is happening right today in Lake Champlain.

So what I am just suggesting is as much as I admire the sincerity of the gentleman, I would like to have him look at some of the records.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, Thomas Jefferson once said "When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it . . . will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated." The current system for establishing international land reserves ignores Jefferson's warning by centralizing the power with the President and taking away the authority of Congress, the States and the average citizen.

During the last 25 years, our nation's public lands have slowly been consumed by international land reserves. Most notably 47 United Nations Biosphere Reserves, 20 World Heritage Sites and 16 Ramsar Sites. These reserves were created with virtually no congressional oversight, no hearings, and in the case of biosphere reserves, no legislative authority. I don't know about you Mr. Chairman, but my ability to represent my constituents as a voting member of this body is important to me! We cannot allow this administration to take our vote away. I ask that you support the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, if that is the case then I would suggest within his authority as chairman of the Committee on Resources that the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) may want to just limit this then to Federal properties and not to State and local properties or private properties.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I believe my bill does that. It does limit it just to Federal properties.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 883. I do want to say to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), that I know that there are many places that perhaps are honored to have these designations bestowed upon them. On the other hand, in my district, a designation was going to be thrust upon people without any local input and I think that is what this legislation is trying to clarify.

I do want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) for his strong leadership on this issue and, in fact, the leadership he shows on many private property rights issues, and the work that he has done on behalf of private property owners.

I would also like to extend a similar thanks to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH), who chairs the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, who has been a devoted champion of private property rights. She recently came to my district in southern Missouri to represent the Committee on Resources and to chair a hearing on the legislation we are talking about today.

We heard from a lot of local people, farmers, county officials, ranchers, small businesspeople, property owners, those people who have the most at stake when international land designation issues arises.

Let me just talk a little bit about what the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) and I learned during the recent field hearing in the Missouri Ozarks, but I am just going to take a second before that to talk about how I became involved in this issue.

Back in 1996, as I was traveling across my district, in every single little town in the center of my district, which is part of the Mark Twain National Forest, in which there is tourism that really promotes the local economy and some timber sales everywhere, Ellington, Van Buren, Salem, to name a few, people were concerned about these designations and particularly about something called the Ozark Man and the Biosphere program that basically would take 15 Missouri and Arkansas counties and put them into a biosphere reserve.

Let me say there was no local input involved whatsoever, and that my folks had to scrape and claw their way to find out anything about this. They were simply tipped off one day by a friend on the conservation commission. The amazing thing was, when they went to the agencies, the Department of Interior, specifically to ask about exactly what was happening, the Interior Department said, do not worry about this; it was going to be fine; we have talked to lots of local citizens around the district.

Well, the fact of the matter is, every single county in my district that would be impacted by this had absolutely no public solicitation by the Interior Department, Fish and Wildlife, whomever was involved, whatsoever. Not one county commissioner was called, not one local citizens group, and it was not until we had enough cattlemen's associations, enough farm bureau associations and finally all of the county commissions writing their own resolutions that this was a bad idea that the designation was dropped and these 15 counties in Missouri and Arkansas were saved from having to have a biosphere reserve designation put on them because, quite frankly, my citizens were afraid that once the designation happened then the government would find more and more reasons to seize the contiguous property around, and that would be their private property.

I think this really shows that we have a broken process and that experience makes the case for our bill today. All this bill would do would be to establish an appropriate process for biospheres and heritage area designations and ensure that local input and participation of Congress is involved. I do not think that is asking too much. I think it is very, very reasonable.

I will say, back when the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) and I were in Missouri, we heard from 12 different panelists, one of whom was a county commissioner; one was the former chairman of the Missouri Conservation Commission; several private citizens, but Leon Kreisler, who was a cattleman, and a landowner in Salem, Missouri, said, and I quote, ''We feel strongly about property rights not because we share a common desire to abuse our natural resources but because landowners are often best suited to ensure productivity for our families and those of future generations. The Ozarks are a natural wonder and we intend to keep them that way, but national or international designations are not the answer.''

Mr. Kreisler makes the point that I would like to reiterate, that our farmers and our ranchers are among the best conservationists anywhere because they depend on the land for their livelihood and they know that if they do not take care of the land then the land is not going to take care of them.

We had also an owner from a sawmill in Potosi, Missouri. He spent 20 years as an analyst for Price Waterhouse before buying the sawmill.

Needless to say, Carl Barnes, the sawmill owner, talked about the threats from this coordinated resource management system and the threats that this would have upon outdoor recreation because they listed farming and mining as threats to outdoor recreation and our ecosystem health.

The fact of the matter is we can do it all, and I think that we do it all responsibly. We simply need to have this program put in place so that local citizens who live in areas for proposed designations have input, that is all it is, and that Congress have input, too.

I urge a yes vote on H.R. 883.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), a member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO), for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. This bill would undo some of the most important progress that has been achieved toward protection of internationally important cultural, historical and environmental resources.

What would enactment of this bill mean? Well, for starters, it would mean that the United States has decided to politicize the question of whether our country will continue to take part in the World Heritage Convention, the Man and the Biosphere Program, and the so-called Ramsar Convention regarding wetlands that have particular importance as waterfowl habitat. That might not be objectionable if our participation in these international programs involved any trade-offs in terms of our ability to make decisions about the management of our lands or resources, but the fact is that nothing in these international agreements affects the ownership or the management of any lands or other resources.

Similarly, I could understand the need for this legislation if, as some of its supporters claim, these international agreements have eaten away at the power and sovereignty of the Congress to exercise its constitutional power to make the laws that govern Federal lands, but here we are debating a bill that would be an exercise of exactly that constitutional power, and that constitutional power is fully intact today, fully intact with regard to each and every acre of Federal lands, including all the Federal lands that are covered by these international agreements.

So what is the real point of this bill? As far as I can tell, it is primarily a means for supporters to take a shot at the United Nations and particularly UNESCO, and to demonstrate their solidarity with some who seem to view the U.N. as engaged in a vast multiwing conspiracy to overthrow our constitutional government. I do not

think the U.N. is a threat to Congress' authority over Federal lands or to any other part of the Constitution. I do think this bill, if we take it seriously, is a threat to America's international leadership in environmental conservation and in the protection of historical and cultural resources.

□ 1145

So I think this bill is bad for our country, and I know it is bad for my home State of Colorado.

I want to tell my colleagues about the two Biosphere Reserves that we have, areas that are part of the Man and the Biosphere Program. One is the Niwot Ridge Research area and the other is Rocky Mountain National Park. As it now stands, this bill would kick those areas out of the program unless Congress passes a new law to retain them.

To get a better idea of what that would mean for Niwot Ridge, I contacted Professor Bowman, the Director of the University of Colorado's Mountain Research Station, and he explained to me that having Niwot Ridge in the Biosphere Reserve System, it provided a framework for international cooperation of many important research efforts, including working with the Biosphere Reserve in the Czech Republic to address air pollution problems, which is a matter of great importance not only to us, but to the Czechs. He told me that the biosphere program also had been helpful to people at Niwot Ridge as they worked with the Forest Service to develop a land management plan that would promote multiple use by minimizing the conflicts that we all grapple with here over recreation and scientific and other uses, which is again a matter of great importance to Colorado and all other public land States.

I also talked to the National Park Service about Rocky Mountain National Park, which again is included as a biosphere reserve. They told me that it not only means that there are more research activities at the park, but that it meant a significant increase in park visitation, tourism, which not only provides important educational benefits but is an important part of our economy in Colorado. Kicking these areas out of the program would be bad for Colorado and something that I cannot support.

Exempting the Colorado areas from the bill would be an improvement, but I do not think that alone would make the bill acceptable. We need to reject this bill, move away from the posturing and begin working on the real problems that face us on our public lands.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman. I am delighted to support this bill, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. I really want to thank the gentleman from Alaska for his efforts in this regard. He has been a champion of private property rights for many years, I have known him for 23 years, and I respect him greatly.

I represent the east side of the State of Washington, one-fourth of the size of our State, and in that portion of the State of Washington there are wonderful open space lands that people inhabit who are very protective of their private property rights.

The right to own property is a core principle on which our country was founded. Over the years, the Federal Government has established programs like the World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves, without the approval of Congress, Mr. Chairman, and that overrides the intentions of the Constitution and our Founding Fathers.

Under the U.S. Constitution, Congress retains the power to, quote, ''make all needful rules and regulations governing lands belonging to the United States.'' The lands designated under the World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves have been so designated without the approval of Congress.

So this bill restores the intentions of our Founding Fathers by requiring congressional approval for any nomination of property located in the United States for inclusion in the World Heritage list. It prohibits any Federal official from nominating U.S. property for designation as a biosphere reserve and prohibits any Federal official from designating any land in the U.S. for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless the designation has been authorized by law.

It simply says Congress is going to be involved in this, these approvals of the disposition of Federal lands. I think they are common sense changes here that restore the role of Congress in the process of changing designation of lands that are Federal lands, and it restores the intentions of our Founding Fathers, and I hope that my colleagues will support it.

I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) for their engagement and involvement in this.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. This bill is unnecessary, it is unjustified. It addresses a phantom problem. It would seriously damage our country's continued participation in important international efforts to protect valuable land around the world. But worst of all, it caters to the suspicions and the conspiracy theories of extreme organizations and individuals, and it leads directly to scare tactics such as those used by the American Policy Center in attempts to alarm American citizens and frankly, to raise money under false pretenses, and this bill ought to be opposed and defeated.

I would like to read from a letter from the American Policy Center which I will include for the RECORD at the end of my statement. This is a letter written by the American Policy Center, signed by Tom DeWeese, the president, urging citizens to send money in to pass this bill, H.R. 883, to ''stop the U.N. land grab of American soil,'' a land grab, Mr. Chairman, that does not exist; urging citizens and this Congress to stop the U.N. from designating any more U.S. soil as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves. The U.N. does not make those designations, Mr. Chairman.

It identifies a U.N. land grab of American soil; calls for the Congress to stop liberals from terminating the United Nations' influence on 51 million acres of U.S. park land. Mr. Chairman, the U.N. does not have influence over 51 million acres of United States national park land. It says that liberals know this bill will lead to the end of international treaties and agreements that give the U.N. control over development of American soil. There are no such international treaties and agreements, nor should there be, nor would this Congress vote for, nor would any President negotiate such international treaties. It is just bogus.

The letter talks about radicals like AL GORE and Bruce Babbitt that enforce treaties in a way that give the U.N. authority over our land and our private property every day. GORE and Babbitt are not radicals and they are not doing any such thing. This letter talks about open warfare in coming weeks to pass this bill. Mr. DeWeese talks about meeting with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and saying that the American Policy Center will back him all the way in the battle to pass this bill.

Of course, then Mr. DeWeese goes to the heart of the matter and asks for any contribution from $17 to $1,000 to help the American Policy Center in their efforts.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not needed. We should oppose it. It is nothing but scare tactics from the right wing. We should vote ''no.''

AMERICAN POLICY CENTER,
Herndon, VA.

DEAR FRIEND OF APC: I have just come from an emergency meeting on Capitol Hill, and I have important news for you.

I was meeting with several national leaders to plan a strategy to pass Congressman Don Young's ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act'' (H.R. 883).

As I'm sure you remember, we were successful last year in passing this bill in the House of Representatives to stop the UN land grab of American Soil.

But we were stopped cold in the U.S. Senate. We didn't even get a hearing on the Senate version of the Bill. Because the Senate did not act, we have to start all over again and pass it again in the House, while we build strength in the Senate.

We intend to win this time. We intend to pass the Bill in both Houses of Congress and stop the UN from designating any more U.S.

soil as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves.

We believe Congressman Young has the votes to pass it again in the House. In fact, he already has 158 co-sponsors, with more joining each day. He also has the support of new House Speaker Dennis Hastert.

The problem, again, is in the Senate.

Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell of Colorado has again agreed to introduce the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act in the Senate. The Bill number is S. 510.

But Senator Campbell has only been able to sign on six co-sponsors. Without more support, S. 510 will again die in the Senate.

You and I can't let that happen. Not again. You and I need to storm the Senate. Here's how.

First, I have enclosed a ''Legislative Petition'' to Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott. He will be key in the fight to build support in the Senate.

Frankly, without his support there can be no floor vote on S. 510.

That's why it is urgent that you immediately sign and return your ''Legislative Petition'' to me right away. You and I must flood Lott's office with petitions to prove S. 510 has strong national support.

So please sign you petition and return it to me immediately.

But you and I can't stop there.

Senator Campbell needs more co-sponsors for the Bill. Please call both of your states U.S. Senators and ask them to co-sponsor S. 510. Simply call the Senate switchboard at 202–224–3121, and ask for your Senators by name.

Just as important, however is that you contact you Congressman to make sure he supports Congressman Young's House version (H.R. 883). We must have a strong show in the House as well. If not, all of our efforts in the Senate will be in vain.

So please, call your Congressman at 202–225–3121. Tell him to support H.R. 883.

It is vital that you do all you can—if we are going to stop the UN's land grab of American soil. To win, you and I will have to beat overwhelming odds.

But don't despair. You and I can win this battle.

Remember when the fight to stop the UN land grab started in the 104th Congress?

Democrats refused to even attend hearings. They laughed and called Congressman Young's bill the ''black helicopter'' bill. They called it ''preposterous,'' ''absurd'' and ''crazy.'' The very idea that someone was challenging the UN was laughable to them. They're not laughing now.

The liberals know they must stop the bill. And they know the Senate is their last chance. Liberals know this bill will terminate United Nations' influence on 51 million acres of U.S. national parklands.

Liberals know this bill will gut the extremist United Nations' environmental agenda and will lead to the end of international treaties and agreements that give the UN control over development of American soil.

Liberals know this bill forces them to take a side. Do liberals support your right to own and control your private property or not?

The bill exposes the left's property-grabbing agenda. It weakens to United Nations' influence in the world. That's why they know they must stop the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act at all costs.

So, right now, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the Nature Conservancy and all of their extremist environmental buddies are charging up Capitol Hill, swarming over Senate offices, using all of their power to keep this Bill from gaining co-sponsors or a floor vote.

They know we can pass this bill. Our position is strong.

The whole purpose of the American Sovereignty Protection Act is to restore the role of Congress where it should have been all along—as the administrator with sovereign control over public lands in the United States.

That authority has been slowly eroded over the years by a series of environmental treaties and agreements that subject our public lands to the influences of UN officials and UN-dictated rules. And with the help of the Clinton Administration.

Those rules not only tell the United States what it must do with public lands—but they also affect private property as well.

Just ask the owner of the gold mine that was located outside Yellowstone National Park. He was on private land—his land. Now he's out of business. Why? Because the United Nations said so.

And these UN treaties, like the Biodiversity Treaty and the World Heritage Sites are incredibly dangerous when radicals like Vice President Al Gore and Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt hold power.

They can enforce the treaties in a way that gives the UN authority over our land and our private property. And they are doing it every day.

The House of Representatives recognized the danger and passed Don Young's Bill in the 105th Congress. They know that the threat is real, and we can pass the Bill in the House again in the 106th Congress.

But the real battle is now in the Senate.

And I tell you with complete honesty—we will have to fight like the Dickens to withstand the coming liberal firestorm. The liberals will use everything in their arsenal to stop this Bill. And the Senate is not a friendly place for property owners.

Get ready for open warfare. It's coming. In the next few weeks.

At our meeting today, I promised Congressman Young that APC would back him all the way in the battle to pass the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. And I meant it. That includes leading the fight in the Senate.

Your enclosed ''Legislative Petition'' is my first step. Please. It is urgent that you sign it and return it to me today. We simply must build pressure on Trent Lott to support the Bill. That's why it's also important that you begin making phone calls to your Senators and Congressman to ask them to co-sponsor and support the bills (H.R. 883 and S. 510).

Over the coming weeks APC will get this message to hundreds of thousands of Americans to build the pressure.

You and I can pass this bill and cut the power of the UN!

But to do it, I urgently need your financial support. Will you help me keep up this fight to save America from the UN land grab?

I've been appearing on radio and television programs and speaking before audiences across this nation to sound the alarm on the UN land grab. The response is incredible. When Americans know the truth—they do the right thing. But they are not hearing most of this story from anyone but the American Policy Center. But, through APC's effort, we are truly awakening a slumbering giant.

Will you help me stay in the fight by sending me your most generous contribution of at least $17?

Remember, the Sierra Club and their buddies have millions of dollars in their war chest. I have only you. So if you can send a larger donation of $25, $50, $100, $250, $500, or even $1,000, I will be able to counter the liberal barrage, word for word.

You know APC's record and what we can do when our action alert system is firing on all cylinders. But it takes dollars to fuel the engine. I need you now. There really is no more important legislation before the U.S. Congress than the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

The bill truly is the whole ball game for our property rights. Pass it—and the UN is less of a threat. That's why the liberals hate it with a passion.

Now is the time. This is the battle. Please help me win it.

Sincerely,

TOM DEWEESE,
President.

P.S. You and I will not fight a more important battle in 1999 than this one to pass the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. It is crucial that I receive your signed ''Legislative Petition'' right away. Equally important is your financial support to keep APC in the battle. Without you, I can do nothing. Please help. Thanks for all you do.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 13½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding and for his work on this legislation. I do rise in support of it.

I want to respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to what he indicated about this. I agree that there has been, and there always will be, overstatements about the dangers of potential actions that are taken, and in this case the dangers of the Biosphere Program. But the argument has been made that the United Nation's designation is important because it provides some international protections for these worldwide important sites. Well, if it provides some protections, then there is some implied authority, if not direct authority, that is yielded to that international body; otherwise, the designation would have no significance. If it has no significance, then why would anyone oppose this simple legislation.

I have a habit in this Congress of trying to read legislation, and I took the time to read this bill that has been offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), H.R. 883, and it says, ''Any designation as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of UNESCO shall not be given any force or effect unless the Biosphere Reserve is specifically authorized by a law.''

Now, the argument is made, well, why should Congress engage in this activity? Well, I voted on naming postal buildings; I voted on naming Federal buildings; we vote on postage stamps. So there is a lot of designations that we do in this Congress.

I believe that private ownership of property is important. I believe that our National Heritage Sites, our parks are very important, and I think that Congress has a role, and when the constituents express a concern about a particular designation, that it is right and proper in this democracy for Congress to address it.

The Ozark Highland Man and Biosphere Plan was advanced in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri without public input. It was withdrawn after property owners, timber producers and other residents in the region learned of and opposed the designation.

I believe the Chairman's bill is reasonable. I believe it is appropriate. I believe it maintains the balance between executive action and legislative authority and certainly, when our constituents have a concern about these types of designations, that it is appropriate that we have congressional oversight and input into that process. So I ask my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), a member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in vigorous opposition to H.R. 883, which really ought to be titled the American Land Paranoia Act, because the principal purpose of this act is to sow paranoia among Americans who ought to take pride in our interest in protecting some of our national treasures. I will tell my colleagues that this is not a small matter.

Some may think this is a small matter, we should not worry about it. I want to tell my colleagues a little story. I was up on the border of the State of Washington and Canada about three years ago, four years ago now; in fact it was in what used to be the district of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT). I was talking to a fellow who was a businessperson, a nice fellow, a pillar of the community. He lives about 10 miles from the Canadian border. We got in a nice little discussion at a county fair.

He said, ''Jay, what are you going to do about those tanks the U.N. has up on those railroad cars just over the Canadian border?'' And I kind of chuckled. I said, ''Henry, what are you talking about?'' He said, ''Well, you know, those tanks that the U.N. has across the border that they are going to use to come in to establish this United Nations park in the North Cascades.''

I laughed. Then I saw he was serious. He was serious. And the reason he was serious is that the advocates of things like this bill have convinced this gentleman and a lot of people in America that somehow the tanks with the blue helmets and the black helicopters are coming to take away their livelihood, and that is flat wrong. Flat wrong. This is no unconstitutional loss.

Mr. Chairman, we sat in the hearings and I was engaged with the committee on hearings on this. People came forward and they sent to us this law professor or lawyer, I do not know if he is a professor, and he argued for 10 minutes passionately about how this violated the Constitution of America.

Then I asked him a simple question. I said, ''How long has this been on the books?'' He said, ''Well, since the late 1960s.'' Then I asked him, ''Well, have you ever gone to court to ask for this to be ruled unconstitutional, the loss of sovereignty?'' He said, ''Well, no.'' The reason he has never done it is he knows darn well it is not unconstitutional.

This is a bunch of flimflam where people are trying to foist these fears on the American people.

The last point I want to make, the World Heritage Convention that is under attack here as some kind of socialist plot was introduced under the administration of Richard Nixon. Richard Nixon came up with this socialist plot, and it is something that has been effective to try to get international attention to help us in this country preserve what we believe are our national treasures.

This is another sad step of my friends across the aisle, frankly, leaving that tradition of Teddy Roosevelt and even Richard Nixon. We ought to keep this thing on the books as it is and reject this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I am the newest member of the Committee on Resources, and I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from the great State of Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his leadership in introducing this bill.

Under Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution, quote, ''The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

□ 1200

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution is clear. The United Nations, despite efforts by its supporters, is not a governing body superior in authority to this Congress.

I know that comes as a shock to some of my colleagues in this place and certainly some of the supporters from whom I have heard, who believe that the United Nations has some superior claim to the sovereignty of the United States, particularly when it comes to determining what is the appropriate use of the land within our borders. It is, however, not, as I say, not a superior authority to this Congress.

Yet, the U.N. is designating land within our country's borders for special protection without the consent of the House.

There are 83 U.N. sites in America, Mr. Chairman. In my home State of Colorado there are five United Nations biosphere reserves. I can tell the Members, having served in the Colorado State legislature for many years, those sites were designated without the express consent of the State of Colorado and without the Congress of the United States.

I have visited many of these areas. I agree they are incredible and breathtaking. I agree they are a treasure, but they are the property of the United States, and we must maintain absolute autonomy in our land management decisions.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill, and urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, again, I rise in opposition to this bill. I would just point out to my colleagues that the only power with regard to the disposition or the use of the lands that are within these designations are inherent in the laws that Congress has passed and delegated to the Park Service, to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the BLM, the Forest Service, or other land managers to manage.

In fact, this is a voluntary thing. All of these designations that are being discussed here, whether it is the Ramsar treaty or the Man and the Biosphere, which happens to be the program associated with the UNESCO program, or the World Heritage Convention and the sites that are identified, only some 15 sites in the United States, are all voluntary.

The laws that govern these sites are the laws of the national and State governments, and the private property rights and laws are completely intact. They are not changed by these voluntary designations. In fact, when making the designations or the recognition of these sites on a global basis, one of the criteria is in fact that the laws and rules are in place that will accord the proper use of these lands. So that is one of the prerequisites.

I would point out that the laws that affected the New World Mine were those that were being applied through the Park Service and the Forest Service in the State of Wyoming, in the State of Montana, and the other States within which Yellowstone lies.

The point is that there is no impact. The impact here, of course, is one of cooperation and collaboration, building on the laws that we have and attempting to encourage other Nations to in fact emulate the stewardship, the conservation, and preservation efforts that we have made in terms of these important sites, because they are important as a natural heritage site or cultural site or because they are important for research or for water fall.

So the only issue here is one where we could say that the Man and the Biosphere program has not directly been authorized by Congress, although we have appropriated money for it.

We have many laws today where the authorization has expired or has not been made, where the Office of Management and Budget, because money is appropriated, the courts have ruled that in fact it has the force and effect of in fact Congress authorizing and lawfully permitting that type of designation, and we have done that for that program, clearly a case we made to bring up an authorization bill and deal with it in that manner.

But that has not been the disposition of the committee. What they have chosen to do, of course, is because, in my judgment, they cannot attack the parks, they cannot attack some of the land uses which they have an issue with directly, they have turned around and wrapped themselves in this question of sovereignty, which there is no constitutional case here. There is no court case here that has been pursued that has been positive that would indicate the statements being made are accurate.

They are not accurate. They have never been tested in court. I think they are inaccurate. They can test such issues in court and get answers back as to whether they are appropriate.

In fact, this has been praised by many. I just picked up a statement here, a press release by Secretary of Interior Don Hodel, most recently, of course, who led the Christian Coalition, but before that he worked in the State of Washington and on Bonneville Power, and was our Secretary of Interior under then President Ronald Reagan.

This letter was dated October 10, 1986, a press release in which he stated how enthusiastic and proud the Department was of the Statue of Liberty which was designated a World Heritage Site. So I think this just sort of indicates across the board how important this is. This is why all of the environmental groups and conservation groups oppose this legislation.

I will offer an amendment in this process, Mr. Chairman, which will address some real concerns, and that is the commercial use by foreign entities of U.S. properties for mining, for grazing, for timber harvesting.

If we are so concerned about the preservation and conservation of these areas, then maybe we should really be concerned about those what we call exploitive activities that go on on these lands by foreign powers, actual activities, rather than these phantom concerns that we have with tanks and other issues that may be in the minds of our constituents. But I am sure that my colleagues have made every effort to dispel these unwarranted fears, and have faced up to the issues of this misinformation campaign that has existed.

I trust they would do that, Mr. Chairman; that they would face up to that type of issue and not let that type of misunderstanding and misinformation spread across the land such fear that would result in imprudent types of actions by this Congress.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also recite Mr. Hodel, the past Secretary of the Interior.

The last paragraph says, ''This legislation Chairman Young is sponsoring, H.R. 883, will bring welcome relief to property owners threatened by a United Nations bureaucracy that has grown out of control.'' I support H.R. 883 thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this legislation. I find it very difficult to understand the arguments of those who oppose it.

What is wrong with Congress being in control? What is wrong with the people in our districts, if they agree or disagree, having a right to talk to their Congressman?

Don Hodel also said, ''During the Reagan administration, these designations were honorary and benign in nature. However, like so many United Nations programs, this one has fallen subject to inappropriate mission creep. It has become a proxy for international attempts to override national sovereignty and control land use.''

Why was America founded by Europeans and Asians? Because they wanted additional freedom, they wanted control, they wanted to be in charge, and they certainly do not want people from other countries, and designating is fine, but having other people to have a say about how land is used in our parks, in our public lands, makes no sense in this country.

This is about sovereignty. This is about freedom. This is about America being in charge of Americans; having relations with other countries, but they should not have a say in America, and the American public should have Congress to go back to. That is all we are asking, for Congress to be the final word.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

(Mrs. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

I have come to the floor many times during my tenure in Congress to discuss this very important issue that H.R. 883 addresses, the constitutional duty that we have as Members of Congress to protect the sovereignty of our lands in every possible way.

Yet, every time this matter is brought before the House, I hear many of my colleagues vigorously argue that this has nothing to do with our constitutional duty to preserve and protect our Nation's sovereignty.

I have also heard arguments today from the floor that we should not be meddling in these kinds of things. I know as chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health we even have to have a bill to move a boundary on a wilderness area a half a mile. We have to have a bill to name buildings.

So what would the opposition to this bill have us do, just stay busy naming buildings and moving boundaries, or protect the sovereignty of this Nation? That is our first and foremost responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, another thing that I have heard from the opposition to this bill is that it does not involve private property. I can tell the Members, it does involve private property when they seized control and took over the New World Mine, a patented mine. That was in fact private property.

In fact, the American taxpayer had to pony up $68 million to pay off the Canadian leasehold interests for their loss in the property. The woman who owned the property, who had the patent on the mine, still stands empty-handed. This Congress must deal with that problem, too.

Mr. Chairman, this very simple bill enacts three very basic requirements. Number one is it requires the Secretary of the Interior to require the approval of Congress for any nomination of property located in the United States for inclusion in the World Heritage list.

Number two, the bill would prohibit Federal officials from nominating any land in the United States as a biosphere reserve unless Congress ratifies and enacts the Biosphere Reserve Treaty.

Finally, H.R. 883 simply prohibits any Federal official from designating any land in the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such designation is specifically approved by law.

I might remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that while the World Heritage sites have been or the treaty was approved by the Democrat-led Senate during the Nixon administration, nevertheless, the biodiversity treaty has never been ratified by the United States Senate, never. Yet, there is enough land that has been set aside under designations of these two designations to fill up the entire State of Colorado.

I think it is time we act. We have a responsibility to the American people to protect the sovereignty of our land.

Mr. Chairman, these very simple provisions do not represent massive changes in policy, nor are they born out of paranoia. There is nothing that says anything about blue helmets or tanks. They are very important items that ensure our Federal officials properly allocate taxpayer resources, and that we as a Congress maintain the total governance of our lands required under Article IV, Section 3, of the United States Congress.

This section, very succinctly, states that ''The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.'' It is very clear. It does not take a rocket scientist to interpret what the Constitution says, and neither does it take a court to interpret this provision for us to act. We

do not need the court decisions for the Congress to act in a responsible way.

Mr. Chairman, there are some who actually believe that the U.N. Biosphere and World Heritage designations, which encompass 68 percent of the land in our national parks, preserves, and monuments, and make up an area the size of Colorado, are benign and have the mere purpose of placing a plaque or a label that these areas can use to attract tourism.

That is utter naivete. However, in the Committee on Resources we have heard testimony from citizens living in Alaska, Arkansas, Missouri, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, and Wyoming that suggest otherwise. These individuals testified about how these designations affected their property value, their economic activity, and most candidly, their ability to play a role in the designation process. They were left out.

Even the U.N.'s own documentation on these programs describes its proactive role on land policy. One such publication defining the purpose of biodiversity reserves call for extensive land policy initiatives such as ''strategies for biodiversity, conservation and sustainable use,'' and for action plans provided for under Article VI of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

I am not going to trade our responsibility to manage our lands under this constitutional provision for Article VI of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and I do not think the American people want us to do that, either.

□ 1215

Mr. Chairman, to me this type of strategy involves a lot more than just a harmless plaque. Nevertheless, the question every Member of this body should be asking themselves today is not whether or not these designations do in fact intrude on our vested power to govern our lands, but whether we should even take that chance.

Mr. Chairman, if World Heritage areas or Biodiversity Reserves really are harmless or benign, it should be Congress that makes that determination, not our unelected officials. I do not think that Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution advises that in governing our lands that we simply opt out of policies that may appear ineffectual. But instead, it expressly requires that we, the Congress, make all needful rules and regulations.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, the danger can be stated any clearer than it was before the Committee on Resources by the Honorable Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, highly respected U.N. Ambassador during the Reagan administration, when she stated, and I quote, ''The World Heritage and Man and Biosphere committees make decisions affecting the land and lives of Americans. Some of these decisions are made by representatives chosen by governments not based in democratic representation, certainly not the representation of Americans.''

Ms. Kirkpatrick went on to say, ''What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya, all of which are parties to this treaty, have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park?''

Mr. Chairman, the only relevant argument that the Clinton administration has made against this bill is that it would add unnecessary bureaucracy to the designation process. I do not believe that is the case. I think that this would simply clarify and straighten out a mess that we have found ourselves in in this administration.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that clearly the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) is confused about the Biodiversity Treaty, which is not a part of this agreement. We are talking about Man and the Biosphere.

I mean, we would obviously stipulate that the Biodiversity Treaty, the Rio Treaty, is something that the Senate has to consider. But apparently we were misplacing our words.

I would suggest that the national protection and international protection of cultural and national heritage in Article VI, this particular program points out that, and I will quote from this, ''Whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of States of whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Article I and II is situated, and without prejudice to the property right provided by national legislation, the State parties to this Convention recognized that such heritage constitutes a World Heritage for those whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate.''

So the issue that we are dealing here with is not whether the countries are members of this, because we know that there are many nations who are members of these programs. In fact, with regards to the World Heritage Convention, 150 nations are members of that; with regards to Man and the Biosphere, it is 125 Nations; and with regards to the Ramsar Treaty, there are 92 Nations.

As I had spoken earlier, nearly 2,000 sites, some 1,932 sites that I have and still growing, I suppose, and in the United States, we have some 82 of those sites where less than 5 percent of the sites are located in the United States, and it is based upon the existing land laws that the Committee on Resources, the administration, that U.S. law provides, whether through the national government, through the State governments, the property rights are intact.

No one can raise one case where, for instance, the Statue of Liberty has been designated a World Heritage site. What have we lost? What has changed in terms of its administration? Tell me one instance where something has changed that is due to the designation or the recognition that is accorded to these 82 sites, not one witness that appeared.

The gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) raised the question that there was a witness from Minnesota. Well, unfortunately, I am from Minnesota. We do not have any sites in Minnesota. I would like to have some sites in Minnesota, and I hope someday that we do. But we do not have any in Minnesota. But I guess that witness from Minnesota knew something that I did not.

But the fact is, and this is the sort of, I think, misunderstandings that this legislation is based on, not one of these sites has been brought to our attention where there has been any change in the land management that is due to these cooperative voluntary international agreements.

While I have tried to portray this as not having a an impact, obviously our park laws, when I wrote and when our committee writes legislation on parks or on wilderness or on BLM or other types of land classifications, I mean what I say when we designate those sites that they ought to be protected, that there are transboundary issues that are affected. I meant what I said.

But, unfortunately, I think what is unfolding here is an effort to try, through this American sovereignty claim, through criticism and fear of the U.N., to try to turn around and blame the U.N. and these programs, these international programs. We have everything at stake in terms of providing this type of leadership on a global basis, in terms of trying to encourage other nations on a voluntary basis, whether it be China, whether they be democratic governments or governments which we think are not democratic, to in fact pursue the preservation, the conservation of their resources on a voluntary basis. We have had spectacular success.

This is a place, as I said, if it is a criticism of UNESCO in terms of Man and the Biosphere, in terms of research, this is an area that is working. This is one area that we should not be debating or disagreeing about in terms of research and gaining information and knowledge. That is the essence of what the Man and the Biosphere program has. It has nothing to do with the Biodiversity Treaty, as was indicated here, a misstatement I guess on the part of the proponents of this.

The same is true of these World Heritage sites. They deliver tourism. Individuals, just like in a park pass, look at these World Heritage sites, some 506 sites, and they try to go to as many as they can. It encourages tourism in this Nation. We have but 20 of those sites. Obviously our parks are a great attraction and globally known and renowned for the wonderful features that characterize them.

The Ramsar Treaty obviously is one. There may be other treaties that are affected. These are the three that have stuck out that we have discussed, but

almost any other agreements that we come to on a voluntary international basis are struck down and put back before Congress. I think we know what the disposition of that is.

Read the bill. I have read this bill and studied it carefully. It makes an almost insurmountable test in terms of any type of designation of the Man and the Biosphere programs. It goes 10 miles outside the boundary of any of these where there would be a Man and the Biosphere designation and demands that it have absolutely no economic effect.

I would suggest that it would almost be impossible to pass the type of test that has been put in here. But I think it has been put in here for good reason; that is, my colleagues want to kill these programs. They want to cut the head off of the Man and the Biosphere program. They want to stop the World Heritage Convention. They want to stop the Ramsar Treaties, which are the basis, really, just the fragile basis of cooperation that we have on an international basis to provide some conservation and leadership.

Frankly, in my view, we ought to be doing a lot more on an international basis, dealing with water quality, dealing with air quality, dealing with the way that landscapes are treated in terms of how we treat our forests and, indeed, that biodiversity issue treaty that was raised by my colleague.

I certainly am a proponent of trying to work on a global basis to protect these resources and to rationally use them and to, in fact, provide for some policy path that would be reasonable with regards to preserving our environment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure. It is a bad measure. It is misunderstood and unfortunately a bill the House should not consider at all. I urge defeat of this measure, H.R. 883.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify the Biosphere Reserve Program is operating without any congressional authority at all. Our constitutional system is designed to make our government responsible to the people; that is, the American citizens who are the ultimate sovereign authority in our system, a people who must satisfy the concerns of outsiders before they are no longer sovereign. That is why this is called the American Sovereignty Act.

I respectfully request my colleagues to vote for this legislation, get us back in control under our Constitution. That is our role. That is our charge. Not to do so is neglecting our responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following for the RECORD:

SENATE,
STATE OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, MN, May 11, 1999.

Hon. TOM COBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COBURN: As Chairman of the Minnesota Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Environment, I commend your efforts to defund the Man and Biosphere Program (MAB). Since one of the major opponents of your efforts is Congressman Bruce Vento of Minnesota, who represents a compact urban district with little undeveloped land, I would like to tell you about the painful experience northern Minnesota had with the MAB program in the past.

During the mid-1980's the National Park Service proposed a massive Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve that included lands in my Senate district which were included without notifying me or any other local elected officials. In 1984 the state-sponsored Citizen's Committee on Voyageurs National Park took up this issue after a casual comment from the then Voyageurs National Park Superintendent Russell Berry that our area had been nominated as a biosphere reserve. At a public meeting of that committee on December 1, 1984 in Minneapolis after the nomination was made, Mr. Berry, partially explained one reason for the biosphere reserve by stating ''I'd like to be in as strong a position as possible to influence activities outside the boundaries that would adversely affect the Park in the context of things that would be detrimental to the ecosystem within the Park.''

Because the park is surrounded by thousands of acres of private property, Mr. Berry intended to use the biosphere as a means to implement land use controls on private property. Since my constituents did not want their constitutionally-guaranteed private property rights further threatened, they strongly opposed this proposal. Consequently, in 1987 the Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve nomination was withdrawn by National Park Service Director William Penn Mott.

Until the MAB program is authorized by Congress and statutory protections for private property are guaranteed, I will support all efforts to defund this program. Without these protections, unelected federal bureaucrats will again use biosphere reserves as a means of implementing federal land use controls on private property.

Since Mr. Vento's district is 300 miles away from the ill-fated Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve proposal, I would encourage you to listen to those who represent people who live and work in the affected area rather than those who recreate in the area on weekends.

Thanks again for your efforts in defense of local control and private property.

Sincerely,

Senator BOB LESSARD.

CHESAPEAKE, VA,
May 18, 1999.

Congressman RICHARD POMBO,
United States Capitol Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. POMBO: Thank you for asking for my comments on the process of UNESCO designation of World Heritage Sites.

During the Reagan Administration, these designations were honorary and benign in nature. However, like so many United Nations programs, this one has fallen subject to inappropriate mission creep. It has become a proxy for international attempts to override national sovereignty and control land use.

The current Administration has submitted a thirteen year old press release to invoke my name in support of the World Heritage Site proposals. This is unfortunate political game-playing and deceptive in that it does not represent my position. Favorable statements made about an honorary and benign program more than a decade ago are patently not applicable to that program as it is now being utilized.

The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, as I understand it, will require congressional approval of United Nations World Heritage Site proposals. I believe that this is a necessary and reasonable safeguard for American citizens against overreaching, unelected, unaccountable domestic and international bureaucracies.

This legislation Chairman Young is sponsoring, H.R. 883, will bring welcome relief to property owners threatened by a United Nations bureaucracy that has grown out of control.

Sincerely,

DONALD PAUL HODEL.

STOCKTON, CA,
May 13, 1999.

Hon. RICHARD POMBO,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POMBO: Thank you for contacting me regarding the House Committee on Resources' March 18 hearing on the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, H.R. 883.

As you know, before President Ronald Reagan appointed me Assistant Secretary for Fish, and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, I served Governor Ronald Reagan as the Director of California's Department of Fish and Game. I am especially proud of the environmental agenda we were able to implement, and the success we had with programs that encourage ranchers, farmers and other private landowners to maintain, develop and enhance wildlife habitat on privately owned land. Those benefits continue to this day, and they serve as excellent examples of public benefits that flow from private land ownership without government intervention or funding.

Before coming to Washington, D.C. in 1980 to serve President Reagan, I gave 20 years of volunteer service on the board of directors of the National Wildlife Federation (NWF), including two terms as the Foundation's president-elect (1976–78).

Before my career and commitment to wildlife resources and the environment, I defended America's freedoms, including the right to own private property, when serving 4½ years with the U.S. Marine Corps during WWII, and another three years during the Korean Conflict.

At the March 18 hearing of the House Committee on Resources, I understand that the U.S. Department of the interior witness entered into the official record a 17-year old letter I signed while serving the Reagan Administration as Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. I recently reviewed the letter in question, and you should know that it merely dealt with the technical issue of creating a standardized form for recording information on World Heritage Sites. The letter must not be interpreted as anything other than that.

The record of the Reagan Administration and the current Clinton Administration regarding UNESCO's World Heritage, and Man and the Biosphere programs are starkly different. Under the Reagan Administration, these designations were indeed voluntary, non-regulatory, and honorary. This is in sharp contrast with the current Administration that invited the World Heritage Committee to Yellowstone National Park to condemn private property located outside of the Park! The World Heritage Committee delegation present was comprised largely of non-elected bureaucrats from Third World countries. Such an action by the World Heritage

Committee clearly runs roughshod over America's sovereignty.

H.R. 883 is sorely needed to require Congress to oversee non-elected bureaucrats, in both the United States and the United Nations, from threatening our nation's sovereignty and private property rights of American citizens. Former United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, stated this best in a May 5, 1999, letter she sent to the House Committee on Resources on this issue. she wrote, inter alia: ''In U.N. organizations, there is no accountability. U.N. bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters. Many of the State Parties in the World Heritage Treaty are not democracies. Some come from countries that do not allow the ownership of private property. The World Heritage, and Man and Biosphere Reserve committees make decisions affecting the land and lives of Americans. Some of these decisions are made by representatives chosen by governments not based on democratic representation, certainly not the representation of Americans. What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya (all of which are parties to this Treaty) have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park? When the World Heritage Committee's meddling has needlessly encumbered a private United States citizen's land and caused his or her property values to fall, that citizen's appeals to these committees (if that is possible) will fall on deaf ears.''

I strongly support H.R. 883 and urge its passage. I believe H.R. 883 is desperately needed, and I know that it is in the best interest of our nation and her citizens to require our elected representatives in the United States Congress to properly oversee the actions of non-elected bureaucrats within the United States and the United Nations.

Sincerely,

G. RAY ARNETT,
Former Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

CLARK RANCH,
Paso Robles, CA, 14 May 1999.

Hon. RICHARD W. POMBO,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POMBO: I greatly appreciate you informing me about the May 12, 1999 letter from Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior Stephen Saunders to House Resources Committee Chairman Don Young regarding H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

The Saunders letter cited a letter I signed 15 years ago as Secretary of the Interior regarding the U.S.'s continued participation in the World Heritage Convention at a time when our nation decided to withdraw from the United States Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). My letter is characterized by Mr. Saunders as showing ''a strong bipartisan consensus that U.S. involvement with the World Heritage Convention and other international conservation conventions at issue in H.R. 883 pose absolutely no threat to U.S. sovereignty.''

That was true fifteen years ago. It is no longer the case today.

When I was Secretary of Interior for President Ronald Reagan, World Heritage sites were merely honorary designations. They did not threaten private property rights or national sovereignty. They were designed to recognize outstanding natural and cultural resources in America without creating new layers of regulation on private landowners and rural communities.

Unfortunately, this program has been used in some cases by the current administration to threaten private property owners and national sovereignty. For example, in its efforts to stop a proposed mine on private property outside Yellowstone National Park, the current administration in 1995 invited the World Heritage Committee to the park to evaluate alleged environmental threats caused by the proposed mine. This visit by unelected United Nations bureaucrats created a circus-type atmosphere whereby the World Heritage Committee made the owners of that private property a pariah in the international community. Partially as a result of this visit and a formal declaration later against the proposed mine by the World Heritage committee, the mine was never developed.

I also understand that some in the current administration are attempting to use our membership in the World Heritage Committee to help stop a proposed mine in Australia that is strongly supported by the duly elected government of that country. Such an effort against a sovereign nation would have been unthinkable under the Reagan Administration which honored the sovereignty of democratically elected governments.

My review of H.R. 883 shows it merely provides congressional oversight of the World Heritage Program to prevent an international agency from threatening private property rights and national sovereignty as it did in Yellowstone and is attempting to do in Australia. This legislation will provide the type of adult supervision from elected officials that every domestic and international bureaucracy needs.

I appreciate you alerting me that my 15 year old letter is regrettably being used for political purposes in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. CLARK.

PULP & PAPERWORKERS' RESOURCE COUNCIL.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Pulp and Paperworkers' Resource Council (PPRC) strongly urges you to support H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, which soon will be voted on by the full House. This bill provides for Congressional oversight of United Nations Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage Sites in the United States. The biosphere program is not even authorized by Congress, nor is the program part of an international treaty.

PPRC is a ''Grassroots'' organization representing more than 300,000 Pulp and Paper Workers and some 900,000 Wood Products Industry Workers. Many of our members are unionized workers and we have members in virtually every state of the union. We support natural resource policies that allow our mills to thrive and keep our members and their families employed in well-paying union jobs.

PPRC is very concerned how America's sovereignty over its natural resources is increasingly threatened by international agreements and unelected bureaucrats at international organizations which often are dominated by Third World nations that have poor records in protecting their own natural resources. This was painfully evident when several PPRC officers participated in the World Commission on Forestry and Sustainable Development conferences.

United Nations Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site designations, administered by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), are nominated through a secretive process that excludes local governments, union workers, private landowners and other average citizens. Only high-ranking unelected officials at the State Department, other federal agencies, UNESCO and national environmental advocacy groups are involved in this nomination process.

Our Members, from diverse states such as New York, Arkansas, Kentucky and Minnesota have fought hard to get a seat at the table when biosphere reserves were proposed in their areas. In all cases, officials from federal agencies ardently worked to keep them out. H.R. 883 would open up this process by requiring that all existing biosphere reserves in the United States be authorized by an Act of Congress by 2002 or they would cease to exist. This would empower average citizens to become involved in these designations.

At House Resource Committee hearings in Tannersville, NY, Washington, D.C. and Rolla, MO, PPRC testified in strong support of this legislation. It embodies a basic principle of open government that citizens and communities have a right to know about decisions affecting them before they are made.

Again, the Pulp and Paperworkers' Resource Council strongly supports H.R. 883.

Sincerely,

DON WESSON,
PPRC National Secretary.

MAY 5, 1999.

Hon. Bruce F. Vento,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. VENTO Thank you for your letters of March 24th and April 28th regarding my testimony before the House Resources Committee on the March 18th hearing of the American land Sovereignty Protection Act, H.R. 883. In my opinion the important issue here is protection of Americans' rights of democratic process. I sought to emphasize the dangers I see in Congress's waiving of its role and responsibilities over matters which fundamentally affect citizens of the United States and ceding that role and its associated powers to a global organization in which affected Americans have no representation.

As I understand it, the proposed Act does nothing more than affirm Congressional role in the management of our public lands, a role mandated to it by the Constitution under Article IV, Section 3, which states: ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.'' I believe that is a clearly worded duty which Congress is bound by the Constitution to uphold.

Your letter raises several questions concerning my testimony, each of which I have addressed below.

I. Please explain the simultaneous decision to continue our active participation in the World Heritage Convention and the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program [after your support for the successful U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO], both of which are coordinated at the international level by UNESCO.

The United States' Permanent Representative to the United Nations oversees U.S. participation in many United Nations' programs and organizations, including aspects of U.S. participation in UNESCO. The World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere programs, however, were not among them when I held that job.

As you know, the Department of the Interior has primary responsibility for the World Heritage and the Biosphere programs. The Department of the Interior, along with a federal interagency panel controls all aspects of these programs. No member of Congress is included on this panel. Neither was a United States' U.N. Ambassador when I held that position. The Code of Federal Regulations July 21, 1980 public notice of proposed U.S. World Heritage Nominations or 1981 states U.S. law at the time I was our UN Ambassador: *''In the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is charged with implementing the provisions of the Convention, including preparation of U.S. nominations.* Recommendations

on the proposed nominations are made to the Secretary by an interagency panel including members from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service within the Department of the Interior; the President's Council on Environmental Quality; the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Department of State.''[1] (Emphasis added). I was never included on the panel as the Department of State Representative. I was never invited to participate in any decisions concerning these programs.

I raised the issue of the U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO to make a point: the UNESCO of the 1980's demonstrates quite well both an example of an incompetent and corrupt international organization and the nearly insurmountable obstacles of trying to reform it and hold it accountable. During my tenure as U.S. Ambassador, I sought to limit the proliferation and scope of U.N. based on international organizations which were accountable to no responsible, democratically elected government. This discussion serves to reinforce the point I was trying to make during my testimony, namely that Congress should take an active role in the oversight of programs which impact private citizens in this country.

II. [A]s you know, 7 of the 20 World Heritage Sites in the United States were listed as such during your tenure as our Ambassador to the U.N. In your capacity as U.N. Ambassador, did you oppose these nominations based on the fact that Congress had not specifically authorized these listings? At any point in your tenure, did you attempt to have any existing designations withdrawn on the same basis?

I refer you to my answer above. The Department of the Interior is charged with implementing the provisions of this program, not the United States' UN Representative's office. I had no role and I was not aware of the details of these programs. Now, however, that this issue has ripened, I believe it is time to restore Congress' proper role in this matter.

III. ''Your prepared testimony . . . includes the statement, 'International Committees—whatever the substance of their decisions—do not represent the American people and cannot be held accountable by them,' (emphasis added). Is it accurate to conclude from this statement that you believe specific Congressional authorization should be required for U.S. participation in any program which involves an 'international committee?' ''

Obviously, these committees do not represent the American people. That is not their function. I want to be absolutely clear on this point. Only our representatives on those committees represent Americans. Obviously, the Cuban or Libyan delegates to these committees do not represent the American people and, in fact, often oppose American interests, regardless of the issue. Neither do the New Zealand—to take a country at random—or Brazil. The United States' Congress, on the other hand, is elected and does, in fact, represent the American people. U.N. based committees, unlike Congress, are not accountable to the American people because they have not been elected by or chosen in any way by the American people. They do not represent and are not concerned with U.S. national interests nor the interests of U.S. citizens.

In this democracy, the citizens grant powers to our elected leaders through our votes from the local and state levels up to the Congress and the Presidency. We give them the power to declare our lands national parks and the right to enact the laws that restrict our use of our properties. We give our duly elected leaders the authority to select the judges who will interpret those laws. Our elected leaders, in turn, respond to our wishes because, just as we have granted them power, so may we take it from them in the next election. Representation and accountability are the foundation of the freedoms we cherish. Having fought and won elections yourself, you know this principle well.

In U.N. organizations, there is no accountability. UN bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters. Many of the States Parties in the World Heritage Treaty are not democracies. Some come from countries that do not allow the ownership of private property. The World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere committees make decisions affecting the land and lives of Americans. Some of these decisions are made by representatives chosen by governments not based on democratic representation, certainly not on the representation of Americans. What recourse does an American voter have when UN bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya (all of which are parties to this Treaty) have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park? When the World Heritage committee's meddling has needlessly encumbered a private United States citizen's land and caused his or her property values to fall, that citizen's appeals to these committees (if that is even possible) will fall on deaf ears.

As for your question ''Is it accurate to conclude from this statement that you believe specific Congressional authorization should be required for U.S. participation in any program which involves an 'international committee?,' '' my answer is, in any U.N. based committee which makes decisions that importantly affect American citizens. Speaking to the issue at hand, which is the requirement of congressional authorization of World Heritage and Biosphere site designations, I definitely believe congressional authorization should be required. Congressional role should be protected, I believe, should be required, in any process, any time the Constitution specifically places a duty on Congress to act. The question presented here is specific. The Constitution mandates congressional responsibility over public land management. The World Heritage and Biosphere programs directly impact the management of public and private lands in the United States. Congress should be involved.

The Constitution grants and requires Congress' broad control over the management of the public lands. The Executive branch, through the Department of the Interior and in conjunction with the World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere programs (the ''international committees'' created by this Convention) should not be allowed to exercise Congress' constitutional authority.

IV. ''Should Congressional authorization be required for any international agreements/contracts which allow use of our national resources and public lands, such as mining or timber harvesting? If it is the case that your support for requiring Congressional authorization is limited only to those areas included in H.R. 883, please explain the specific characteristics of 'international committees' dealing with conservation which makes them particularly threatening?''

First of all, as you know, any U.N. based agreements or contracts which allow use of our natural resources and public lands require various forms of authorization from our elected officials. In this particular case, the authorization must come from Congress. The Convention itself requires that ''the inclusion of a property in the World Heritage List requires the consent of the State governed.'' [Article II, Section 3] The State in question is the United States and its consent requires the consent of the people through their duly elected representatives in accordance with the Constitution. That means Congress, the body delegated the authority over land management by the Constitution. The ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act'' is consistent with both U.S. and international law.

In the second part of your question, you ask what are the specific characteristics of ''international committees'' dealing with conservation which makes them particularly threatening?'' My answer is, those communities which affect substantial interests of U.S. citizens. If American citizens have an interest in the conservation of a particular area, that decision should be made by Congress, the body delegated responsibility by the Constitution for making these decisions in full view of the American public. And if each decision requires consideration of costs and benefits to the property rights of individual voters affected, so be it. UNESCO committees are not competent to address the complex private property and public interest issues presented here. They have no interest in how their actions affect private U.S. citizens. I believe Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities for land management to international groups whose members have no concern for protecting individual property rights and American interests.

Sincerely,

JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 883, The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. We must preserve and protect our nation's private property rights for our citizens and for our country.

The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act will require Congressional approval before nominating U.S. property as U.N. land designations for inclusion on the World Heritage List. This legislature will also prohibit U.S. property from being nominated as a Biosphere Reserve and it will terminate existing Biosphere Reserves if they do not meet the proper conditions. Under H.R. 883, Congress will be re-established as the ultimate decision-maker in managing public lands and maintain sovereign control of U.S. soil, not the United Nations. We must pass this legislation and halt designations made without consulting Congress or landowners.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations has identified 92 sites in 31 states and the District of Columbia for acquisition. The fact is, property owners and local governments are routinely shut out of the process and have little recourse if their land is claimed by the U.N. or other international agencies. We must put an end to this uncalled-for seizure of our nation's land and restore control to landowners and local officials.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 883 and continue to protect our nation's soil. We must never allow foreign nations or international organizations to bully American landowners.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. I and 182 of my colleagues who co-sponsored this bill believe that it is not only common sense, but also Congress' Constitutional duty, to protect the sovereignty of America's people and her land.

[1] ''Proposed U.S. World Heritage Nominations for 1981, Public Notice,'' 45 FR 48717, July 21, 1980. You will find the same language in each annual notice.

As you have heard, UN Land Designations, World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves, take place without the approval of Congress and with little or no Congressional oversight; consequently, the citizens of the United States are excluded from the process. These decisions infringe upon State sovereignty, individual rights of United States citizens, and private interests in real property.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the beautiful forests, monuments, national parks and other lovely places in the U.S. as anyone and am thrilled that others outside the U.S. see the beauty in them as well. However, I feel very passionately that if the United Nations decides to designate the Uwharrie Forest—in the 8th District of North Carolina—as a World Heritage Site, that the people of my district should have the opportunity to address how this designation might affect them. Receiving this designation would mean that United States agrees to manage the Uwharrie Forest in accordance with an underlying international agreement which may have implications on private property outside the forest. At best, a World Heritage Site or Biosphere Reserve designation gives the international community an open invitation to interfere in how the Uwharrie, and land surrounding it, are used.

The voters of my district might decide it would be in their best interest to accept the UN designation. If that were the case, I would gladly honor the will of my constituents. However, it is their community, their lands and their livelihoods being affected, they have the right, and should have the opportunity, to have a say.

The Uwharrie Forest is just one example of a beautiful site in my district. I know each of you can think of several beautiful places in your own districts that would be prime for a UN World Heritage Site designation.

I urge you to give your constituents the chance to be involved in decisions that affect them, their private property rights and our sovereignty as a nation. I urge you to vote in favor of the Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, when I was sworn into office, I took an oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution. Each of us has taken that same oath, and I rise to remind us of our oath of office and reflect on the words of the Constitution. Article IV, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution states, ''The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

Clearly, the U.S. Constitution gives the U.S. Congress and only the U.S. Congress the authority to make all rules and regulations over Federal lands.

This authority is not given to the President, it is not given to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. No one in the State Department or the Department of the Interior is given this authority. The Constitution does not give this authority to the United Nations, UNESCO or any other body. The authority to establish rules and regulations over Federal lands is reserved to the U.S. Congress and only the U.S. Congress.

What does H.R. 883, this bill, require the Government to follow? The U.S. Constitution. The bill requires the specific approval of Congress before any area within the United States is subject to an international land use nomination, classification, or designation. Is this so offensive?

H.R. 883 requires the consent of Congress before the Secretary of the Interior may nominate any property in the United States for inclusion in the World Heritage list. I believe this is certainly consistent with Article IV, section 2.

H.R. 883 specifically prohibits Federal officials from nominating any land in the United States for designation as a biosphere reserve. Such designations are left to Congress to determine.

The bill requires the Congress to reconsider for designation as a biosphere reserve those sites that have already been designated as biosphere reserves by previous administrations. It restores to Congress the authority to choose to redesignate or not redesignate these sites. This is a process that should have been in place all along.

H.R. 883 prohibits Federal officials from designating any land in the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such designation is specifically approved by law.

I call on all of my colleagues to uphold the U.S. Constitution and the constitutional authority of this body. A vote for H.R. 883 is a vote to preserve the authority of this body. A vote against H.R. 883 is a vote that quite frankly, in my opinion, is inconsistent with Article IV, section 2, and the oath that we have taken.

''The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is critical for the United States to ensure that our lands are not subject to special international restrictions without careful consideration of the implications before a designation is made.

The increasing interdependence of the world's economic stability, environmental quality, and peace and human development are often dependent on international cooperation, but this cannot preempt the United States from meeting our obligations to our own citizens.

This legislation restricts Federal officials from designating lands under the World Heritage List of the United Nations without the express consent of Congress.

Furthermore, it amends the National Historic Preservation Act to restrict United States' lands from being designated as a Biosphere Reserve.

It gives Congress the necessary authority to approve all land designations and change any existing designations. These measures are key elements to ensuring that America remains in full control of American land.

It is critical for the United States to ensure that our lands are not subject to special international restrictions without careful consideration of the implications before a designation is made.

There is no denying that our world is becoming increasingly interdependent.

Economic stability, environmental quality, and peace and human development are often depending on international cooperation.

This interdependence, however, cannot preempt the United States from meeting our obligations to our own citizens.

I cannot support policies that place limitations on our ability to manage our own affairs.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 883.

This bill asserts that Congress under the U.S. Constitution has the power over federal lands. The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act would give Congress the authority to review, not attack, existing Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site designations, in order to decide if such designations are necessary.

I find it troubling that initiatives such as the United Nations Biosphere Reserves, World Heritage Sites and Ramsar Sites have been designated with virtually no Congressional supervision. Also, I find it disconcerting that all of these designations have had virtually no input from state and local officials.

Private property rights are a cornerstone to the American heritage. Our founding Fathers protected the rights of land owners. Many people in the United States have found that their private property rights are being restricted because they live in proximity to biosphere reserves. Restrictive regulations that govern these reserves are the brainchild of the United Nations, not the United States government.

Land management decisions should be made and reviewed by Congress, not arbitrarily by bureaucratic officials in the Executive Branch or international agencies.

What do my colleagues from the other side fear from Congress doing their job? Why do they fear individuals, local, state and federal entities being involved in the process? Congress should not relinquish their duty of maintaining and protecting federal lands. We must ensure the rights of American private property owners at the federal and international level. I urge the passage of this important legislation. Vote yes on H.R. 883.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for 4 hours and is considered read.

The text of H.R. 883 is as follows:

H.R. 883

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 ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations governing lands belonging to the United States is vested in the Congress under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution.

(2) Some Federal land designations made pursuant to international agreements concern land use policies and regulations for lands belonging to the United States which under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution can only be implemented through laws enacted by the Congress.

(3) Some international land designations, such as those under the United States Biosphere Reserve Program and the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Scientific, Educational, and Cultural Organization, operate under independent national committees, such as the United States National Man and Biosphere Committee, which have no legislative directives or authorization from the Congress.

(4) Actions by the United States in making such designations may affect the use and

value of nearby or intermixed non-Federal lands.

(5) The sovereignty of the States is a critical component of our Federal system of government and a bulwark against the unwise concentration of power.

(6) Private property rights are essential for the protection of freedom.

(7) Actions by the United States to designate lands belonging to the United States pursuant to international agreements in some cases conflict with congressional constitutional responsibilities and State sovereign capabilities.

(8) Actions by the President in applying certain international agreements to lands owned by the United States diminishes the authority of the Congress to make rules and regulations respecting these lands.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) To reaffirm the power of the Congress under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution over international agreements which concern disposal, management, and use of lands belonging to the United States.

(2) To protect State powers not reserved to the Federal Government under the Constitution from Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements.

(3) To ensure that no United States citizen suffers any diminishment or loss of individual rights as a result of Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements for purposes of imposing restrictions on use of those lands.

(4) To protect private interests in real property from diminishment as a result of Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements.

(5) To provide a process under which the United States may, when desirable, designate lands pursuant to international agreements.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN WORLD HERITAGE SITE LISTING.

Section 401 of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (Public Law 96–515; 94 Stat. 2987) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the first sentence, by—

(A) striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''Subject to subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), the Secretary''; and

(B) inserting ''(in this section referred to as the 'Convention')'' after ''1973''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(d)(1) The Secretary of the Interior may not nominate any lands owned by the United States for inclusion on the World Heritage List pursuant to the Convention, unless—

''(A) the Secretary finds with reasonable basis that commercially viable uses of the nominated lands, and commercially viable uses of other lands located within 10 miles of the nominated lands, in existence on the date of the nomination will not be adversely affected by inclusion of the lands on the World Heritage List, and publishes that finding;

''(B) the Secretary has submitted to the Congress a report describing—

''(i) natural resources associated with the lands referred to in subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) the impacts that inclusion of the nominated lands on the World Heritage List would have on existing and future uses of the nominated lands or other lands located within 10 miles of the nominated lands; and

''(C) the nomination is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act and after the date of publication of a finding under subparagraph (A) for the nomination.

''(2) The President may submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a proposal for legislation authorizing such a nomination after publication of a finding under paragraph (1)(A) for the nomination.

''(e) The Secretary of the Interior shall object to the inclusion of any property in the United States on the list of World Heritage in Danger established under Article 11.4 of the Convention, unless—

''(1) the Secretary has submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a report describing—

''(A) the necessity for including that property on the list;

''(B) the natural resources associated with the property; and

''(C) the impacts that inclusion of the property on the list would have on existing and future uses of the property and other property located within 10 miles of the property proposed for inclusion; and

''(2) the Secretary is specifically authorized to assent to the inclusion of the property on the list, by a joint resolution of the Congress after the date of submittal of the report required by paragraph (1).

''(f) The Secretary of the Interior shall submit an annual report on each World Heritage Site within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains for the year covered by the report the following information for the site:

''(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the site.

''(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the site.

''(3) A list and explanation of all nongovernmental organizations that contributed to the management of the site.

''(4) A summary and account of the disposition of complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the site.''.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION AND TERMINATION OF UNAUTHORIZED UNITED NATIONS BIOSPHERE RESERVES.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 403. (a) No Federal official may nominate any lands in the United States for designation as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

''(b) Any designation on or before the date of enactment of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of an area in the United States as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization shall not have, and shall not be given, any force or effect, unless the Biosphere Reserve—

''(1) is specifically authorized by a law enacted after that date of enactment and before December 31, 2000;

''(2) consists solely of lands that on that date of enactment are owned by the United States; and

''(3) is subject to a management plan that specifically ensures that the use of intermixed or adjacent non-Federal property is not limited or restricted as a result of that designation.

''(c) The Secretary of State shall submit an annual report on each Biosphere Reserve within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains for the year covered by the report the following information for the reserve:

''(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the reserve.

''(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the reserve.

''(3) A list and explanation of all nongovernmental organizations that contributed to the management of the reserve.

''(4) A summary and account of the disposition of the complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the reserve.''.

SEC. 5. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS IN GENERAL.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 404. (a) No Federal official may nominate, classify, or designate any lands owned by the United States and located within the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such nomination, classification, or designation is specifically authorized by law. The President may from time to time submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate proposals for legislation authorizing such a nomination, classification, or designation.

''(b) A nomination, classification, or designation, under any international agreement, of lands owned by a State or local government shall have no force or effect unless the nomination, classification, or designation is specifically authorized by a law enacted by the State or local government, respectively.

''(c) A nomination, classification, or designation, under any international agreement, of privately owned lands shall have no force or effect without the written consent of the owner of the lands.

''(d) This section shall not apply to—

''(1) agreements established under section 16(a) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4413); and

''(2) conventions referred to in section 3(h)(3) of the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 712(2)).

''(e) In this section, the term 'international agreement' means any treaty, compact, executive agreement, convention, bilateral agreement, or multilateral agreement between the United States or any agency of the United States and any foreign entity or agency of any foreign entity, having a primary purpose of conserving, preserving, or protecting the terrestrial or marine environment, flora, or fauna.''.

SEC. 6. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 401(b) of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1(b)) is amended by striking ''Committee on Natural Resources'' and inserting ''Committee on Resources''.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and pro forma amendments for purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall 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 NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

On page 9, line 13, strike ''2000'' and insert instead ''2003''.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a technical amendment which simply extends the time for grandfathering existing Biosphere Reserves by 3 years to 2003. I ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment. Perfecting this bill is a very tall task, but the gentleman has made one modest effort to do so.

As long as the gentleman continues to yield, I point out that I understand that I will offer just one amendment, as I had indicated to the gentleman. I was not aware that of course the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) has an amendment, and I understand the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) has an amendment. I was not aware of those amendments yesterday at the Committee on Rules.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, neither was I. So the gentleman is true to his word.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have no objection to trying to improve this bill. It needs significant improvement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. VENTO:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

''SEC. 7. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS CONCERNING THE DISPOSAL, MANAGEMENT, AND USE OF LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

SEC. 405.—No Federal official may enter into an agreement with any international or foreign entity (including any subsidiary thereof) providing for the disposal, management, and use of any lands owned by the United States and located within the United States unless such agreement is specifically authorized by law. The President may from time to time submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate proposals for legislation authorizing such agreements.''.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I guess according the rule we are not going to read the amendment, but this amendment is an important amendment that deals with the key component of the pending legislation.

This legislation specifically requires to approve the recognition of any U.S. lands for conservation purposes as a result of an agreement with a foreign entity. However, at the same time, the legislation does not require similar congressional action when U.S.-owned lands are leased, oftentimes at a loss to American taxpayers, to foreign-owned countries for such things as drilling, mining under the 1872 mining law, timber harvesting, or other types of commercial endeavors.

My amendment establishes a parity in that process. My amendment would suggest that commercial users and development of U.S. lands by foreign companies and their U.S. subsidiaries may only be established when specifically authorized by law. My amendment would not prevent such activities from occurring. It would simply require Congress to approve such actions.

The Vento amendment in which I am joined by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Resources in this amendment is a responsible provision that responds to the abuses which are now occurring and which neither Congress nor the administration can legally stop.

Many of my colleagues may recall the public outcry when it was revealed that the concession facilities at Yosemite National Park were going to be managed by a Japanese conglomerate, Matsushita. No legal recourse was available to block that action.

A similar outrage was voiced when the Secretary of Interior was required under Federal law to lease lands containing more than $10 billion in gold to a subsidiary of a Canadian-owned corporation who paid less than $10,000 for that particular $10 billion gold mine.

Nothing has been done to prevent a repeat of this type of continued rip-off. A foreign firm can still operate the concession for the Statue of Liberty or any other of our national parks. Foreign firms can continue to exploit American resources while at the same time at the expense of the American taxpayers.

We now have an opportunity to change that policy. The Vento amendment will not prevent these activities from moving forward, Mr. Chairman, it would simply require the Congress to consider the national consequences and specifically authorize these actions.

If we are going to require Congress to approve actions to recognize U.S.-owned lands for conservation purposes of all things to save migrating waterfall, for instance, on a global basis or to recognize our World Heritage sites, some of our outstanding crown jewels, our parks, our natural or cultural areas in the parks, or simply for Congress to approve when we are going to agree with the cooperative research like under the Man and the Biosphere program, then Congress should also approve actions by foreign firms or individuals to in fact use exploitative activities on U.S. lands.

I understand those activities, the U.S. lands, of course, are going to be used for mining, for timber harvesting, for grazing, water rights, a variety of other things, but the issue is that, if it is going to be done by foreign entities, we hand over the ownership, this has real impact, this particular amendment. Unlike this bill which simply relies upon the existing laws, the fact is this has real impact in terms of trying to limit these types of activities.

So I want to add this particular amendment to this for that reason, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the black helicopters are circling over our lands.

And the agents of foreign powers are indeed locking up our public lands, intent upon not only controlling them, but ultimately, America's very natural resource heritage.

But to be sure, the pilots of these helicopters are not wearing the blue helmets of the United Nations.

Rather, they are wearing the corporate emblems of companies based in South Africa, Australia, Luxembourg and Canada.

These foreign agents are not from the United Nations. Their weapons are not world heritage sites or international biospheres.

Indeed, the true threat comes from foreign conglomerates, multi-national mining firms, who swoop down upon our public lands and extract gold and silver with no rents or royalties paid to the American people.

The UN Charter, in this instance, is not the issue.

It is our very own Mining Law of 1872 which continues, with reckless disregard to our economy and our environment, to turn over federal assets to the control of foreign nationals.

And so, I rise in support of the Vento-Rahall-Miller amendment to this bill, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

For if we are to protect the sovereignty of our American lands from foreign powers, then we must include commercial developments undertaken by foreign powers in the legislation.

This is what this amendment is all about.

Our lands, our resources, owned by all Americans, are being claimed by foreign entities.

The hardrock minerals on these lands are being mined with no return to the public.

And these lands are being privatized by foreign entities for a mere pittance—$2.50 an acre.

Allowed under the Mining Law of 1872? Yes.

Should these practices continue to be condoned in 1999. No. Of course not.

So the real issue here today is not what the proponents of H.R. 883 make it out to be.

It is not about the UN. It is not about black helicopters descending upon an unsuspecting populace.

It is, in these times of budgetary constraint, about the relinquishment of our lands, and our minerals, to multinational conglomerates for fast food hamburger prices.

Cast a vote for America.

Vote yes on Vento-Rahall-Miller.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly accept the amendment.

□ 1230

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

Page 9, line 6, after ''in the United States'' insert ''(other than an area within the State of Colorado)''

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It would exempt all the Biosphere Reserves in Colorado from the provisions of the bill that would end the participation of U.S. sites in the Man and the Biosphere program unless we pass and the President signs a new law to continue their participation.

As I noted in general debate, currently there are two of these reserves in Colorado, the Niwot Ridge Research Area and Rocky Mountain National Park. They include lands within the Second Congressional District which I represent.

Mr. Chairman, these areas are not involved in some conspiracy. They are not part of any sinister foreign plot to undermine our Constitution or our way of life. On the contrary, they are places where good things are taking place.

In the Niwot Ridge area, scientists associated with the University of Colorado are doing important research about air pollution and other environmental issues in cooperation with scientists from other countries, such as the Czech Republic. This is important work, work that needs to continue; and my amendment would allow that to happen without interruption.

As for Rocky Mountain National Park, all I can say is that this is one of Colorado's brightest gems, one of the things that makes us proud to be Coloradans. Rising up from the edge of the Great Plains, it straddles the Continental Divide and includes snow-capped peaks, high-altitude tundra, and a diverse array of other land forms and a splendid diversity of vegetation and wildlife.

As Coloradans, we are glad to share its beauty with the Nation and we invite the world to experience it. And the world is doing just that, at least in part, because of its designation as a Biosphere Reserve. The National Park Service tells me that many visitors say that they learned of the park because it was included in the Man and the Biosphere program and that is what made them want to visit it.

As one who believes there is a benefit to every visitor to special wildlands like Rocky Mountain National Park, I am convinced that that is reason enough to keep the park in this program. But it is also true that tourism is a very important part of Colorado's economy, and that is another reason to keep the park in the program, which my amendment would do.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. Adoption of my amendment will not make this a good bill. Even if this amendment is adopted, that alone will not be sufficient for me to be able to support the bill. But this amendment will protect Colorado from some of the worst consequences of the bill, and to that extent I think it is very, very important.

Accordingly, I urge adoption of the Udall amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

These Biosphere Reserves were designated without congressional authorization and without consulting the public or State and local governments. This amendment invades the responsibility, again, of the Congress under Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution, making all laws concerning disposal or regulation of lands belonging to the United States with Congress.

Under H.R. 883, existing Biosphere Reserves would have until December 31, 2003, to get authorization. They are not automatically disenfranchised. If the Colorado Biosphere Reserve had the strong local support claimed by the gentleman that offered the amendment, then there would be no problem of getting the passage of this legislation in this Congress.

If I am still chairman of that committee, I will commit to the gentleman that I will support it if his people want to have it in that district. If they do not, it would not occur.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of my good friend and colleague from Colorado (Mr. UDALL). The sites that he identifies that presently exist in Colorado, the Niwot Ridge Reserve and specifically also the Rocky Mountain National Park, are being designated sites under the Heritage Act.

Specifically, the Rocky Mountain National Park, of course, has been around for a long time and has been the protected environmental jewel in the crown of Colorado for a long, long time. It is peculiar, to say the least, that some other kind of designation, some United Nations designation, would help continue or would help preserve the environmental uniqueness of this particular property, or anything else in the State of Colorado, for that matter.

My colleague talks about the many tourists that flock to the State to see these places, especially Rocky Mountain Park. He is certainly correct in that; and, of course, they come in droves. In fact, one of our problems in Colorado is that oftentimes we have far too many people trying to get into these particular areas and preserves, into Rocky Mountain National Park; and our problem is trying to deal with the numbers coming in and the impact that that has on the Rocky Mountain Park and on many things that we are trying to protect.

When I was in the committee, Mr. Chairman, and we were debating this bill, it was a very interesting situation that occurred, in that in the State of Wyoming there was an attempt on the part of some people in the State of Wyoming to develop some mining adjacent to Yellowstone National Park, and all the processes were underway. The environmental impact statements had been ordered and were underway.

We had spent years actually in the process of identifying the problems and trying to come to a solution as to whether or not it was appropriate to let this mine go forward. All of a sudden, within I think it was a short period of time, a week or less, that we were going to actually get the final go-ahead on this project in Wyoming, the head of the Park Service stepped in and called upon the United Nations to come out to this particular area and give it a designation that would, in fact, prohibit any future development. And when that happened, the administration intervened and everything stopped.

Now, this is the kind of thing I am concerned about in the State of Colorado, and this is why I certainly oppose the amendment of the gentleman that would exempt Colorado from the protection provided by this particular bill. We need this protection just as much as any other State in the Nation because the same thing could happen in Colorado.

We think we know about how to preserve and protect the land that we have under our control in the State of Colorado and with the Department of Parks and Recreation. We do not need the United Nations to tell us how to manage that land. We do not need the imprimatur of the United Nations on Rocky Mountain Park in order to encourage tourism to Colorado. We can do it without them.

In fact, oftentimes, as in the case I just stated, this United Nations designation becomes much more problematic from the standpoint of the proper regulation of the land within any State, in this case Colorado.

So I certainly rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from the Second Congressional District.

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

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of getting involved in this Colorado feud, obviously this does not improve the bill enough, but I think it is a modest step, and I want to support the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) whenever I get a chance, Mr. Chairman.

The fact is that most of the land designations, I would suggest to my colleague from Colorado, whether it is Park Service Organic Act or the Frasier Experimental Station or the others, inherent in them, in these designations of wilderness, is the concept of doing scientific research. I mean, that is what the Organic Act has, that is what the Wilderness Act of 1964 has in it. That is one of the purposes.

And so, insofar as the Man and the Biosphere program that my colleague was alluding to, and I guess I saw four sites that were affected by that. My colleague said there were two. The gentleman had earlier said there were six. I found four. So there are some sites in Colorado that may not be well understood where they are. But one is the Frasier Experimental Station, as my colleague probably has noticed. Another was the Rocky Mountain National Park, a wonderful area.

Now, I suppose the problem of getting people in and out, that that was such a big problem, I think that is a good problem in terms of Rocky Mountain. And I hope we can solve some of the transportation problems that exist around those parks, but I would not suggest that to solve that we take away the designation of the park, and I am sure my colleagues from Colorado would not suggest that, either.

In any case, that was the purpose. The purpose of this is, and just as a way of using this amendment to point out, that most of the laws that are applicable that are engaged in the agreements we have are already in place. We already passed judgment on these issues. We did it once.

Now, some of my colleagues may want to do it again. Some may have objections. Obviously, we continue to hear about the Ozarks issue, a large area that was proposed as a biosphere. But in that case, whatever system was in place, however cumbersome it was, it worked. They did not designate that particular site.

With regards to Yellowstone, I think it is important to recognize, and the gentleman from Colorado, our friend and colleague, brought up the issue of Yellowstone again, as did our colleague from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), that in fact it was designated a World Heritage Site long throughout the process of the mine evaluation, EIS.

What happened is that the committee decided that if that mine was going to go in, it became a Heritage Site at risk, endangered type of site. And of course the committee can make that declaration. It had absolutely no effect on the decision that was made, other than it might have persuaded the Park Service or others to pay a little closer attention.

I mean, we cannot take away free speech in this process. We cannot take away free thought in terms of what is going to happen. We cannot do that with legislation here. In fact, we as a Nation enshrine the concept of free debate and free thought with regard to these issues. And it is as if this legislation is trying to reach out and prevent somebody from making a judgment about the U.S. and how we manage our lands. We cannot do that.

For instance, if somebody is mismanaging lands in other areas, we obviously are going to speak about it, whether it is Amazonia and/or other parts of the world, other rain forests. So we are going to speak out about it.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

I just wanted to make a couple other comments in response to the points that my colleague from Colorado made, as well as my colleague from Minnesota.

It seems, as I hear this debate today, all roads lead to the New World Mine. We keep coming back to that particular situation. And I think there is a continued debate about what happened there, and we ought to continue to figure out ways in the long run to mitigate those kind of situations when we have a big mining project on the edge of a national park that is so important to us, the Yellowstone National Park.

But I am offering my amendment in the spirit of let us not let that conflict and that situation affect what is going on in Colorado. There are important research projects occurring at Niwot Ridge and occurring in Rocky Mountain National Park. I do not see what the problem is that we are fixing in Colorado. In fact, I think we are creating a problem by doing this.

So I urge adoption of my amendment. Let us not hurt Colorado and some of the other States that are involved in these projects, this important Man and the Biosphere project, because of what happened in one case in Yellowstone National Park.

□ 1245

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I of course rose in support of the amendment. But I use this as an indication of what is generally wrong with the entire thought process and what is going on with this particular legislation. I do not think it is repairable by this amendment or others that might be offered. It is a flawed bill. These discussions and debates ought to be going on in subcommittee rather than the sort of exaggerated statements that we had. Unfortunately, they did not. So we are on the floor. I would think that there would be more important business that could and should be considered by this Congress on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I just would conclude with a comment, a quote actually from Jeane Kirkpatrick that I think encompasses everything we have tried to establish here on our side about our concerns with regard to this amendment in particular and to the concerns of our opponents to this bill in general:

> If American citizens have an interest in the conservation of a particular area, that decision should be made by Congress, the body designated responsibility by the Constitution for making these decisions in full view of the American public. And if each decision requires consideration of costs and benefit to the property rights of individual voters affected, so be it. UNESCO committees are not competent to address the complex private property and public interest issues presented here.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate the quotes from the former U.N. representative Jeane Kirkpatrick. Seven World Heritage sites were designated while she was in that role. So apparently, as with Mr. Hodel, he has now since then, being strongly in support of them in the 1980s when they were in control or in power, now have found reason to oppose these sites. But I think actions speak louder than words. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. SWEENEY:

Page 9, line 16, after ''management plan'' insert the following: ''that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs, and''.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for affording me the opportunity at rather a late moment to introduce my amendment. My good friend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) just said that all roads in this bill and this debate and this discussion seem to lead to the New World Mine. The reason I am happy I am able to introduce my amendment is because I think it will serve a number of purposes. But one point that can definitively be made is that that is not true, that all roads are not leading in this matter to the New World Mine, that it has impact on the individuals, of people throughout this Nation and in particular in my district.

We have heard eloquent debate on both sides of the issue, speakers who have spoken of the need for greater local input and greater input from individuals, and those who have said or who have perceived that these issues involve just the use of public lands. That is not true at all. My amendment expands the existing provisions of H.R. 883 by requiring the Secretary of Interior as part of the management plan to also ensure that the biosphere designation does not affect the revenue of State and local governments, including and probably most importantly the revenue for public education programs.

Mr. Chairman, as we have heard, the manner in which international land use agreements have been carried out can tend at times to infringe on the authority of our local municipalities and individuals. My amendment would help protect State and local governments from experiencing a decrease in real property values. As those in many struggling local townships and counties in upstate New York which I represent know all too well, depressed property values serve to depress property tax revenues, the major source for education funding in this country. Today, there are 47 U.N. Biosphere Reserves and 20 World Heritage Sites and there is not an argument on this side of the aisle that there is not some legitimacy and need for these agreements. But many of these international agreements were established without local input and certainly without congressional input or approval. This is not government of the people, for the people, by the people, it is detached internationalism in the eyes of many. Most U.N. designations, including the ones in my district, encompass privately held lands, not just public lands.

Most of all, there have been instances where no communication with local officials and community residents took place about the effects of designating these lands. These are the people that it affects the most. These are the people in most instances who have rightful ownership of the property that is being affected, who define their freedom in fact by virtue of that ability to own these lands. The current process of selecting U.N. Biosphere Reserves with no recourse for those local residents and their elected officials affected must end.

In the 22nd Congressional District of New York, which I represent, there is now one of the largest U.S. Biosphere Reserves housed in the Adirondack Mountains. The private landowners and townships in the Adirondacks had no idea that the Adirondack Park Agency, a quasi-State agency, quietly approved the U.N. biosphere designation and residents were helpless to impact on that, to stop it, to comment on it. In fact, that designated area encompasses 7 million acres of privately held land. It encompasses territories outside the purview and jurisdiction of the Adirondack Park Agency. Yet it has become part of that designated area.

Let me tell my colleagues from experience, the U.N. biosphere is an unwanted cloud now that hangs over a good part of the Adirondack region. My congressional district is one with the greatest interest in seeing that this practice is reined in, that the input and the voice of the local individual be heard. It is unfair that my constituents are not included in any discussions that directly affect them and that I as their representative in Congress have practically no avenue to express their concerns.

The Secretary of Interior must be required to make the case of U.N. designation to State and local governments as well as this Congress and our Federal bureaucracies should be held accountable to this Congress for any of the effects that international agreements will cause. It is imperative that we protect the rights of our private property owners and the legitimate interests of local governments and their citizens. This bill accomplishes those objectives and my amendment I believe strengthens it by elevating the interests of State and local governments and the effects of U.N. designations on their ability to collect revenue. It is important to the private property owners, it is important to the citizens of those regions, it is important to public education in those areas.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and support this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to take this opportunity to speak today in support of this important legislation, H.R. 883—the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

My district in upstate New York has one of the largest U.N. Biosphere Reserves in the United States, thus I have a direct interest in H.R. 883 and strongly support its passage.

H.R. 883 clearly addresses the concerns many of us have had with the U.N. Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Sites programs.

As we know, the U.N. Biosphere Reserve program has been operating with essentially no public or congressional oversight for the past 25 years. And without such oversight often, no one is accountable.

These designations can have a marked impact on the properties in and around the biosphere region, yet, in most cases, neither local government nor property owners are ever consulted regarding the designation or site consideration.

As an example, in my congressional district, the Champlain-Adirondack Biosphere Reserve was created in 1989 at the request of a quasi-governmental agency—the Adirondack Park Agency.

This was done without hearings or formal input from local citizens of the Adirondacks; thus the residents were left feeling helpless and in the reality had no impact upon it. The result was a very bitter feeling and rightfully so over an unwanted imposition on private landowners.

Given negative effect on property values, and compounded by the cavalier attitudes of those handing down designations and the blatant disregard for local authority, I would submit that with congressional oversight and public input, many of these U.N. sites would not have been approved in their current form.

The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act unequivocally states that no land in this country can be included in international land use programs without the clear and direct approval of Congress.

H.R. 883 is a first step in the right direction in returning power to the local citizens as well as the elected Representatives in Congress.

Most importantly, this bill reasserts the constitutional rights of property owners to make property decisions, within local zoning authority, without interference from the United Nations whose mandate does not necessarily include concern for our town halls, school houses, or individual property owners in any given area.

What recourse do affected landowners have against the United Nations bureaucracy?

Absolutely none.

This bill changes that. I urge your support.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York spoke of 7,000 acres of land that apparently falls under a biosphere, some other impact.

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield, seven million acres.

Mr. VENTO. Seven million acres.

Mr. SWEENEY. In the Adirondack region of New York State that are privately owned.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate that and am happy to yield to the gentleman briefly.

Did the gentleman have any instance where there was some problem that arose out of that designation with regards to private property owners?

Mr. SWEENEY. There have been a number of instances where private property owners in the use of their property, in the valuation of their property and their ability to develop and cultivate that property have been infringed upon based upon the designation. I think the gentleman misses the point, that the most predominant frustration that those constituents of mine have——

Mr. VENTO. Just reclaiming my time for a minute, we have been through this with others that have claimed that but we have yet to substantiate any of those types of claims. So if the gentleman could help substantiate that, I think it would go a long way towards solving a problem. Because right now the way the bill stands, I think it is purporting to solve problems, in my judgment, that do not exist. On the amendment that the gentleman has, he suggests to insert after ''management plan'' on line 16, and it is amendment No. 4, I believe; is that correct?

Mr. SWEENEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VENTO. The gentleman says that after ''management plan,'' he wants to put in language that specifically ensures, and I am quoting from the gentleman's amendment, ''that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs, and.''

What if the revenue increases? What if it decreases? According to this amendment, you would have to demonstrate that you would have a static situation, that there would be no increase and no decrease in revenue. That is the effect of the gentleman's amendment. Is the gentleman aware of the effect of his amendment?

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield further, that is not the effect at all. I think the effect is one that is a basic premise of citizenship, and that is the right of citizens to know the impact that their government or any other entity might have on their particular property.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, it is not just a question of knowing this. It is this is one of the requirements. It says that ''any designation under this law, the Man and Biosphere Program, shall not have, and shall not be given, any force or effect,'' and then you are putting down, ''that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs.''

So it can have no effect, no effect going up, no effect going down. That is what it says. That would completely vitiate the ability to, and this is almost an impossible test in this bill in any case.

So I might say, I do not know, this is sort of what I would call piling on in football. I would have long ago blown the whistle. This is what the amendment has. I understand that the gentleman may not have had that intention. But we are not going on the basis of intention. We are going on what is written in the law.

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield further, this is not an issue of remedies, it is an issue of notice. I think it is fundamental in the proposal that any U.N. Biosphere area be designated, that this Congress and the individuals and the constituents in that area affected have the right to know of the effect of that designation.

My amendment simply calls for the providing of that notice. It says nothing to the effect of imposing any sanction or remedy.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman will look at his amendment again. It says that specifically ensures, the plan has to ensure that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public. So it does not affect it. What does he mean by does not affect it? He means it goes up or down, does he not? What happens to revenue?

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield, it requires the Secretary of Interior to report back to Congress of the cost effects, the property tax in particular, effects on any of those affected individual properties.

Mr. VENTO. What if the values go up as a result of this designation?

Mr. SWEENEY. That should certainly be part of the debate that we have at that time on any of those designations.

Mr. VENTO. It would be invalidated based on that. I just think it is an inartfully drawn amendment. As I said, I think the amendment just represents piling on. For that reason, I do not intend to support it. I think it is not well drawn, and I wanted to point out the effect of that. I think the test here in this bill would make it nearly impossible to have this voluntary scientific cooperation in the process. I do not know the purpose of this. This amendment obviously is not drawn well. But unfortunately under the rule that the gentleman perhaps voted for, I did not, we had to preprint everything in the RECORD ahead of time and we are all limited in time here. You do not really have the right to perfect your amendment or correct these types of problems, another little issue the gentleman ought to take up with the Committee on Rules under a so-called open rule.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA TO AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Young of Alaska to amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. Sweeney: Insert ''adversely'' before ''affect''.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, it is my intent to offer this amendment, which I have just done, I do think it is germane, to try to improve the amendment of Mr. SWEENEY, which I do believe his amendment is clear, but the gentleman from Minnesota has raised a question. I want to make sure that this now is perfectly clear, for adverse effect only.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended, will be postponed.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation and in support of the Vento and the Udall amendments that have been offered and against the Sweeney amendment that has been offered in the committee today.

First and foremost, let me say that I think this is a very unfortunate piece of legislation. It plays into some conspiracy theories that somehow, when we receive the honor of the designation of World Heritage area or the Biosphere Reserve Program or were part of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, that somehow this is land use planning by the United Nations. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in these designations that changes any Federal, State, local laws or regulations pertaining to these lands or changes the manner in which private property owners can use their lands, but what it does do is it provides an honor for some of the great natural assets of the United States and some of the great historical assets of the United States that leads to increased tourism, improved economics, and recognition of what this Nation has done in setting aside some of the great national parks and public spaces in the entire world, and I think we ought to welcome that kind of designation.

I also want to say that it is very clear when we consider the Vento amendment that much more harm has been done to public lands and done to private lands because of the acquisition of these lands by foreign entities that then come in here and take the resources from those lands, whether it is mining or whether it is timber or grazing or other proposals like this, where then we end up spending hundreds of millions if not billions of taxpayers' dollars cleaning up after these entities, making up for erosion, making up for the destruction and the deterioration of those natural assets.

That is why I think that the Vento amendment is very, very important for its adoption today because we should not just have a willy-nilly process where people come in, buy these assets, exploit the resource and then leave it to the American citizens to pick up the cost of their bad policies, their bad management and mistakes in the use of those lands and those resources.

So I would hope that Members would vote against this bill on passage, and I would hope that they would support the Udall and the Vento amendments, and I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) very much for his managing this bill on the floor today, and his involvement in this issue over the last several years in trying to put this argument into perspective and show how foolish it is and how much it is based upon fallacy and misrepresentation of facts.

Also, I think he said something in the Committee on Rules the other day that is very important, that success with this legislation is really about the first step in removing the designations from our great wilderness areas, from our parks areas, from our national monuments, because the same people who support this legislation in fact oppose the designation and the protection and the acquisition of these great lands for the use of the people of the United States, for all of the people of the United States. As much as those people support it, we have a small group of people in the Congress and in this country who insist that somehow these lands really do not belong in the public domain in spite of the fact that millions of Americans will pick up their families, their children, and they will travel across this country to visit the Statue of Liberty, to visit Liberty Hall, to visit the Grand Tetons, the Grand Canyon, Bryce, Yosemite and so many other great monuments and great natural assets in the national park systems of this country.

There is still a few in this Congress who want to believe that we should roll back designations. This legislation is the first step in that process, and this Congress ought to reject that effort.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's support in this battle, and I think we are winning it and we should win it.

Mr. Chairman, the problem in our country is not with the designation and the parks that are embraced by our people. They are, in fact, among the most popular and the most strongly supported by the public. The parks really represent what is right with our country. It is one of the best ideas we have ever had. And it is not, Mr. Chairman, I might say, the scientists that are doing research on natural resources that are at risk. These are not the problems in terms of our public lands and in our communities, in terms of scientific research that is being done in these parks or in these areas. That is not a problem, but this bill purports to solve that problem. It solves the problem of the designation of our parks, recognition of our parks. It tries to solve the problem of scientific research, to strip away the ability to do collaborative research. That is what the essence of these treaties and agreements exist.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has expired.

(On request of Mr. VENTO, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. So it is not the scientists that are doing research that are the problem, and in fact we can on a global basis cooperate and encourage other nations to work with them and do the type of scientific research that is necessary. We can study all we want within the United States, but we have got 1,900 other sites around the world that this permits us to study in, and other sites that it permits us to recognize as natural or cultural.

So this is an assault on parks. It is an assault on research. That is really what it purports. The problems here are the mines, they are the clear cuts, they are the destruction of rain forests, the burning of rain forests. They are the uncontrolled types of mining that goes on in other nations. That is where the problems exist largely, and we ought to be coming to grips with those: the drift nets in the oceans, the destruction of the biosphere.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the first efforts, the first timid efforts of this Nation and of this global community to try to deal even with the recognition of parks in a honorific way and the research of scientists, this bill attacks. I think it is a misunderstood bill, I think it is a bad bill, I think it is bad policy, and I hope the Congress will reject this, the House will reject this, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and let me just say, as my colleagues know, it is with great pride that the American people point to their national park system, it is with great pride that the American people know that the Statue of Liberty stands in New York Harbor and sends a beacon to the world about the tenets and the values of this Nation, and it is a great pride that those assets, the Grand Canyon, the Everglades, the Statue of Liberty and others, when the rest of the world honors, honors the decision that people in this country made about setting aside those public lands for public use, and it is a great honor that the millions of Americans choose to visit those parks each year to enjoy them, to participate in them, to learn from them. But it is also a task of this Congress and of the world community to make sure that we learn more about those parks that we are able to maintain.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we are able to maintain and protect those parks, and this Congress has a rather checkered past on that. But if we put it to the American people, they would vote to spend billions of dollars to maintain and protect the great parks of this Nation.

It is an honor to this Nation that people come from all over the world to visit these parks, that nations come to us and send their representatives here to learn how to do the same thing in Asia and Africa and Europe, all over. All over the world people want to emulate what Theodore Roosevelt started and what we have protected on a bipartisan basis.

Now we have a group of people who decided that they are going to roll that back, they are going to take away that designation, they are going to remove this honor from the American people. The pride of this Nation, the beacon we send to the rest of the world; they now have decided that they want to remove this honor and start that process of denigrating these most valuable and cherished public lands in our Nation. The pride of our Nation as we send out messages to the world about conservation, about the protection of public lands, about the values of this country.

This legislation is absolutely looney, it is absolutely looney. It is based in some unknown conspiracy, unsubstantiated, based upon the fact that some people believe that day in and day out they see black helicopters swooping in to protect the national parks of the United States.

No, Mr. Chairman, that is not how it is done in this country, it will never be done that way in this country, and this legislation should not try to validate those kinds of crazy conspiracy theories.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have just heard one of the greatest presentations of looney tunes I have ever heard. Very frankly, this is nothing to do with the parks. We do not invade the parks, we do not invade any of the other areas. We are trying to reestablish the congressional activity in designating land and not letting the U.N.

I have to remind people the U.N. organizations are not accountable. U.N. bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters, and remember, many of the U.N. delegates that make these decisions do not believe in privately-held property. Their countries are owned by dictators or owned by governments that do not have private property, and when they make decisions, the United States, under our Constitution affecting private property rights, that is wrong.

All my bill does is have the Congress get back involved in the designation of lands. If they are so heavily supported, those outside the parks, then I suggest respectfully they will be easily passed in this Congress. It does not affect any of the parks or any of the reference here or any of the Heritage Sites such as the Statue of Liberty. My bill does not affect that. All we do is put the committee, this Congress, back into the process of designating the lands.

UNESCO,
Paris, France, March 6, 1995.

Hon. GEORGE T. FRAMPTON, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Fish & Wildlife & Parks, U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, Washington, DC, USA.

DEAR MR. FRAMPTON: I am writing to you with respect to a letter from a group of North American conservation organizations, addressed to Dr. Adul Wichiencharoen, Chairman of the World Heritage Committee, and dated 28 February, 1995. The World Heritage Committee is the executive body of the Convention and is elected by its 140 States Parties. I note that a copy of this letter was sent to your office. The letter concerns the possible listing of Yellowstone National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Committee had been made aware of some of these concerns in a brief report by the United States Delegate to the July 1993 meeting of the World Heritage Bureau.

The fourteen organizations signing this letter are as you know among the most prestigious and influential in the field of natural resources conservation. We believe that the concerns they raise about the threats to Yellowstone must be carefully examined and addressed.

Included with their letter was a briefing book containing copies of correspondence from the Governor of Wyoming and Senator Baucus of Montana, each raises serious questions about the potential damage to Yellowstone National Park, in particular from the proposed mining operation. Similar letters of concern are provided from professional geologists, geomorphologists and hydrologists who have investigated the proposed mining operation. This correspondence is sufficient to raise considerable concern about the long-term sustainability of the World Heritage values of this World Heritage site.

From the report it appears that while a draft Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared, it did not resolve several major questions and many issues remain under review. Thus it would appear premature to reach any conclusions at this time.

With respect to the List of World Heritage in Danger, there are no specific criteria. The Committee has the authority to place a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger when it is of the view that the World Heritage values for which the site was inscribed are seriously threatened.

The procedure for listing normally involves a monitoring report by the World Conservation Union (IUCN), in consultation with the State Party and the management authority responsible for the site. IUCN reports to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee which meets in July and the Bureau makes a recommendation to the Committee, which usually meets in December of each year.

While we have taken note that the conservative organizations have requested that the World Heritage Secretariat involve itself in the EIS process, we simply are not staffed to do so. We would, however, be pleased to address these organizations on any aspects of the operation of the World Heritage Convention. We could also request IUCN as our technical advisors, to review the Environmental Impact Statement. We are confident that as the State Party responsible for the implementation of the Convention the essential professional skills are available to you.

It is important to note that Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention obliges the State Party to protect, conserve, present and transmit to future generations World Heritage sites for which they are responsible. This obligation extends beyond the boundary of the site and Article 5 (A) recommends that State Parties integrate the protection of sites into comprehensive planning programmes. Thus, if proposed developments will damage the integrity of Yellowstone National Park, the State Party has a responsibility to act beyond the National Park boundary.

Examples of the need to act beyond park boundaries are found at the Everglades National Park, Glacier National Park and Glacier Bay National Park, all World Heritage sites. In two of the sites the Government of British Columbia acted to close major mining operations rather than risk possible damage to downstream World Heritage values in both Canada and the United States.

Clearly if there are threats to World Heritage values the State Party has a responsibility to act. If enabling legislation is not adequate, new legislation should be considered, as was the case in Australia with respect to the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage site.

The World Heritage Committee has the authority to act unilaterally in placing a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, in the past the Committee has demonstrated a clear desire to work in consort with the State Party. In this respect we would appreciate receiving a comprehensive report on the situation in time for the meeting of the World Heritage Bureau to be held in Paris in early July. Such a report would enable the Committee to give serious consideration to the listing of Yellowstone National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger, should such a decision be warranted, at its nineteenth session to be held in December 1995.

The United States has an exemplary record in support of and in accordance with the principles and requirements of the World Heritage Convention. We look forward to continuing this cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

BERND VON DROSTE,
Director, World Heritage Centre.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 13

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the United Nations has designated 67 sites in the United States as ''World Heritage Sites'' or ''Biosphere Reserves,'' which altogether are about equal in size to the State of Colorado, the eighth largest state; and

Whereas art. IV, sec. 3, United States Constitution, provides that the United States Congress shall make all needed regulations governing lands belonging to the United States; and

Whereas many of the United Nations' designations include private property inholdings and contemplate ''buffer zones'' of adjacent land; and

Whereas some international land designations such as those under the United States Biosphere Reserve Program and the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Scientific, Educational, and Culture Organization operate under independent national committees such as the United States National Man and Biosphere Committee that have no legislative directives or authorization from the Congress; and

Whereas these international designations as presently handled are an open invitation to the international community to interfere in domestic economies and land use decisions; and

Whereas local citizens and public officials concerned about job creation and resource based economies usually have no say in the designation of land near their homes for inclusion in an international land use program; and

Whereas former Assistant Secretary of the Interior George T. Frampton, Jr., and the President used the fact that Yellowstone National Park had been designated as a ''World Heritage Site'' as justification for intervening in the environmental impact statement process and blocking possible development of an underground mine on private land in Montana outside of the park; and

Whereas a recent designation of a portion of Kamchatka as a ''World Heritage Site'' was followed immediately by efforts from environmental groups to block investment insurance for development projects on Kamchatka that are supported by the local communities; and

Whereas environmental groups and the national Park Service have been working to establish an International Park, a World Heritage Site, and a Marine Biosphere Reserve covering parts of western Akaska, eastern Russia, and the Bering Sea; and

Whereas as occurred in Montana, such designations could be used to block development projects on state and private land in western Alaska; and

Whereas foreign companies and countries could use such international designations in western Alaska to block economic development that they perceive as competition; and

Whereas animal rights activists could use such international designations to generate pressure to harass or block harvesting of marine mammals by Alaska Natives; and

Whereas such international designations could be used to harass or block any commercial activity, including pipelines, railroads, and power transmission lines; and

Whereas the President and the executive branch of the United States have, by Executive Order and other agreements, implemented these designations without approval by the Congress; and

Whereas the United States Department of Interior, in cooperation with the Federal Interagency Panel for World Heritage, has identified the Aleutian Island Unit of the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge,

Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Cape Krusenstern National Monument, Denali National Park, Gates of the Arctic National Park, and Katmai National Park as likely to meet the criteria for future nomination as World Heritage Sites; and

Whereas the Alaska State Legislature objects to the nomination or designation of any World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves in Alaska without the specific consent of the Alaska State Legislature; and

Whereas actions by the President in applying international agreements to lands owned by the United States may circumvent the Congress; and

Whereas Congressman Don Young introduced House Resolution No. 901 in the 105th Congress entitled the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of 1997'' that required the explicit approval of the Congress prior to restricting any use of United States land under international agreements; and

Whereas Congressman Don Young has reintroduced this legislation in the 106th Congress as House Resolution No. 883, which is entitled the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act'';

Be it resolved that the Alaska State Legislature supports House Resolution 883, the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act,'' that reaffirms the constitutional authority of the Congress as the elected representatives of the people over the federally owned land of the United States and urges the swift introduction and passage of such act by the 106th Congress; and be it

Further resolved that the Alaska State Legislature objects to the nomination or designation of any sites in Alaska as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves without the prior consent of the Alaska State Legislature.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, May 11, 1999.

Hon. BRIAN PORTER,
Speaker of the House, Alaska State Legislature State Capitol, Juneau, AK.

DEAR SPEAKER PORTER: I am transmitting the engrossed and enrolled copies of the following joint resolution, passed by the Twenty-first Alaska State Legislature, to the Lieutenant Governor's Office for permanent filing: CS for House Joint Resolution No. 15(RES) ''Relating to support for the 'American Land Sovereignty Protection Act' in the United States Congress.'' Legislative Resolve No. 13.

Sincerely,

TONY KNOWLES,
Governor.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, May 11, 1999.

Hon. DRUE PEARCE,
President of the Senate, Alaska State Legislature, State Capitol, Juneau, AK.

DEAR PRESIDENT PEARCE: I am transmitting the engrossed and enrolled copies of the following joint resolution, passed by the Twenty-first Alaska State Legislature, to the Lieutenant Governor's Office for permanent filing: CS for House Joint Resolution No. 15(RES) ''Relating to support for the 'American Land Sovereignty Protection Act' in the United States Congress.'' Legislative Resolve No. 13.

Sincerely,

TONY KNOWLES,
Governor.

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

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 9 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO), Amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), Amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended.

Pursuant to House Resolution 180, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated 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 262, noes 158, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—262

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—158

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Berry
Biggert
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Davis (VA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fletcher
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (OK)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Radanovich
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)

Souder
Stump
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Walden
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Bilbray
Borski
Brown (CA)
Deutsch
Dixon
Foley
Horn
Largent
Moakley
Napolitano
Salmon
Stark
Towns

□ 1334

Messrs. MCCOLLUM, BATEMAN, DREIER, RYUN of Kansas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. BLUNT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. QUINN, HEFLEY, BOYD, HILL of Montana, BASS, SUNUNU, LOBIONDO, WAMP, WELLER, HOBSON, UPTON, CUNNINGHAM, SHIMKUS, STEARNS, CAMP, COBLE and HUNTER, and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 141, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 141, the Vento amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to House Resolution 180, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 231, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

AYES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—231

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Brown (CA)
Dixon
Foley
Graham
Largent
Moakley
Napolitano
Salmon
Stark
Thornberry
Towns

□ 1344

Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. MORELLA changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY, AS AMENDED

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 407, noes 15, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—407

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
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
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
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
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-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
Knollenberg
Kolbe
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
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
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
Pitts
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
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
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—15

Bilbray
Blumenauer
Castle
Cubin
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Klink
Kucinich
Markey
Meehan
Morella
Schakowsky
Scott
Shays
Thompson (CA)

NOT VOTING—11

Brown (CA)
Cox
Foley
Gonzalez
Granger
Largent
Moakley
Napolitano
Salmon
Stark
Towns

□ 1352

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. PASTOR changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS, 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. 883) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, pursuant to House Resolution 180, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 883.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1400

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the plans of the Committee on Rules in regard to H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000 and the Fiscal Year 2000 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

Today the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) informed the House of the Committee on Rules' plan regarding these bills in two ''Dear Colleague'' letters.

The Committee on Rules will be meeting the week of May 24 to grant a rule which may restrict the offering of amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

The bill was ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services on May 19. A copy of the bill and report will be available for review in the office of the Committee on Armed Services on Monday, May 24. The bill is also expected to be available for review on the Committee on Armed Services' web site this evening.

Any Member contemplating an amendment to the bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation to the Committee on Rules in H–312 of the Capitol no later than Tuesday, May 25 at 5 p.m.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

The Committee on Rules is also planning to meet the week of May 24 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration for Fiscal Year 2000 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.

The Committee on Appropriations ordered the bill reported Thursday, May 20, and is expected to file its committee report on Thursday, May 25, 1999.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H–312 of the Capitol no later than 12 p.m. on Tuesday, May 25. Amendments should be drafted to the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations. Copies of the bill may be obtained from the Committee on Appropriations in room H–218 of the Capitol.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

DECLARATION OF POLICY OF UNITED STATES CONCERNING NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense, with a Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4, Declaration of Policy of the United States Concerning National Missile Defense Deployment with a Senate amendment.

The rule is twofold. First, it makes in order a motion to concur in the Senate amendment in the House. Second, the rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 is a straightforward bill, declaring that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as it is technologically possible and to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces.

Mr. Speaker, in 1957, during a speech here in Washington, D.C., General Omar Bradley warned that we are now speeding inexorably towards a day when even the ingenuity of our scientists may be unable to save us from the consequences of a single rash act or a lone reckless hand upon the switch of an uninterceptible missile.

Forty-two years later, General Bradley is still right, not because we may be unable to stop an incoming missile, but because we cannot.

Not long ago, this House approved the national missile defense program by a margin of 317 to 105, a ratio of better than three to one. I am urging my colleagues to demonstrate their overwhelming support for this rule and its underlying bill once again.

Besides thousands of nuclear warheads on ballistic missiles maintained by Russia, China has more than a dozen long-range ballistic missiles targeted at the United States, and countries like North Korea and Iran are developing ballistic missile technology and capability much more rapidly than once believed.

The argument that rogue nations need more than a decade to obtain ballistic missile capability is both technically irresponsible and politically naive. The threat is real. The threat is here. The threat is now.

Even worse, most Americans do not realize that we have absolutely no defense, none at all, against a missile attack. We have been lulled into a false sense of security, unaware that nations across the globe are currently developing ballistic missiles which pose an immediate threat to our security.

In fact, just last year, Iran launched a medium-range ballistic missile with the help of North Korea and Russia.

We can protect ourselves from missiles of these potentially hostile nations. Deployment of a national mission defense system would cost less than our last six military peacekeeping missions.

Let us pass this rule and pass this declaration of policy and protect our Nation and its people from the threat of a missile attack.

I would like to commend the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, for their hard work on this very important measure.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, while I support the Senate amendments to H.R. 4, I rise in opposition to the rule. I oppose the rule because of the process or the lack thereof.

The Democratic members of the House Committee on Armed Services were totally bypassed on this bill; and that, Mr. Speaker, is reason enough to oppose the rule. The process is really incomprehensible, Mr. Speaker, since the Senate amendment to the House-passed version of the bill states very simply that it is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective national defense missile system that will protect the territory of the United States from missile attack.

That simple statement of policy is the distillation of what has been acrimonious public debate for over 15 years. What has changed, Mr. Speaker? I think most of the Members of this body can agree that what this bill calls for is not the Reagan Star Wars of the 1980s. Indeed, the Senate amendment wisely adds language that subjects any missile defense system to the annual appropriations process which, in this era of fiscal restraint, places real constraints on any proposed missile defense system.

In addition, H.R. 4 does not mandate one system over another, nor does it mandate a date for deployment. In its simplicity, this bill acknowledges that the United States might well find itself subject to an attack that we should be prepared to defend against, but that we should do so within the context of the technological and financial realities of 1999.

Mr. Speaker, few of us in this body can deny that the world has become, since the end of the Cold War, an even more dangerous place than we might have imagined. There are rogue nations and factions that seek to harm, if not destroy, the United States.

This bill is an attempt to move forward the debate on the issue of the national missile defense without the acrimony that has accompanied the discussions on this subject in the past. H.R. 4 provides us with a good start, and I am hopeful that it will help us move to a resolution to a thorny, but incredibly important, issue.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow 1 hour of debate on the Senate amendments, a time limit that might have, given the importance of this matter, been extended to allow all Members who are interested in this matter an opportunity to speak.

In spite of the fact that the House has conducted very little business in the past few weeks, the Republican majority continually fails to give matters of great importance adequate time to be fully aired on the floor. I would hope that when we return from the Memorial Day recess, one that has now been extended through an entire week, the Republican leadership will consider a schedule that gives important legislation more time to be debated by the elected Members of this body.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who is the House leading expert on missile defense.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the underlying Senate amendments, but I am not happy with the legislation.

I am not happy because, when we brought this bill up in the House, we

had a clear and distinct debate. As the original author of H.R. 4, I made the point known to every Member of this body that this would be a vote for the President's policy or against the President's policy.

If my colleagues are supportive of holding this decision off for a year so it could be made during the middle of a Presidential election, then they should have opposed the House bill. And 102 brave Democrats and two brave Republicans did that. They opposed the bill.

But I said, if in spite of the President's letter of opposition on the morning of the vote, if my colleagues were for moving forward now to make that decision, then they should vote for the bill. And 214 Republicans did, joined by 103 Democrats, for a veto-proof margin. It was a clear and distinct point of opposition against this administration's policy. No mistake about it.

Then we saw the White House and Bob Bell try to suspend what we had just done, try to tell us that it really did not mean what we said it was. In fact, the Senate on the floor of debates agreed to two amendments. These amendments mean nothing. They mean nothing. They are simply cover for liberal Democrats who do not support missile defense to have a way to cover their you know whats.

One of them says that any missile defense program should be subject to the authorization and appropriation process. Well, duh. Everything we do in this Congress is subject to the authorization and appropriation process. Are we so naive as to think that somehow we pull manna from heaven and we bring dollars to the table and that is what funds programs? That amendment means nothing. It has no bearing on this bill or what we are doing here.

The second amendment says that we should continue to negotiate reductions in arms. Who disagrees with that? The irony is that the Senate put an amendment on that only refers to reductions in Russian arms. What happens, Mr. Speaker, if the Russians regard this as only being an attempt to get them to reduce their arms while the U.S. is not paralleling that process? The amendments unfortunately passed, and we could do nothing about that.

The Senate having the rules, they had forced us to take a bill that I am not happy with. But it does move the process forward, and I would say to my colleagues, in the full debate, we will have a colloquy that will be joined by the chairman of the full committee that will be joined by the majority leader and the Speaker who will clarify on the RECORD what this bill means by this body.

□ 1415

If the White House chooses to run for Congress, than they can interpret our bills. If Bob Bell chooses to step down and run for a House seat, he can change or he can then interpret our bills. But, short of that, nobody can interpret our legislation except for us. We are the ones who drafted the bill. We are the ones who passed the bill. We are the ones who passed the clean bill of this House, only to be amended by extraneous and irrelevant amendments on the Senate side.

I will be asking my colleagues today to vote ''yes.'' But clearly, during our debate and discussion we will clarify the record time and again to show that there is a clear and distinct difference between the position of this administration and the position that 317 Members of Congress supported.

I am outraged that right after we passed this bill President Clinton would send me a letter that says this: ''Next year we will determine whether or not to deploy for the first time a limited national missile defense against these threats.'' That is the letter.

That is not what this bill says. It does not say, Mr. President, next year. It says today we will pass this conference report, we will move forward, and we will do it in direct contradiction to what this administration is trying to spin.

And when the White House has its signing ceremony, I do not know whether I will be invited or not, but if I am, I will clearly make the case that it is a clear policy difference between this White House and their attempt to spin what we did that they could not defeat in this body. We could have overridden the veto because we had 103 Democrats agree with this, along with 214 Republicans, and this was at a time when the White House issued a statement in opposition to our bill.

These amendments mean nothing. All of us agree that an authorization and appropriation processes must be followed. All of us want to see reductions in arms by both Russia and America. Unfortunately, the Senate amendment only says Russia, which could be read as destabilizing.

The point is, the crux and the actual content of this bill is simple. Today we are saying in the Congress of the United States that it is time to deploy a national missile defense capability.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania to know that I was one of the Democrats who voted for his resolution. But I must say, we held a hearing in the defense appropriations subcommittee, now called the Subcommittee on National Security Appropriations, this year. Lieutenant General Lester Lyles came over and briefed our committee. And, frankly, we are not doing very well in developing this technology. We have got serious problems.

I personally believe that if we look at missile defense, that the number one priority when we deploy our troops is to have a capable theater missile defense system. We need to focus on that first. And of course, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows, we have had five failures of the THAAD system, which is fundamental to having a credible theater missile defense system. We have the Patriot 3, the PAC–3 program, which is doing quite well.

Now, if we cannot do theater missile defense, no matter how loudly we yell, we are not going to command a national missile defense system into being. Now, General Lyles has testified before our subcommittee that it is going to be at least 2005 before we have done the testing that is necessary to have any confidence that we would have a credible limited system.

So I think the language in this resolution that says let us be honest with ourselves, we cannot be in denial here, that we are going to do this, I voted to do it when it is technologically feasible. If the science is not there, if the engineering is not there, if the technology is not there, we cannot just wish it into existence.

And so I hope that my colleagues will think about this issue. This is one of the most important national security issues that we face. None of us likes the idea of being vulnerable to any country's potential for using a ballistic missile. But think about it. We had the whole era of the Cold War when the Russians had thousands of warheads aimed at the United States and we had thousands of warheads aimed at them. What did that produce? That produced deterrence. We knew that if either one of us struck the other that we would open up the possibility for a catastrophic war that would destroy both countries, and so we were deterred.

And today the United States has more offensive capability than any other country in the world and more credible and more capable offensive capability. And I believe that any country that thought about launching an attack against the United States would have to be out of their mind, because they would know that we would know where the missile launched from and we could have the potential to respond with overwhelming force. I think deterrence still is a valid doctrine that we should not forget about as we work towards getting a national missile defense system in place.

So I think the language of the Senate improves and makes more credible this resolution that we previously voted on. And I think my view is that I want this technology to work.

One of the companies from my State is in charge of trying to integrate this and make it work. But we cannot tell the American people that there is something out there that will work until we can demonstrate it, and we have not been able to demonstrate THAAD. We have not been able to demonstrate a comprehensive theater missile defense system.

And so I think we ought to be very sober about any of these exhortations that we are hearing about from people

here who want to wish this into existence.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, let us focus the debate on the facts.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague just spoke and made some points. First of all, he said the THAAD program has had five failures. What he did not properly explain is that of the five failures that occurred, none of them, none of them involved hit-to-kill. The five failures that occurred were caused by quality control problems of the Lockheed Martin contractor, and we in the Congress took the lead to force them to begin to pay for those failures.

We have never had a test yet to actually get to hit-to-kill, but in fact the THAAD program has accomplished 28 of 30 milestones. That is a tremendous success. So to characterize the THAAD program as a failure does a terrible disservice to those people who are working on that program because the facts do not bear that.

Second, the gentleman made the point that this is a terrible technology challenge. Well, it is. And he pointed out that a company in his area, Boeing, is a lead system integrator. What the gentleman did not mention is that the head of this program, Dr. Peller, in congressional testimony said the challenge to build the Space Station was more difficult than to build a national missile defense. Now, that is the top official of the company that comes from the district of the gentleman.

The third is deterrence, that we somehow can rely on the deterrence of the 1980s. That may have been true. I do not want to trust North Korea not to fire that Taepo-Dong 1 at one of our cities. And I would say to my good friend and colleague, 28 young Americans, half of them from my State, came back from Desert Storm in body bags because we could not defend against a low-complexity missile that wiped them out.

I agree with the gentleman, theater missile defense is our top priority; and I use my votes and my voice to help accomplish that. But we cannot ignore the threat to our country by saying North Korea will avoid attacking us because of deterrence.

And finally, this is what offends me. I will make a prediction on the floor today. The reason why the White House is spinning this the way they are is because next year, in the middle of the presidential campaign, Vice President Gore will announce that we are going to deploy NMD. That is an absolute travesty and an outrage for this country.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to say to my colleagues, we want a national missile defense system against a limited attack. I think that is a wise thing to do.

I am just saying to everyone here today, after having General Lyles come before our committee and after going through each of the technologies in place, I have to report to my colleagues that General Lyles says 2005 is the earliest we would have a capability, and that capability has not yet been demonstrated. We have not been able to do what it takes to put it in place. It does not exist. And we cannot just create something out of whole cloth.

Now, let us make it work. Let us be sober. Let us be realistic and honest with the House and the American people. Let us wait and do this when it is technologically feasible. We cannot do it, anyway. I mean, we cannot wish this into existence. So I urge everybody, including my colleague from the State of Washington, to be sober.

I can remember when these people came in from my own State and they told and told me in 1983 that this technology was in hand. Edward Teller came and told us that the technology was in hand. It is now 1999, we have spent billions, and it is not in hand. This is a hard problem.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELETON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to speak on the rule. I am compelled to do so because I speak today about the process, about the process that brings us to the floor. Mr. Speaker, I speak not as a Democrat but as a Member of this House and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Just over 2 months ago, the House and the Senate passed H.R. 4 and S. 257, respectively, similar legislation, declaring it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. But since then, Mr. Speaker, the process has been hijacked.

There was no conference committee between the House and the Senate. As a result, differences in the two measures have not been reconciled as normally they are reconciled. Rather, we are being asked to concur in the exclusive work of the Senate on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. That is not right.

Implied in this fact is the notion that the Senate has a patent on all the knowledge and all the insight on this particular matter. And, of course, I reject that because we in this body, in our committee, have been very, very active on this issue.

And, therefore, I am disappointed that the views of the House Members, both Democrats and Republicans, have not been afforded regular order consideration in the matter that is before us today. I think the process that brings us here today is not only unfortunate but it is unnecessary.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, how appropriate the timing of this debate. As we speak, folks are lined up around the block across America to see the new Star Wars movie. And what better time than right now, with the refrain of that great Star Wars theme music, the opening day of ''The Phantom Menace,'' for us to be taking up this proposal.

Just like the original movie, this bill puts a tractor beam in the Capitol dome and aims it right at the wallets of the American taxpayer to support this defective system. This Star Wars scheme is a technological failure. It has failed one test after another, again and again. An accelerated program to test it has been described as ''a rush to failure'' by former Air Force Chief of Staff General Larry Welsh.

I am reminded of Han Solo's admonition to Luke Skywalker: ''Jumping through hyperspace ain't like dusting crops, boy.'' Well, hitting a bullet with a bullet, hitting in fact many bullets, with bullets raining down over the entire continental United States at 15,000 miles an hour, and doing it accurately and reliably, is not like dusting crops, either. And yet here we are, year after year, having demands to throw more good money after bad.

I disagree with my colleague from Washington State about this measure, but he is right about one thing. Wishing is not going to make it so. The first law of Disney Wish and make it so, does not apply here; rather it is the laws of physics and thermodynamics that control weather this can be accomplished.

□ 1430

Just 3 days ago, we acted in this Congress on spare parts and training and readiness. As Joint Chiefs Chairman Hugh Skelton said recently, the massive amount of experiments on these kind of Star Wars programs drain resources from personnel and readiness accounts. If there is a readiness problem, it is a problem that this Republican Congress created in preferring pork over readiness. We are diverting these kind of precious resources away from our true military and nonmilitary needs because we have people here who keep coming up year after year asking us to throw an infinite amount of taxpayer money at a problem that has real physical limitations.

I agree fully with my colleague from Texas, Mr. FROST, about the substance of this resolution, about the important meaning of the Senate amendments. But the effect I disagree with him on, because it is clear that the Star Wars advocates are using this measure to boost their cause. The missile defense that is being advocated, even if it worked, would not defend us from the real threats we face from terrorism, with bombings at the World Trade Center, with gas attacks like that that occurred in a Japanese subway.

If we really want to do something to address our security, the Congress

ought simply to read the National Research Council of the National Academy of Science report this week about the threat, the very real threat that we have from the potential or diversion of Russian nuclear materials. Our Energy Department had to spend $600,000 in emergency funds last year because guards at some of these facilities in Russia had no winter uniforms for outside patrols and left without paychecks searching for food. That is a real security threat that should concern every one of us. We are not doing very much about it.

Implementing the START II nuclear missile reduction treaty would eliminate 3,000 Russian nuclear warheads, in fact, that this fantasy proposes to deal with in outer space. Such implementation would do a great deal more to assure the security and safety of American families than this proposal. We should be giving that our highest national security priority. Instead of diverting attention from this vital objective, this Congress should be encouraging a START III to have further reduction in nuclear armaments around the world and truly protect our freedom.

What so many in this House fail to recognize is that national security is measured in terms other than simply how many bombs, bullets and missiles we possess. It is measured in economic strength, in productivity and in the success of our efforts to reduce threats from abroad. I urge the House to consider defense programs that meet our true security needs and reject this proposal.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I believe in ballistic missile defense if it is feasible, but we have yet to prove that it is feasible. I was the principal cosponsor of H.R. 4 because I thought we needed a focus to our ballistic missile defense program. I thought we needed to make a decision that we would go forward with the objective of fielding a system, a system that worked and would afford us at least limited protection against an accidental strike in this country. But I was honest to acknowledge on the House floor that we are not there yet. We have not proven the capability of this system. However, having spent $50 billion over the last 15 years, I thought it was time to bring those efforts to fruition, to build a workable system if we can as opposed to putting more viewgraphs on the shelf.

H.R. 4 was an effort to reach some kind of bipartisan consensus on a very basic proposition, that the focus of our efforts in ballistic missile defense would be to deploy a system. We passed that bill here with a hefty margin. We sent it to the other body, they struck everything in it, adopted a completely different bill and now they send it back to us in a process that is a breach of procedure, bypassing the procedures that are long established and that are intended to achieve a consensus between both Houses. Normally when we pass a bill and send it to the Senate and they pass a different bill, there is a conference to hammer out the differences, a conference to establish a record as to why the compromises in language were made to the extent that these are made. There is no record here. We have had no conference. We are bypassing the traditional procedure. For what reason I do not know. This is no way to legislate. It is also no way to build bipartisan consensus on something that has been sort of a political totem.

As I have said before, we do not debate ballistic missile defense the way we debated the MX or the B–2 or other major systems. This system is so charged with political significance that it is a totally different kind of debate. One of the things we will not have as a result of this procedure is a record, a record to explain the legislative history of what some truly ambiguous and unclear language in this particular bill actually means.

This bill calls for billions of dollars to be spent to deploy a national missile defense system, quote, as soon as it is technologically feasible, or possible. What does this mean? I am concerned that it could mean that as soon as we have got the technology or think we have it in hand, we are supposed to rush to deployment, even though we might end up with a suboptimal or a substandard system. I am concerned that it may mean before we have adequately tested, we will move to deployment. That is not an idle concern.

Yesterday in the defense authorization bill markup, an amendment was added which allowed the director of this program and the Secretary of Defense to begin deployment before this system was fully tested, a dispensation that is granted to very few defense programs. It could mean that we will deploy even though it is extravagantly expensive, far more expensive than the protection it would allow us. It could mean any number of different things. We do not know. There is no legislative history. We have not been able in the House to have the opportunity to give meaning to that particular phrase.

The bill specifies that this national missile system must be capable of affording us a limited defense, or defense against a limited ballistic missile attack. What does ''limited'' mean? Is it an unauthorized attack, an accidental attack, or an attack by, say, one submarine which could mean easily more than 100 warheads? Very, very critical to have that definition pinned down.

In our bill, we had legislative history. We said it was an accidental attack. We limited the scope of the effectiveness of the system. Here they talk about a limited attack. That could range from 5 warheads to 200 warheads. It is not clear at all. We have no opportunity to make it clear.

Furthermore, the timing of this bill, the timing of the previous bill, disturbed me. I know it disturbed the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), too. Because this bill is misperceived by the Russians. I said that on the floor, I said it in committee. The Russians see this bill as somehow a potential or anticipatory breach of the ABM treaty. I think that is unfounded.

I think what we are trying to move towards is a system where we can rely upon our defenses so that we do not have to rely so much upon the threat of a retaliatory strike. I think that would be an improvement in deterrence and an improvement in the stability in the world. The Russians do not see it that way yet. They see us moving away from the ABM treaty. This language in this bill is not bound to give them comfort and encouragement, because this bill says that in addition to deploying defenses in this country, we should also seek to negotiate reductions in Russian nuclear weapons. I agree that we should be negotiating with the Russians. We should have done START II. We should have pressed them to ratify it long before now. But they perceive START II as being tilted against them.

Now we are saying in this bill, ''We're going to build defenses and we want you to build down your missile systems,'' which suggests that we want complete superiority here. It is not the formulation for a successful bargain. It is not the kind of message we need to send the Russians, particularly at a time when we are leaning on them and Chernomyrdin is today in Belgrade trying to cut a deal with us. It is just ill-timed. I will probably vote for this bill because I believe in ballistic missile defense and I do not want to muddle that message on my part but I am very, very disappointed in the process and procedure it is taking.

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

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

It is important that we take a look at reminding ourselves as we debate this rule that the national missile defense program, the vote most recently held in this House, was 317–105, better than a 3 to 1 ratio of the Members of this great body in support of a national missile defense program. Number two, on some of the questions with the rule, I would remind all of my colleagues that at the Committee on Rules yesterday, it was a voice vote on the rule approval that we have before us today.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must go back to my opening remarks, that most Americans do not realize that we have absolutely no defense, none at all, against a missile attack. We have been lulled into a false sense of security, unaware that nations across the globe are currently developing ballistic missiles which pose an immediate threat to our security. Mr. Speaker, today is the day to act. I urge passage of this rule.

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.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 179, I offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Spence moves to concur in the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Missile Defense Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate) with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for National Missile Defense.

SEC. 3. POLICY ON REDUCTION OF RUSSIAN NUCLEAR FORCES.

It is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1995, Norway launched a weather rocket that was mistaken by sensors in Russia for a launch of an ICBM from one of our nuclear submarines. They were in a final countdown in the process of preparing to launch a missile attack against us, and only minutes away when they finally discovered the mistake and called off the launch. We were that close to being faced with nuclear warfare.

Mr. Speaker, most people in this country do not realize we have no defense against that type of an attack nor do we have a defense against even one missile launched accidentally from somewhere else in the world today. There are literally thousands of these missiles abroad in the world today. The threat of ballistic missile attack is real and it is here today.

Last summer, an independent study by the bipartisan Rumsfeld Commission unanimously concluded that the ballistic missile threat to our country is broader, more mature and evolving more rapidly than anticipated, and that the United States may have little or no warning of a ballistic missile attack. With each passing day, our Nation's vulnerability to missile attack grows. Rogue nations like North Korea, Libya, Iran and Iraq are working aggressively to acquire the capability to strike the American homeland with ballistic missiles carrying weapons of mass destruction. Russia and China already possess this capability. I am confident that the more than 200 Members who attended the Rumsfeld Commission extraordinary classified briefing here on this House floor back in March have a much greater appreciation of the need to move forward with missile defenses and of the reason why we need to make the kind of commitment that we are making in this bill.

□ 1445

Let me briefly make a few points:

First, contrary to intelligence estimates that predicted the ballistic missile threat was more than a decade away, the missile threat to our country is real, as I have said before, and it is here today.

Second, technology has matured to the point where moving forward and deploying a national missile defense system is feasible. There will always be test failures, there will always be technological challenges, but Americans have never shied away from a challenge and certainly never in the face of a threat that gets worse every day.

Third, the cost of a national missile defense system, by the administration's own estimates, will comprise less than 1 percent of the overall defense budget and less than 2 percent of our military modernization budget over the next 5 years. Because to deploy an initial national missile defense capability will amount to less than the amount our country has spent on peacekeeping developments, deploying missiles in the past 6 years, this strikes me as a small price and a sound investment.

Mr. Speaker, national missile defense is necessary, feasible and affordable, but in spite of the growing consensus that the threat is real and the technology is maturing, the administration has steadfastly refused to commit to actually deploy a national missile defense. H.R. 4 addresses the administration's unexplainable lack of commitment in this regard and represents the Congress' bipartisan belief that all Americans should be protected against ballistic missiles.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this important bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to concur with the Senate amendments to H.R. 4, an act to declare it the policy of the United States to deploy national missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Missouri, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on National Security, that I concur with him and that we should pass this, and I am not at all upset about what the Senate did. I think putting in the phrase ''when technologically feasible'' means that we have to have something to deploy. And I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the committee but I must tell my colleagues, when we brought over the people who were running this program and we went through each of the various possibilities, they have said basically that at this point we do not have something to deploy. Now, we just cannot make it up. Either it is deployable or it is not. Either we have tested it and we know it will work or it will not.

So I urge everyone here that we should stay with our commitment to keep working on this problem, but to start deploying something that we have not tested is an absolute recipe for failure.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I hope that we get a national missile defense, but let us not waste money trying to deploy something that we have not yet demonstrated, and I think theater missile defense should be our first priority. I appreciate the gentleman having yielded to me.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to continue very, very briefly, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

At today's motion I would like to, and I hope we all understand that the technology needed to develop an ICBM capable of delivering a warhead of mass destruction against large portions of these United States is today, in the hands of at least one so-called rogue actor nation. Worse, much of the needed technology has already been demonstrated, and now I believe it is not only possible but probable that significant portions of the United States will be threatened by ICBM-delivered warheads of mass destruction sometime before the year 2005, the time the administration says is needed to deploy a suitable limited national missile defense system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

As some of as my colleagues know, I changed my mind about the way we need to approach ballistic missile defense. I always believed we needed BMD, but over the last year I changed my mind about when we needed it, and that was because of the report of the Commission to Assess Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States. This was a bipartisan commission charged to assess the nature and magnitude of existing and emerging ballistic missile threats to the United States.

The report and testimony of the commission made two things clear. First, the ballistic missile threat to the United States may be coming faster than previously estimated. Second, the threat to our friends, allies and troops overseas already exists.

That is why I cosponsored this bill, and that is why Congress overwhelmingly decided to go on record in support of ballistic missile defense.

Now I think there are legitimate grounds to be unhappy with the procedure we are using today. I think everyone on our side agrees that accepting a Senate amendment without benefit of a conference is not the best way to do this, and those of us in the House would have liked to sit down with Members of the other body to talk about what they mean by phrases like ''technologically feasible.'' And for another thing, it fails to recognize tireless contributions and leadership of Members on our side, such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), but it does make the point by putting Congress on record that it is the policy of the United States to deploy an effective missile defense.

On balance, Mr. Speaker, I think this language sends a message that is vital to national security, and I urge this body to support it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member for their support, and let me again clarify some points here.

First of all, none of us are mandating that something be deployed before it is ready, none of us. We are not that naive to put a date certain on requiring that something be done by a certain time, and no one should misinterpret this legislation as requiring that.

What we are saying is that we are making a clear and distinct policy change here as a Nation. For the first time we are saying publicly that it is the policy of this country to deploy a limited national missile defense system against those rogue threats that we see emerging.

We took great efforts in this process to bring the Russians in, to show them that this was not aimed against them. In fact, a number of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle traveled with us to Moscow the week before the vote with the former CIA Director of the Clinton administration, Jim Woolsey, with the former Secretary of Defense and White House Chief of Staff, Donald Rumsfeld, and with the former Deputy Secretary of State, Bill Schneider, and we took the time to give the Russian leadership the briefing as to the emerging threats and convinced them that this was not being done to score some type of strategic advantage over Russia. This was being done because in today's world North Korea is not a stable nation that deterrents will work with. In today's world the Chinese now have at least 18 long-range ICBMs. We know that Iran and Iraq both have medium-range missiles and are developing long-range capabilities.

So, Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons we are making a clear and distinct policy change that will occur when the President signs this bill. And the key thing that I want to keep stressing is, one, that when the President signs this bill, that is the change in policy of this government, that we are deploying a national missile defense system as soon as that technology is available, not before it is available, not prematurely, but as soon as it is available. We do not recommend the technology. We do not say land-based over sea-based. We do not say one site over three sites. We say as soon as available and as soon as it is ready, we deploy it.

That is a clear and marked difference over the policy that exists today, and for the White House to try to spin what we are doing is totally wrong. And I want the record to clearly show that this Congress and the other body are on record as interpreting our own bill, and there should be no one in the White House in future years who will try to spin what it is we are trying to accomplish today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with our distinguished chairman for the record. I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

There has been some misconception concerning this national missile defense bill. The purpose of this bill is very simply to establish a U.S. policy, the deployment of a national missile defense, as soon as technologically possible. In the chairman's view, does this bill commit the United States to deploy a national missile defense?

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it does.

The intent of this bill is straightforward and unequivocal. However, I understand that in a May 7 letter the President indicated, and I quote, the legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made, unquote. Following the Senate passage of S. 257 earlier this year, the Secretary of State even sent a cable to our embassies articulating this same opinion.

I do not understand how anyone could look at this legislation objectively and arrive at the same conclusion as the President and the Secretary of State. This bill makes it clear that the Nation is committed and is committing to the deployment of a national missile defense.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD both the White House letter as well as the State Department cable so that everyone can see what type of spin the administration is trying to place on this bill.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 7, 1999.

Hon. CURT WELDON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WELDON: Thank you for your letter on National Missile Defense (NMD). We are committed to meeting the growing danger that outlaw nations may develop and field long-range missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies.

Next year, we will determine whether to deploy for the first time a limited national missile defense against these threats. This decision will be made when we review the results of flight tests and other developmental efforts, consider cost estimates, and evaluate the threat. In making our determination, we will also review progress in achieving our arms control objectives, including negotiating any amendments to the ABM Treaty that may be required to accommodate a possible NMD deployment.

I am pleased that the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, included in its NMD legislation two amendments that significantly changed the original bill, which I strongly opposed. By specifying that any NMD deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, the legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. By putting the Senate on record as continuing to support negotiated reductions in strategic nuclear arms, the bill also reaffirms that our missile defense policy must take into account our arms control objectives.

We want to move ahead on the START III framework, which I negotiated with President Yeltsin in 1997, to cut Russian and U.S. arsenals 90 percent from Cold War levels, while maintaining the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability. The changes made in the NMD bill during Senate debate ensure these crucial objectives will be taken into account fully as we pursue our NMD program.

Thank you again for writing on this important matter.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

S. 257—NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Background.—U.S. policy regarding ballistic missile defense most recently was elaborated in reftels (n.b., identical text to different addresses). During the March floor debate on S. 257, the Cochran National Missile Defense (NMD) bill, the Senate on a bipartisan basis adopted two very important amendments that modified the original bill that had been reported out of the Armed Services Committee on essentially a party-line vote last month. The first amendment makes clear that any deployment of a limited U.S. NMD system must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, thereby underscoring that no deployment decision has been made. The second amendment confirms that U.S. policy with regard to the possible deployment of a limited NMD system must take account of our objectives with regard to arms control. With these improvements, the administration informed Senate leaders that it would accept S. 257 as amended if it reaches the President's desk in this form. On March 17, the Senate passed S. 257 (as amended) in a rollcall vote, 97–3.

Posts are authorized to draw upon the materials contained herein in addressing this matter. The text of S. 257, as passed by the Senate is at paragraph 3. White House talking points prepared by the National Security Council are at paragraph 4. The text of a statement by the President, released on March 17, is at paragraph 5.

The text of S. 257 as passed by the Senate is as follows:

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

Section 1. Short title.

This act may be cited as the National Missile Defense Act of 1999''.

Section 2. National Missile Defense Policy.

It is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense System capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate) with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for national missile defense.

Section 3. Policy on reduction of Russian nuclear forces.

It is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian Nuclear Forces.

Begin White House Points:

The administration made clear its strong opposition to the Cochran NMD bill as it emerged from the Armed Services Committee last month. The Presidents senior national security advisors recommended that the bill be vetoed were it to reach the President's desk in that form.

We are pleased that the Senate on two bipartisan votes, adopted two very important amendments to the bill and thereby significantly improved it.

The first amendment makes clear that no decision has been made to deploy a limited NMD system. It does so by specifying that any such decision must necessarily be subject to the annual authorization and appropriations process.

The President has not proposed that any funds be authorized or appropriated in the FY2000 Defense Department budget for NMD deployment. Whether he requests such funds in FY 2000 (the first fiscal year in which the administration intends to address the deployment question) will depend on the administration's assessment of the four factors. Which it believes must be taken into account in deciding whether to field this system:

(1) Has the threat materialized as quickly as we now expect it will;

(2) Has the technology been demonstrated to be operationally effective;

(3) Is the system affordable; and

(4) What are the implications of going forward with NMD deployment for our objectives with regard to achieving further reductions in strategic nuclear arms under START II and START III?

The second amendment makes clear that in pursuing our policy with regard to the deployment of a limited NMD, we must also take into account our objectives with regard to securing continued negotiated reductions in Russian and U.S. nuclear forces.

Through START II and START III, the United States can realize the removal of up to an additional 8,000 Russian and U.S. strategic nuclear warheads. These treaties are clearly in our national security interests.

At the Helsinki Summit, Presidents-Clinton and Yeltsin declared that the ABM Treaty is of fundamental significance to the attainment of our objectives for START II and START III.

In this context, it is crucial that the United States negotiate in good faith any amendments to the AMB Treaty that may be necessary to accommodate any U.S. limited NMD system.

The second Senate amendment affirms the Senate's recognition that the arms control dimension of the NMD deployment question must be taken into account.

As a result of these two amendments, the administration will accept S. 257 if it reaches the President's desk in its current form.

If asked—does this mean that the administration will hold NMD hostage to the ABM Treaty?

The administration has articulated its strong commitment to the ABM Treaty, which it regards as a cornerstone of strategic stability. At the same time, the administration has also made clear that it will not give Russia—or any other state—a veto over any missile defense deployment decision that it believes is vital to our national security interests.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am pleased that the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, included in its National Missile Defense (NMD) legislation two amendments that significantly change the original bill, which I strongly opposed. By specifying that any NMD deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, the legislation now makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. By putting the Senate on record as continuing to support negotiated reductions in strategic nuclear arms, the bill reaffirms that our missile defense policy must take into account our arms control objectives.

We are committed to meeting the growing danger that outlaw nations will develop and deploy long-range missiles that could deliver weapons of mass destruction against us and our allies. Next year, we will, for the first time, determine whether to deploy a limited national missile defense against these threats, when we review the results of flight tests and other developmental efforts, consider cost estimates, and evaluate the threat. In making our determination, we will also review progress in achieving our arms control objectives, including negotiating any amendments to the Arm Treaty that may be required to accommodate a possible NMD deployment.

This week, the Russian Duma took an encouraging step toward obtaining final approval of START II. We want to move ahead on the START III framework, which I negotiated with President Yeltsin in 1997, to cut Russian and U.S. arsenals 80 percent from cold war levels, while maintaining the Arm Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability. The changes made in the NMD bill during Senate debate ensure these crucial objectives will be fully taken into account as we pursue our NMD Program.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina. We cannot have a policy to deploy without a commitment to deploy.

In his letter the President also said, and I quote, next year we will determine whether to deploy a limited national missile defense, unquote. However, when the President signs this bill into law, he will be committing the U.S. to deploy. When the President signs this bill, he is also committing the Nation to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as technologically possible. The law is the law.

I would also like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if the President is correct in his view that subjecting a national missile defense program to the authorization and appropriation process can somehow be interpreted as meaning the decision on deployment has not yet been made.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, such an interpretation is not correct. The bill's language neither states nor implies anything of the sort. In fact, all Department of Defense programs are subject to authorization and appropriation.

This is a matter of current law in both Titles 10 and 31 of the U.S. Code. It is a constitutional requirement. Every weapon system we have deployed, bombers, missiles, tanks, fighters, ships and so on, goes through the authorization and the appropriation process. Deployment of these systems is simply the manifestation of policies that have been agreed upon to meet national security requirements.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. As the original author of this legislation, I fully agree. The administration has now recognized the threat, as evidenced by the CIA, and when the President signs this bill, he will be committing the Nation to the deployment of a national missile defense to meet that threat.

I would also state that in signing this bill the President is indicating a commitment to use the funds he has budgeted for national missile defense only for the execution of the policy he enacts and endorses by signing this legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. The President has budgeted $10.5 billion through fiscal year 2005 to support national missile defense deployment. When the President signs this bill, I believe it also reflects a commitment that these funds will be used to resolve the programmatic issues, to establish the technological feasibility of a national missile defense and, finally, to deploy a national missile defense system.

□ 1500

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Does the chairman believe that this bill in any way conditions deployment of a national missile defense system on further arms reductions with the Russians?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not. The section of this bill dealing with the arms reduction with the Russians is consistent with the current arms control policy and only reflects Congress' support for continued negotiations. There is no explicit or implicit linkage in H.R. 4 between achieving arms control reductions and the commitment to deploy national missile defense.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I agree with the chairman. Russia, or any other country, does not now have nor will it ever have a veto over our Nation's deployment of a national missile defense to protect our citizens.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank my friend and colleague for his strong interest in clarifying the record on this important legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying amendments and the underlying bill as well. I thank and congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member, and in particular my colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their efforts in this behalf.

At a time of multiplying chaos in the world, this bill gives us a measure of certainty. The sources of chaos are technological as new weapons systems and new instruments of terrorism proliferate every day. The sources of chaos are political as new states are imposed upon ancient religious and ethnic rivalries. The only thing that is certain in our political evaluation is that there will be more chaos in the years to come. The certainty that is behind this bill is that we are making a decision for certain as a Congress that it will be the policy of this country to deploy and defend ourselves in the very best way we can with a national missile defense system.

The arguments against this bill are diplomatic, economic and strategic. I find each of the arguments lacking. The diplomatic argument against this bill is that it will somehow destabilize the world.

I think the greatest source of destabilization is the risks that an accidental or rogue launch could plunge the nuclear powers of the world into an irreversible course of mutual destruction. I think a viable defense system is an instrument of stability, not instability.

For those who raise economic objections to this bill, yes, it is expensive. Yes, every dollar of taxpayers' money that we spend must be spent carefully, but it is important to understand the narrow scope of the expenditure that is before us. In this year's budget, for example, about one nickel out of every $100 that we spend as a government will be dedicated to this purpose. One nickel out of every $100 is, in my judgment, a prudent and sound investment for the defense of the country.

For those who raise strategic objections, I would simply say that every strategic instrument that is possible to be at our disposal should be so.

Will this succeed today technologically? Of course not, but we cannot succeed technologically, we cannot reach the goal technologically until we have the goal.

When President Kennedy in the early sixties said we would get to the Moon as the first country in the world that would do so, it was impossible technologically at that time, but because he set that goal and we followed it as a country we set in means the creative resources of the country and we did achieve it. I believe the same thing will and can happen here.

It is for those reasons that I would urge both Republican and Democratic colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days after Congress first enacted this legislation, or acted on this legislation, the State Department sent an internal cable to our embassies abroad instructing them to explain away the President's support for the bill.

That cable, which Mr. Weldon just placed in the RECORD, told these embassies to say, in effect, even though Congress has passed and the President has endorsed legislation committing America to deploy a national missile defense, do not worry because the President intends to use loopholes to deny that commitment.

In this way, the Clinton State Department sought to comfort foreign governments who feared that we might render their offensive missile programs harmless and obsolete.

Just what are the alleged loopholes the President was to seize upon? Because the bill says that funds for missile defense are subject to annual appropriations and authorization, the President thinks he can sign it without really committing to protect our citizens from missile attack.

This is, of course, ludicrous. The entire Defense Department is subject to annual appropriations. Much of the Federal Government is. Those words merely restate the obvious. They do not add or detract any significant meaning from the bill.

When John F. Kennedy committed to America to land a man on the Moon in his decade, that commitment was no less real because the money for the space program had to be appropriated each year. Neither is this commitment.

The President is seizing on this language to conceal that he and his party have been forced to flip-flop on missile defense. After over a decade spent opposing missile defense, they have been mugged by reality. The reality of a North Korean ICBM test, the Southwest Asia arms race, the Ayotollah's missile program, the theft of our nuclear secrets by Communist China, and the spread of missile technology around the globe.

Once the cable to Moscow and Beijing and elsewhere came to light, we considered trying to rewrite the bill but then we realized, what would be the point. If the President and his aides can so absurdly misconstrue even the most innocuous language, then there are no words that might have fixed meaning for this administration. All we can do here is make our intentions and the meanings crystal clear.

Let me do so. This bill commits the United States to deploy an effective national missile defense system as soon as is technologically possible. If the President disagrees with this position, if he truly believes that we should leave our citizens vulnerable to missile attack, he should show the character of a true leader and say so, without disassembling, without equivocation, without seizing on nonexistent loopholes. He should veto the bill.

If, on the other hand, he signs the bill, we can, by rights, conclude that he agrees with the plain English meaning of the bill and that is that the United States is committed to deploy a national missile defense as soon as is technologically possible.

I will close with this: The President's endorsement of this language, whatever his private feelings on it, is a tribute to the vast public support that now exists for national missile defense. It shows that the debate that Ronald Reagan started in 1983 has now been decisively won by those who believe that the American people need a defense that defends.

I am very proud that today we are taking this important step to defend the American people from missile attack. I am very proud that in this age of high technology we can use that technology to give our children that which is better than what they have had, the technology of the 1950s of duck and cover.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. There were many reasons to vote against the original House bill, H.R. 4. There are even more reasons to vote against the bill as amended by the Senate.

H.R. 4 provided that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. I opposed all 15 words of H.R. 4 because of what it did not say. It failed to acknowledge how much national missile defense would cost, whether it would undermine arms control and whether a national missile defense would actually work. On the other hand, the authors of H.R. 4, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), saw virtue in what it did not say.

As I look at the Senate amendment, I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) have a point.

The Senate's version says that it is the policy of the United States to deploy, as soon as technologically possible, an effective national missile defense system. As soon as technologically possible, what does that mean? One test? Two tests? A really good simulation?

There is a huge difference between technologically possible and technologically viable, or technologically reliable. We should not commit to deploy until a system is fully and successfully demonstrated. Rushing deployment leaves us vulnerable to failure.

This bill may only be a national missile defense policy statement but it sets us on a slippery slope. Hit-to-kill technology has only succeeded in 5 of 19 intercept tests. Now to be sure, some of those failures are in the booster phase and people believe they can be corrected, but if we have another THAAD, which has failed on all six flight tests, we should not deploy NMD.

For other major defense systems, we fly before we buy; but for NMD, however, we are buying before we fly, and that is not right.

The U.S. should decide to deploy a national missile defense not today but only if it is tested rigorously and proven to work; only if it does not undermine overall U.S. national security, by jeopardizing mutual nuclear reductions and the ABM treaty, and only if it is needed as a cost effective defense available against nations with ballistic missiles.

Let me provide some perspective on this Congress' approach to national security. This bill rushes to deploy an unproven national missile defense to defend against an ill-defined future threat. Yet this House recently refused to support the deployment of our men and women in uniform to save lives and bring peace to the Balkans.

Madam Speaker, in the Middle Ages the king would command the alchemist to turn lead into gold but no amount of money or political will could turn lead into gold. Unlike alchemy, national missile defense may work some day but we cannot deny that there is more to national missile defense than wishing it into existence. Please defeat this bill.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 19 minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4. I was pleased to be a cosponsor of the original legislation sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services that I serve on.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for his leadership, as well as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for their work.

This bill recognizes the reality of the world in which we live today, a world that is a much more dangerous place, a world in which we face threats from rogue nations like Iran and Iraq and North Korea. The threat of unauthorized, or intentional or unintentional ballistic missile attack is a very real one. This bill addresses that threat that we face.

The people of our country do not realize that we are defenseless against a nuclear missile attack. They do not realize that a missile launched from North Korea would take a mere 23 minutes to reach the continental United States. In fact, it would take only 32 minutes for that missile to reach my home district in Texas. These figures are startling, but it does reinforce the fact that we must take steps today to defend ourselves against this threat.

I join with the many colleagues in this House who are supporting this legislation today, because we believe that our country has no choice but to make this investment in our defense. This bill requires that the system be deployed only after it is determined to be technologically possible to implement such a system. That is the right way to proceed, and I am very confident that our military and the scientists of our country will have the ability to put such a system in place.

We stand here today united in an effort to defend our country against threats that we have to face in today's world. I am confident that this bill will do the job, and I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting H.R. 4.

□ 1515

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

It is particularly ironic that we are having the debate this week with the release of the latest Star Wars movie. We might title this ''Star Wars, the Phantom Solution,'' because that is what this is. This is a phantom solution. Hitting a bullet with a bullet in outer space to intercept a North Korean missile.

Now, let us think about it a minute. North Korea has not yet built the missile, it has not been successfully tested, but they might build one or two and put warheads on them. Well, one thing that works in our arsenal of the anti-ballistic missile defense is the radar. We can track the warheads. Guess what? The second they shoot something at us, we will know. Guess what? We have thousands of nuclear warheads with which to retaliate if they have shot at us. Will they do that? No.

This is not a real threat to the United States of America, single missiles launched that could be tracked back to their source. Any nut who is going to attack the United States with weapons of mass destruction is going to do it in an undetectable manner, and yet we are doing nothing to deal with bioterrorism, chemical terrorism, smuggled nuclear weapons, while we spend billions over here to make the defense contractors happy who have yet to conduct a successful defense test after spending nearly $50 billion.

So what is the solution? Hurry up and deploy it. Deploy what? The phantom system against the phantom menace.

This is real life; it is not a movie. We have to make tough choices. Are we going to defend America against real threats? Are we going to fund pay raises for the young men and women in the military? Or are we going to throw more billions after billions in a failed dream, a dream of Ronald Reagan which was put forward back in the 1980s, an impenetrable shield above the United States?

We all know that even if this thing works, we can bring in a submarine and launch under it, or terrorists certainly can smuggle in a nuclear weapon. This does not defend the United States against real threats.

I say to my colleagues, do not, do not do this. Do not destabilize the ABM Treaty. Do not waste our precious resources, and do not give people a false sense of security while we are letting real threats go unchallenged. Vote ''no.''

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, it reminds me of the patent chief commenting about the invention of the telephone who said, who is kidding whom about this rip-off? Anybody that believes that two Americans will be able to speak through a wire across town is trying to steal your money.

I say to my colleagues, I support this bill. I support this chairman, the ranking member, and I support the distinguished Members who are responsible for bringing it. We cannot protect America any longer with a Neighborhood Crime Watch, and I am not just concerned about rogue action.

If my colleagues have seen the latest report of a classified Pentagon release, China has developed a super missile that has been labeled by the Pentagon ''invincible.'' Invincible. They have seen nothing like it. Now, what infuriates me is the report further goes on to say it is American tax dollars that built it, with a $60 billion trade surplus China enjoys now. But what really frosts me, the report goes on to say that the design of the invincible missile is basically the design that was stolen from America.

We have a problem. We have a major problem. And to those naysayers, let me say this. Our number one duty is to secure the national security, to protect your citizens and my citizens, in your towns, in my town, in every town of the United States of America. And with all of the technology we have, I want to compliment the wisdom of the

leaders here, we can intercept their missile. Invincible, my ascot.

Madam Speaker, I want to close out by saying the stealing of our secrets should be investigated, and let the chips fall where they may. I want to know how China got access to these secrets. Second of all, the President and Congress better come together and provide for an umbrella of security for this Nation. It may not be a total, 100 percent fail-safe program, but by God, our military has done quite well on intercepting foreign missiles.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

I just want to again clarify for the record that the gentleman who spoke earlier made the point that North Korea has not yet built a missile. Well, if the gentleman would go talk to George Tenet or Bob Walpole at the CIA, he could receive a classified briefing where they are now publicly saying that North Korea on August the 31st fired the Taepo Dong 1 missile. Maybe he does not believe the CIA, and that is something that I cannot comment on.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I was at the so-called classified briefing which was conducted by people who are consultants for defense contractors, and actually, subsequently it has turned out the test was not entirely successful, despite their protestations at that time.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would talk to Bob Walpole, who is our CIA expert on strategic threats, the test itself shows that North Korea now, in the minds of our intelligence community, can, in fact fire a three-stage Taepo Dong 1 missile with a light payload that would hit a city in the U.S.

Now, what they say is it will not be accurate. They may aim for St. Louis and hit Dallas, but if one lives in Dallas, does it really matter that it is not accurate? The point is that the gentleman's CIA agents and his own administration have now said publicly that North Korea has the capability today.

Second point, he mentioned that we are not dealing with other threats. Again, I would ask the gentleman, although since he has left the floor I cannot ask him personally, if he would comment on our past five defense authorization bills, because in each of those bills with the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), along with the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and Members on both sides of the aisle, we have plussed up funding in the area of weapons of mass destruction and cyber terrorism to a higher amount than the administration has ever requested.

We did not do that one year, we did it all five years. We have given this administration money that they did not ask for to deal with the threats of a terrorist device, the threats of coming through our ports. We take that threat very seriously, and we are dealing with it. So when the gentleman says that we do not care or we are not concerned about other threats, he is totally misinformed or just has not gotten the latest brief.

Let me say at this point I want to acknowledge the intellectual honesty of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN). He came down to the well and in a very intellectually honest way opposed what we are doing. I respect him for that. I respect the other 105 Members of this body, 104 Members, 102 Democrats and two Republicans, who voted against what we are doing, because intellectually they are being pure.

What I really have a problem with are those Members in the other body who want to have cover; who have consistently opposed missile defense but then came up with nonsensical amendments to now say they are for missile defense. The gentlewoman from California, one of the Senators from California who has consistently opposed missile defense, with these amendments now says she can support this bill. That is outrageously simplistic and it is not being intellectually honest. I would rather have those Members do like the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and oppose the bill because they oppose the policy.

We just disagree. Let me say this, Madam Speaker. We passed this bill overwhelmingly in the House. The Senate passed a bill that we are considering today overwhelmingly in the Senate. The President then came out and issued this letter that is now a part of the Record where he said we will make the decision in a year.

Now, what is he saying? In a year we will decide whether or not the threat has changed. Well, Madam Speaker, his own CIA is saying the threat is here today. It is not going to change a year from now. It is already here. He is saying that we will have to evaluate the cost. He has already requested $10.5 billion in his five-year budget. So why would the President then want to wait a year after we are making a policy decision today?

I hate to say this because this has been a totally bipartisan effort, and I applaud my colleagues on the other side for their leadership, because without that we probably would not be here today. But I can tell my colleagues why I think the President is saying postpone it for a year. He wants to give Vice President GORE a major campaign appearance where, in the middle of the spring of next year, he will hold a press conference and with all the gravity he can bring as the Vice President, he will say that we now have to deploy a national missile defense system.

Well, I want to let the President know, if the President is listening, and I would say to my colleagues I want to let the President know through them that we see through that facade. We are not going to stand here today and pass this bill and make this change, and have the President or the Vice President plan some kind of a political event a year from now so that they can enhance their standing in the polls. This bill means that when this President signs it, the policy to deploy on behalf of this country is today.

I thank my colleagues and the leadership in both parties for supporting this momentous piece of legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

I rise today in support of this bill, although somewhat reluctantly. As an original cosponsor of H.R. 4 and a longtime proponent of national missile defense, I want to be supportive of this bill. However, I have several concerns that I must express on the floor today.

Like many of my colleagues, I supported this bill as originally drafted, both for what it said and for what it did not say. That bill did not say when a national missile defense system must be deployed, how a national missile defense system must be deployed, nor where a national missile defense system would be deployed. It did not include extra provisions that are not sufficiently defined, like ''technologically possible.'' Our bill also did not include language that could upset our colleagues in the Duma, something that is very important to us as we move towards better relations with Russia.

The Senate version which we are now being forced to take or leave today states that it is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces. I understand the need to continue negotiating with the Russians, because that is the issue with the reduction in nuclear forces. However, traditionally, negotiations have included both reductions between the Soviet Union and between the United States. The Senate language could be perceived by the Duma as an insult because it includes only a reduction in their forces and it does not address reductions in ours.

Another concern is aimed directly at the other body as a whole. Many of us were under the impression that we would have the opportunity to go to conference with the Senate and work on a compromise between those two bills. Instead, the Senate simply chose to retain only our bill number and return the bill to us with their language.

As I noted, I have been a long time supporter of national missile defense.

Some critics of deploying a national missile defense system argue that the technology is not proven. National missile defense will use hit-to-kill technology. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet.

Recently, another one of DOD's hit-to-kill missile defense programs, the PAC–3, showed that this technology can work. I repeat, this technology can and does work. The PAC–3 interceptor successfully destroyed the target over White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico this past March.

I know that perfecting national missile defense technology will be more difficult than for the PAC–3. However, I just want to make sure that all of my colleagues in this House understand that the Army has proven the hit-to-kill concept.

I also want to reiterate what my good friend CURT WELDON said earlier. THAAD is not a failure. Again, THAAD is not a failure. THAAD has accomplished 28 of its 30 milestones. Every time THAAD has failed to intercept the target missile, it has done so, but has shown that the failure was due to a low-tech problem. These problems with the THAAD have been quality control issues, not design defects.

We need to show our support of national missile defense and move forward with a program as quickly as we can. As such, I will support this bill today and I also urge all of my colleagues to do so. It is vital to the security of this Nation that we move forward on this issue today.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to merely say that much has changed since the Strategic Defense Initiative debate was born some 16 years ago, and a lot has changed since last year. So I ask all of the Members, Madam Speaker, to approach this bill, H.R. 4, as amended, with an open mind, as a good-faith effort to establish a bipartisan consensus on defending America. I intend to vote for it. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

□ 1530

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. We should not have to be here today. People cannot understand the frustrations we have had over a long period of time in having to literally fight our own government to protect our own people.

I will just go back to recent history. In 1996 we provided for national missile defense for our people, to protect our people from missile attack. The President vetoed that legislation. We have been trying time and time again since that time. No one could imagine the hoops we have had to jump through in an effort to force our government to protect our own people.

One example, just for the RECORD, to show the extent to which our own administration will go in an effort to resist our efforts to defend our people.

Back when the bill was vetoed in 1996, the administration had a politicized intelligence estimate put out by the CIA, the national intelligence estimate. It goes in part like this: Aside from the declared nuclear powers, it will be 10 years before any rogue Nation can develop the capability to threaten this country with missile attacks.

When I saw that, I said, my gosh, what about the declared nuclear powers? Are they not a threat? They were just brushed aside. And what about the fact that a Nation which does not have a capability can simply purchase a capability from someone else? They do not have to develop their own capability themselves from scratch, we say, they can buy it.

So I called up the Director of the CIA at that time in an effort to get him to issue a clarifying estimate that was not misleading to the American people, because the American people had been lulled into a false sense of security.

Well, the result was that the Director refused to change the estimate reflecting those things, so we had to appoint an outside commission, a bipartisan outside commission of intelligence experts, to assess the threat and report back to Congress of what their findings might be.

They reported back and they confirmed what we had said. Instead of 10 years to develop a capability, we would have little or no warning, according to this report.

On the part about taking 10 years to develop a capability, they confirmed what we said by giving an example of how China sold, intact, a mobile intercontinental ballistic missile system to another country. This other country becomes nuclear-capable overnight by simply buying the system.

This is just one example of what we have had to do along this line to get us to this place today. I hope that we are on our way now with the passage of this legislation. I pray that it is, and I pray that it is in time, and that we can develop a defense before we are actually faced with an attack.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4 which states that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. I am convinced that this measure should and will pass by a large bipartisan majority. I am also convinced that the President of the United States will sign this important piece of legislation. In doing so the President will make a historic decision, a decision to protect the United States and its people from the grave threat of missile attack.

Today the United States faces these threats defenseless, unable to stop even a single missile launched at the United States. And yet there are dark clouds on the horizon. Countries like North Korea and Iran are moving ahead undaunted with weapons of mass destruction programs, including intercontinental ballistic missiles. The United States and the American people are at risk now, and H.R. 4 states clearly that we must do something to respond to these threats.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his tireless work and leadership on this critical issue. It is rare that one individual can make such a difference on behalf of his country. The bipartisan support for this measure is a tribute to his hard work and dedication to protecting the American people from a clear and imminent threat.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this vital measure.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill.

It is imperative that we move forward to counter the growing ballistic missile threat. Today our nation has absolutely no ability whatsoever to shoot down an incoming ballistic missile—even one fired by accident.

Meanwhile, rogue and terrorist states like North Korea and Iran are committing significant resources towards the development of these weapons. Last August, North Korea—notwithstanding the severe famine now going on there—launched a three-stage ballistic missile, demonstrating an ability to threaten United States territory for the first time. Likewise, Iran is actively seeking long-range missiles that could threaten our nation.

This bill reflects the Congress's bipartisan concern about this situation, and expresses the belief that all Americans should be protected against this very real threat. It will make it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system to defend against a limited attack as soon as technologically possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to not commit the United States to a flawed policy with a flawed process.

It is a flawed policy to commit the United States to a missile defense policy that hasn't been proven technologically feasible.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, one of our nation's highest military leaders, said ''the simple fact is that we do not yet have the technology to field a national missile defense.''

It is a flawed policy to commit the United States to a missile defense policy with an open-ended price tag.

Since 1962 we have spent $120 billion to develop missile defense system.

We paid $67 billion for the failed ''Star Wars'' initiative.

In the last 10 years we have put some $40 million into the program.

At $4.2 billion this year, missile defense is the largest single weapons program in the defense budget.

What about our other defense priorities?

It is a flawed policy to maintain a defense posture at the expense of all other domestic priorities.

We have not yet saved Social Security, we have not reduced class size, we have not provided for health care for all Americans.

In our zeal to protect our democracy we are actually jeopardizing our democracy by failing to protect our domestic tranquility.

I urge the defeat of H.R. 4.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 71, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—345

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
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
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—71

Allen
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Blumenauer
Bonior
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Conyers
Coyne
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Doggett
Ehlers
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Holt
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Luther
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Minge
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Rangel
Rivers
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Slaughter
Strickland
Tierney
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—18

Bilirakis
Brown (CA)
DeMint
Deutsch
Foley
Frank (MA)
Largent
McNulty
Moakley
Napolitano
Pickett
Rogers
Salmon
Stark
Thomas
Towns
Walsh
Waxman

□ 1555

Mr. BAIRD and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HOBSON changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I was not present for the vote concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4. The National Missile Defense Act. If I had been present I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DEUTSCH. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 144, agreeing to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4, a bill declaring United States policy of the deployment of a national missile defense system. If I had been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

I am a strong supporter of this legislation and voted for the original measure when the House of Representatives earlier considered it this year.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1999, TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, May 21, 1999, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1999, TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, May 21, 1999 to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise to inquire about next week's schedule.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for an explanation of the schedule for next week.

□ 1600

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week. The House will not be in session on Friday, May 21.

The House will next meet on Monday, May 24, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 o'clock p.m. for legislative business. We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to all Members' offices. Members should note that we expect votes after 6 o'clock p.m. on Monday, May 24.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week, the House will take up:

H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safety Deposit Box Act of 1999;

H.R. 1833, the United States Trade Representative and Customs Service Reauthorization Act;

H.R. 150, the Education Land Grant Act;

The Agriculture Appropriations Act;

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act; and

H.R. 1401, the Defense Authorization Act.

On Tuesday, May 25, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour and at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday, May 26, and Thursday, May 27, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Madam Speaker, we hope to conclude legislative business for the week by 6 p.m. on Thursday, May 27.

I would like to remind Members that the Memorial Day District Work Period begins following the close of legislative business on Thursday, May 27. And the House will return on Monday, June 7, with votes after 6 p.m.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the majority leader for the schedule. If I might just ask one or two questions about the schedule for next week.

Does my colleague know what days the Social Security Lock Box bill and the appropriations bills will be called up?

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I thank the gentlewoman for asking.

On Tuesday, we expect to do the Lock Box and the Agriculture Appropriations bill. It is our expectation that on Wednesday we will be able to do Legislative Branch Appropriations, the Education Land Grant, and USTR-Customs. On Thursday, we would begin work on DOD authorization.

If the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I should encourage Members to anticipate that we may be working later into the evenings on these evenings next week. As our past experience tells us, when we enter appropriations season and we begin to consider these bills under the 5-minute rule, they may oftentimes take longer days than other legislative business under more time-constrained rules.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the majority leader anticipated my question in wanting to know if there were going to be any late nights next week. So we should anticipate late nights next week.

And a final question: I do not see on the agenda listed out for next week anything about campaign finance reform on the schedule. Does the gentleman from Texas know when we might be able to expect any action on that issue?

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, again, I thank the gentlewoman for her inquiry. And if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, we have had several discussions with different Members that have interest in this matter.

As the gentlewoman knows, we are going into the appropriations season. The appropriations season is very important in terms of its early conclusion in order to get into the final end-of-the-year appropriations conference reports.

It is our anticipation that, while we expect this important issue to be addressed before the year is over, that we would like to get this appropriations work behind us so that we would have time to address that during which period they are in their conference committees. So I would guess that she should have an anticipation that it would be sometime later in the year.

Ms. DELAURO. Sometime later in the year.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House join me in wishing my son, Scott, happy birthday tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY MONTH

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, occupational therapy is a health and rehabilitation profession that helps people regain development and build skills that are important for independent functioning, health, well-being, and happiness. Occupational therapy employs purposeful occupational tasks, the kind of thing that we do in our everyday life, to return individuals with disability to function.

The American Occupational Therapy Association has a motto that expresses it so very well. ''Occupational Therapy: Skills for the Job of Living.''

In Texas and across the Nation, we recently recognized contributions of this important profession with an official designation of Occupational Therapy Month. Our therapists help those whose lives are dramatically impacted by injury or stroke. They help people return to work and resume their place in the community. They work in the aid and development of children. They assist parents in developing and improving the skills necessary to participate in school, work, play, or leisure activities.

My wife, Libby, has had an opportunity to see firsthand the incredible work that our occupational therapists perform to improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities. I join in recognizing the significant benefits of occupational therapy for Americans from childhood to old age and salute the efforts of our occupational therapists across the country.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 24, 1999

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BORDER PATROL RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 1999

(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. Madam Speaker, today I rise with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SILVESTRE REYES), to stand up for the men and women who guard our Nation's borders and risk their lives every day.

Today, with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), I will introduce the Border Patrol Recruitment and Retention Act of 1999. The legislation will

provide incentives and support for recruiting and retaining Border Patrol agents. This legislation would increase the compensation of Border Patrol agents, and allow the Border Patrol agency to recruit its own agents without relying on personnel officers of the Department of Justice or the INS.

The United States is in dire need of more Border Patrol agents to enforce policies against illegal immigration and drug smuggling. Under current law, the INS is authorized to add a total of 5,000 additional border agents at a rate of 1,000 per fiscal year from 1997 to 2001.

We have not met our goals. The INS has only recruited between 200 and 400 new agents because salaries and the recruitment skills have not been up to par.

My legislation will increase the salaries and work harder at retention, and salute those men and women who serve us very ably at the border. It is time now to give more respect to our border agents.

Madam Speaker, I rise to the floor of the House today to stand up for a group of men and women who guard our nation's borders and risk their very lives everyday. The group of men and women whom I am referring to are the United States Border Patrol. Today, along with my colleague from Texas, Mr. REYES, I introduce the ''Border Patrol Recruitment and Retention Act of 1999.''

This legislation will provide incentives and support for recruiting and retaining Border Patrol agents. This legislation would increase the compensation for Border Patrol agents and allow the Border Patrol agency to recruit its own agents without relying on personnel offices of the Department of Justice or INS.

The United States is in dire need of more Border Patrol agents to enforce policies against illegal immigration and drug smuggling. Under current law, the INS is authorized to add a total of five thousand additional border patrol agents, at a rate of five thousand additional border patrol agents, at a rate of one thousand per fiscal year from 1997 to 2001. However, INS did not request any additional agents in its FY 2000 budget due in large part to the lucrative job market and the low unemployment rate.

According to Commissioner Meissner of the INS, only 200 to 400 new agents will be hired this year. Arizona had been slated to receive approximately 400 of the full complement but will not likely receive between 100–150, and my home state of Texas, which would have received approximately 500 new agents this year, could see that number cut by more than half.

The ''Border Patrol Recruitment and Retention Enhancement Act'' would move Border Patrol agents with one year's agency experience from the federal government's GS–9 pay level (approximately $34,000 annually) to GS–11 (approximately $41,000 annually) next year. We need better recruitment and better retention. We cannot play with the nation's borders, and right now in the Immigration and Claims subcommittee in which I am a Ranking Member, we listen to testimony hearing after hearing about how the Border Patrol agents need more money, and the INS needs to be given the resources to be able to do it. This legislation is the step in that direction.

Madam Speaker, we are a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws. The ''Border Patrol Recruitment and Retention Act of 1999,'' will give us the ability to control our borders and uphold the law. I urge my colleagues to join me and Mr. REYES, who is our resident expert on Border Patrol matters due to his service as a Border Patrol Sector Chief to support this much needed measure.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

REGARDING LATEST SHOOTING IN ATLANTA

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

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, the latest shooting in an Atlanta school is deeply troubling. My wife is a teacher in a public school. My kids have gone to a public school. I taught for a lot of years in a public school.

I fervently believe that every child deserves to learn in a good school and in a safe environment. But how can we create such an environment if it is the children themselves who make the schools unsafe?

Clearly, we need to tighten current laws to make it more difficult for kids to get guns. We will take a look at the measure passed by the Senate to make sure that it is a reasonable and common sense approach.

We also need to more effectively enforce the laws that are already on the books and to prosecute those who break the laws. But these measures will fall short if we do not effectively address the deeper problems that face our society and our children.

Our children need to learn the differences between right and wrong. They need moral instruction. They need a culture that reinforces positive values that help create a safer and more secure society.

It is more difficult to be a parent today. We feel the need to work harder just to keep pace with the neighbors. All too often, parents are forced to worry first about their jobs and then about their kids. And it is becoming more and more difficult for parents to monitor what their kids are watching, hearing, and learning.

I support free expression, but there is a point where unbridled free expression undermines a free society. I challenge the entertainment industry, the Internet industry, the video game industry, and the media to become good corporate citizens. Monitor the material that flows to our kids.

I applaud the Disney Company for taking some steps in the right direction, but the whole industry must join in the cause. Keep casual gunplay out of the movies. Keep hate music out of the music stores. Keep bomb-making web sites off the Internet. Do not make video games so violent that they warp young minds.

Free expression does not necessarily have to lead to moral chaos. Let us join together in finding ways to help parents raise their children to be good productive citizens.

GOD BLESS AMERICA'S VETERANS

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. Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the Third District of North Carolina. The Third District covers most of the eastern part of the State, including five military bases: Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station, New River Marine Corps Air Station, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Elizabeth City Coast Guard Station, and Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base.

In eastern North Carolina we are also proud to be the home of 77,000 thousand of our Nation's 25 million living veterans. Madam Speaker, these are the men and women who courageously served to protect this country and preserve the principles that it was founded upon.

Out of respect and appreciation, we must ensure the sacrifice these brave soldiers made is something we never forget and that the vital role they play in this country's history remains as unmistakable as our commitment to their continued well-being.

As President Abraham Lincoln said in his Second Inaugural Address: ''Let us care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.''

This statement is said to reveal the government's promise to provide lifetime health care for our veterans and their families, a promise that many of my colleagues in Congress and I continue fighting to fulfill.

Madam Speaker, today I am here to share with my colleagues good news, to tell them of two successful efforts by the government to provide our Nation's veterans with the health care that they need and deserve.

Two weeks ago I had the pleasure of attending the dedication of a new community-based outpatient clinic in Jacksonville, North Carolina. For the veterans of Onslow County, this is a tremendous victory and the result of a great deal of work and determination.

It has been a priority of mine for some time to find a way to see that a satellite facility was built in eastern North Carolina. For too long, many veterans were forced to travel to Fayetteville, North Carolina or Durham, North Carolina to reach the closest VA hospital.

Madam Speaker, as my colleagues can see, we were in desperate need of health care services that were more accessible to the veterans of eastern

North Carolina. The journey was long, but we now have two reasons to celebrate.

The Jacksonville facility marks the second outpatient clinic in eastern North Carolina. It has just been joined by a third. Earlier this week, an additional VA clinic opened in Greenville, North Carolina. They both serve as tributes of the commitment to duty, God, and country that each of our soldiers accept.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of the efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs to reach out to veterans across this country, especially considering the drastic cuts they have suffered. Since the end of 1994, the Department of Veterans Affairs has cut 20,000 medical care employees, eliminated half of its acute-care hospital beds, and merged many neighboring hospitals. Following such extreme fiscal cutbacks, the Administration's budget request for Fiscal Year 2000 was worth little more than the paper it was printed on.

Fortunately, I am proud to stand here today to report that a Republican Congress has increased the VA budget $1.7 billion over the President's recommendation. And I only wish that it could be more.

Madam Speaker, today I came to the floor to reaffirm my commitment to the men and women who answered their call to duty and protected the freedom my colleagues and I enjoy today. I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting to make sure our Nation's veterans have access to quality, accessible health care, a promise made to them by the government they pledged to protect.

Again, I want to quote Abraham Lincoln when he said it, and he said it best: ''Let us care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.''

Madam Speaker, it is the least we can do to thank our Nation's heroes, our United States veterans. God bless America, and God bless those who have served and those who are serving America today.

□ 1615

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

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

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

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

CALLING FOR END TO FAILED POLICY IN YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how long must the bombing of Yugoslavia continue? I have asked that question repeatedly on this floor over the last week, and no one seems to have an answer. Where is the President leading us?

Today, the New York Times, which is generally supportive of the President, contained an article written by Michael Gordon entitled, NATO's Battle Within: Is Leadership Missing? In the article, Mr. Gordon wrote that NATO strategy for bringing the war to a successful close is starting to unravel. Without clear direction from Washington, Britain, Germany and Italy have begun to promote publicly their separate and conflicting plans. Britain wants ground troops in Kosovo and Yugoslavia. Germany is opposed to ground troops. Italy wants to stop the bombing. In the article, they quoted the former Director of European Affairs at the National Security Council who was quoted as saying, there is a lack of direction because no one is leading the way.

Mr. President, why do you not lead the way and stop the bombing? Mr. President, Italy today has urged NATO to impose a 48-hour bombing pause to pursue a diplomatic settlement. I urge you to stop the bombing.

Just last night, NATO launched its strongest air attack in 2 weeks against the Belgrade area. Our bombs hit a hospital and at least three civilians were killed. Furthermore, an operating room was demolished, an intensive care unit was leveled, and rescuers were evacuating women and children from the maternity ward, just last night in Belgrade, because of our bombings. In addition, the Swedish ambassador's residence was damaged when an exploding bomb blew out windows and a door.

Mr. President, your policy is not working. Not only are we losing the support of our allies but bombing has exacerbated the refugee problem among the Kosovar Albanians and now, because of the bombings, the Serbian people themselves. From a policy point, it is difficult to imagine how the situation could be much worse. Our bombs have killed innocent people, destroyed hospitals, leveled the embassy of China, damaged the infrastructure, and now even damaged the residence of the Swedish ambassador to Yugoslavia. The incessant bombing has transformed what was a Balkan crisis into a worldwide crisis. In fact, the New York Times Sunday reported how demonstrations are erupting all over the world against the bombing.

So I would say to the President, what do you want? The Yugoslavian government is beginning to remove forces from Kosovo. They have expressed a willingness to negotiate. How many more bombs must be dropped? How many more deaths must occur before you stop this failed policy and give diplomacy an opportunity to work?

ON H.R. 644, PRESCRIPTION DRUG FAIRNESS FOR SENIORS ACT

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to put an end to a national disgrace. Plainly speaking, I am talking about price gouging, price gouging some of the most vulnerable members of our community, our seniors.

Americans widely support programs to ensure the health and welfare of older Americans. We have Social Security, we have Medicare, as well as housing programs, nutrition programs and programs that really protect our low-income seniors. Seniors today have less fear of being taken advantage of because of consumer laws and senior abuse laws that protect them. But there is one area where we clearly have failed, and that is to ensure that prescription drugs are affordable, affordable to the people who need them the most, our seniors.

The latest surveys indicate that 86 percent of Medicare beneficiaries take prescription drugs and that the elderly in the United States, who make up only 12 percent of our population, use one-third of the prescription drugs sold in this Nation. The need for prescription drugs to treat such diseases as arthritis, diabetes, high blood pressure, heart disease, is simply a fact of life for seniors, or a fact of death. A few years ago, a survey of seniors reported that 13 percent of older Americans had to choose between eating or buying medicine.

In Sonoma and Marin Counties, the district I represent, the two counties north of the Golden Gate bridge, two individuals that I have come to know, Roy and Ivera Cobbs of Sebastopol, have had to make some very difficult decisions around their prescription drugs. What they decided was, she would take her prescription drugs and he would not because they could not afford both. That is not the way we are supposed to be treating our seniors.

Also in Sonoma and Marin County, the area Agencies on Aging and Green Thumb have told me some other stories. They tell me about cases where seniors just do not buy food because they have to have prescription drugs, or they take part of their prescription every other day instead of every day or once a day instead of twice a day, as prescribed by their doctors, because they cannot afford to pay for the whole dosage. And for the reason some seniors cannot pay for them keeps our seniors from having the best health care they can. This reason, I believe, is solely on the shoulders of the Nation's largest drug companies, because they engage in discriminatory pricing. If you are a favored customer, like an HMO, like a large insurance company, you pay less, much less for prescription drugs. But if you are an older person, on Medicare, you pay a premium price for your drugs.

In the district I represent, Sonoma County seniors pay on the average of 145 percent more for the most commonly used drugs than favored customers pay for the same drugs. For one drug, they pay 242 percent more than favored customers. I know this, because I asked the minority staff of the Committee on Government Reform to look into prescription drug pricing in Sonoma and Marin Counties. I released the results to that report to my community and its central conclusion can be summed up in the report subtitle, Drug Companies Profit at the Expense of Older Americans. As Members can see by these charts, for Sonoma County alone, the study looked into five commonly used prescription drugs, charted their price at local pharmacies and compared those prices to what the Federal Government pays for the same drugs. The Federal negotiated price is nearly the same, you must know, as that charged to favored private customers, large insurance companies and HMOs. Senior citizens and other individuals who pay for their own drugs pay more than twice as much for these drugs than do the drug companies' most favored customers. For some drugs listed in the report, the price is even more outrageous. Synthroid, for example, a hormone treatment, costs Sonoma County seniors 1,738 percent more than it cost the manufacturer's favored customers. By looking at these charts, we can see that for Medicare patients, those who need the cholesterol drug Zocor, their costs are significantly greater than the favored customers. This comes out to $115 for Medicare patients and $34 for the favored customers. That is 231 percent different. The difference is not in price because the HMOs, the large insurance companies and government buyers are able to negotiate and buy in bulk. The difference is because they are charging seniors to make up the difference for what they cut for their most favored customers.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO HELP AMERICA'S FARMERS

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Madam Speaker, American agriculture today and rural communities today face an extraordinary challenge, the challenge of having farm policy change in 1996 with the consent and approval of this Congress and the consent and approval of the President of the United States for the good, to have an opportunity to have less farming for the government and more farming for the market. Overall, combined with the freedom that this new agriculture policy provides and the additional expenditure of taxpayer dollars for agriculture research with the movement toward reduction of Federal regulations that hampered the farmer's freedom to do what the farmer does best, and that is farm for the market and other changes that were made in the 1996 farm bill, it has overall been a good thing. What the American farmer faces today is low prices and lack of markets. Our farmers do not have the ability to market overseas the products that we grow so well in this country.

My State of Washington is a perfect example, and the Fifth Congressional District is a more narrow example of a perfect example. That is, our farmers in the Fifth District grow wheat and barley and oats and peas and lentils and potatoes and apples, the best in the world. But yet most of our products, on our grain products and commodities, are exported overseas. My farmers are limited in those exports because of unilateral American sanctions on countries that used to be wonderful trading partners of Washington State farmers and agriculture in the West.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 212, earlier in this Congress as a priority matter for not only the farmers of the Pacific Northwest but the farmers of the country. What that bill does is lift the unilateral sanctions that are currently in place by our government that prevent our farmers from selling to countries that other farmers around the world can sell to. We used to have a fine market in wheat sales to Iran and Iraq and the Sudan and other places that are currently sanctioned. The sanctions are imposed because of our disagreements with the terrorist policies and the enemy policies of these governments.

I disagree with those policies of those rogue nations that have used terror in the world and oppression in the world. But yet selling agriculture and medicine to those countries does not in my judgment pose a national security threat on our country. What it does as we unilaterally impose those sanctions is hurt our farmers. So H.R. 212 does two things. It lifts the sanctions that are currently in place for food and medicine only, and it gives the President the opportunity in the event that the President feels that lifting those sanctions poses a national security threat, the President has the ability to reimpose those sanctions on that basis. But in the meantime, it allows our farmers, then, to seek to reclaim those markets that we have lost by virtue of the sanctions.

In 1980, President Carter imposed a sanction on the Soviet Union for political purposes. Who did that hurt? It hurt the Olympics, and the American interest in the Olympics, and it hurt American farmers, a market that was a prime market for my farmers in the West. We have yet to get that agriculture market back by virtue of those sanctions back in 1980.

□ 1630

Yesterday in the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies on which I serve as a subcommittee member I introduced a narrower version of H.R. 212 which would lift of the sanctions on food and medicine for these countries that are currently sanctioned, but it would not allow any government spending in connection with the lifting of those sanctions. In other words, the taxpayer would not bear any of the burden for allowing our farmers to deal directly with those countries and make sales. It is a $6 billion plus market for our farmers in commodities as diverse as rice and corn and peas and wheat and barley. It is a great market that is exposed to our farmers.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, my friends on the appropriations subcommittee defeated this amendment by a vote of 28 to 24. It was a very close vote, but it was a great debate, and we ought to have that debate again on H.R. 212 and on this next version of this amendment that went into the appropriation bill yesterday.

So, I urge my colleagues to study H.R. 212, study the concept of lifting sanctions on food and medicine. It is a humanitarian basis that is good policy for our country, and it will absolutely help our agriculture markets who are struggling to find markets overseas.

One final point: In the event that we lift these sanctions and allow farmer-to-country correspondence and sales, it prevents the agriculture community that is in straits from coming to the Congress and seeking Federal tax dollars. It is the free market approach to agriculture success.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BROADCASTERS FAIRNESS IN ADVERTISING ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, today I am here to introduce the Broadcasters Fairness in Advertising Act of 1999. There is a silent and pervasive trend among ad agencies and the companies they represent to engage in discriminatory practices which are called, quote, ''no urban/Spanish dictates'' end of quote, and they are called, quote, ''minority discounts,'' end of quote. The term: ''No urban slash Spanish dictates'' means not advertising products on stations that cater to minorities. ''Minority discounts'' means paying minority-owned stations far less for advertising the same product that is paid to nonminority-owned stations. These policies have no business rationale and are purely discriminatory.

Madam Speaker, year in and year out minority broadcasters lose millions of dollars in revenues, however the advertising companies would have us believe otherwise. They will contend that they do not advertise in these stations because minorities do not buy their products.

For example, in a study conducted by the FCC, a major mayonnaise manufacturer told a station manager that, quote, black people do not eat mayonnaise, end of quote. Or worse, one minority station salesperson was told that, and I quote again, black people do not eat beef, end of quote. Such a blatantly absurd statement demonstrates the openly racist obstacles minority broadcasters face from the advertising industry.

My bill will prohibit discrimination against minority formatted stations by directing the FCC to adopt regulations to prevent such discrimination. It would also allow private right of action by any minority broadcaster who has been subjected to advertising discrimination. And finally, my bill will prohibit Federal agencies from contracting with ad agencies that utilize these discriminatory practices.

Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this very, very important initiative.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE INAUGURATION OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF KURDISTAN

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about democracy, a form of government which was invented in the 5th century B.C. by the Greeks in Athens, great city of Athens. The British honor democracy through their parliament, the Japanese have their Diet, the Duma serves the Russians, and of course here in the United States democracy is exercised right here on the floor of Congress. Democracy still remains the best hope for troubled humanity throughout the world.

With the end of the Cold War, Madam Speaker, we have seen a great expansion of the boundaries of democracy. The world is a better place today because many former Soviet republics now enjoy self determination and are given their rightful seats in the Hall of Nations. But auspicious as has been the forward march of liberty, the world remains far from being free. Nations remain in captivity. The color of one's skin still bars some from feeling our common humanity. But the hope that we can rise to the challenge of total equality is enduring. People of goodwill are risking their lives against great odds. They know the rewards are worth the risks.

Madam Speaker, on May 24, 1999, just a few days from now, a nation whose voice has been silenced for too long will convene its first congress, unfortunately not in its own land but in Brussels, Belgium, and 150 delegates from around the world representing the Kurdish people of Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Iran and the former Soviet republics will assemble for the purpose of raising their voice for their brothers and sisters who are denied a voice in Kurdistan. I salute the birth of this congress that represents a people as old as the dawn of history.

Madam Speaker, the Kurds are natives of the Middle East who inhabit a mountainous region as large as the State of Texas. They speak Kurdish, which is distinct from Turkish and Arabic but is closely linked with Persian. Having survived in mountain strongholds and ancient empires, they are now persecuted, denied their identity and forced to become Turks or Arabs or Persian by the states that were born in the early 20th century. Thirty million strong, they are viewed as beasts of burden or as cannon fodder, but never as Kurds who should enjoy human rights that we take for granted in this country.

It is a crime to be a Kurd in Turkey, Madam Speaker. Saddam Hussein has used chemical and biological weapons against them in Iraq. The theocracy in Tehran often machine guns the Kurdish dissidents in the city squares. The poignancy of the Kurdish situation hits closer to home when we realize that our own government is sometimes involved in their misery. Turkey boosts of American F–16 fighter planes, Sikorsky attack helicopters and M–60 battle tanks. Saddam Hussein, according to some declassified U.N. documents, had the support of 24 European companies to produce his deadly chemical fumes and biological fumes. Tehran's opposition to the Kurds has gone beyond Iran with the assassination of Kurdish leaders in Vienna and Berlin.

We all revere the words of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote in the Declaration of Independence: ''When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.''

Madam Speaker, given the lot of the Kurds, it is more than understandable that they set up their own Congress and take charge of their own destiny. They have the people, the resources and the political understanding to succeed in their dream of statehood.

Madam Speaker, I need also at this time to address the situation of Abdullah Ocalan, the Kurdish leader who, according to a recent New York Times article, was handed over to the Turks with the help of our intelligence services. As you may recall, he had ventured to Europe from his home base in the Middle East to seek a political solution to the enduring Kurdish struggle for basic human rights. I spoke on this floor welcoming his declaration of cease-fire and hoped, it now seems against hope, to see the debate on the Kurdish question change from war to peace and from confrontation to dialogue.

Mr. Ocalan, denied a refuge in Rome, was promised the safe passage through Greece to the Hague where he intended to sue the Government of Turkey at the International Court of Justice for its crimes against the Kurds. But the laws of granting asylum to political figures, as old as the time of prophets, were suspended in this case. Abdullah Ocalan, the most popular Kurdish figure of the day, was arrested. Through a deal that smacks of political venality at its worst, he was handed over to the Turks and now awaits his most likely execution as the sole inmate in the Imrali Island prison in the Sea of Marmara.

Madam Speaker, it is unbecoming of this great power to aid and abet dictatorships which are merely disguised as democracies. Those who imprison duly elected representatives such as Layla Zana in Turkey for testifying before a standing committee of this Congress cannot and should not enjoy our support. Leaders such as Abdullah Ocalan, despite his violent past, still hold the promise of peace and reconciliation for the Kurds with their neighbors. The euphoria that we all felt for the freedom of captive nations in the former Soviet Union now must extend to our allies and their subjects as well.

So we welcome the convening of the National Congress of Kurdistan. They are dreaming what to many may seem an impossible dream, the dream of a united Kurdish people in the Nation of Kurdistan.

TAIWAN CONGRATULATIONS

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, 3 years ago President Lee won a landslide victory in the first presidential election in the history of China. As a democratic elected president, he demonstrated to the world that democracy could indeed thrive in Taiwan. During the last 3 years President Lee continued to implement his program for the Republic of China. As a result, Taiwan presently has free elections in every level of government, a free press, and holds respect for human rights in the highest regard.

As a believer in increasing cooperation between Taiwan and mainland China, President Lee continued to emphasize that it is necessary for Taiwan and the mainland to work together to conduct further discussions on the issue of reunification. Many close to the president maintain that his one true dream is to witness a unified China under the principle of democracy rules, free enterprise and the distribution of wealth.

A few years ago I had the privilege of being President Lee's guest on a visit to Taiwan. Since that time I perceive him as a world class statesman and

hope that he will be able to influence mainland China to democratize and reunify with Taiwan on the basis of democratic principles. As a faithful friend of the United States, we must give him our wholehearted support as his presence on the island is symbolic of the economy and a politically stable Asia.

GUNS AND CHILDREN—THEY DO NOT MIX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thought it was important to come to the floor of the House to address again the crisis that we are facing in this Nation, and that crisis is that of the safety of our children.

Today unfortunately as the sun rose another youngster took weapons to school and shot children. I am most grateful, as most mothers and fathers, families, that this tragedy did not result in death. I cannot imagine what people in Littleton, Colorado, are thinking, or Jonesboro, or the State of Pennsylvania, or my own State of Texas, and rather than be political and politicize this, I am simply begging with all of the intellect in this Congress that we have the courage to admit that there are many concerns.

□ 1645

There is the entertainment industry, violence in videos. There is the issue of intergenerational conflict or disconnect because maybe adults and children are not talking the way they should.

There is the concern that I have raised and will be presenting in legislation, Give a Child a Chance Omnibus Mental Health Services bill for 1999 where we can focus on the fact that children need mental health services, both children who can afford it and those who cannot.

I think right now, in light of the Senate's actions today, we realize that gun legislation is not political. Over 89 percent of the American public are waking up and saying we must have safety locks. It is important to keep from children, or young people under 21, guns. We must close the loopholes in pawn shops and in gun shows so that there are no more opportunities for people to randomly walk in and get guns, as a young lady did on behalf of Eric Harris in Littleton, Colorado.

Parents are in pain. Children are in fear. Our children can talk about guns and their feeling of being unsafe. They can talk about the fact that they do not know whether their graduation will be safe or whether large gatherings will be safe.

Many of us as women Members of Congress have gathered. We gathered before Mother's Day and asked Speaker HASTERT to ensure that we pass gun legislation before Father's Day. I want to go a step further. We have next week. We should not leave here until we say not only to the American people but the world that we pride ourselves, as loving our children greater than our guns, and in fact this is not taking away guns from people who use them for sports and legally. This is saying that we have a proliferation of guns and our children are asking or crying out for us to be restrained and to restrain them; 250 million Americans, 260 million guns on the street.

Why cannot we find common ground on legislation that I passed in my city holding parents responsible, adults, for allowing guns to be in children's hands and thereby causing an injury? It was unanimously supported and then passed in the State of Texas, certainly a State that has its share of guns.

Safety locks, as has been said eloquently by my colleagues, there are regulations of diaper bags and regulations of parks and schools and equipment that children use. Why not guns? Why can we not keep guns out of the hands of those under 21? Why can we not do instant check at gun shows where all kinds of people come and, believe me, they use that method to get guns. Why can we not have tracing so that felons who are now dealing with the black market can be found? Why can we not have an amendment that deals with gun running?

It is very important, Madam Speaker, that the women in this House stand up. I demand that we collectively raise our voices to the Speaker, and I guess I demand of him, to not shy away from the responsibility.

Put the NRA aside. It has its own agenda, and anyone who says it does not is not reading all of their PR, their public relations. I did not come here to point the finger. I have mentioned the entertainment industry. They know what they can do.

This is a pyramid. We are building blocks. I have mentioned the need for more mental health services from K to 12, intervention risk assessment in every piece of legislation, that I can. In addition to the omnibus bill, I am going to be raising my voice for mental health services. It is too long and too late where it is a stigma, so that is why children have stopped taking their medication because there is a stigma all around. So if the parent does not tell them they certainly do not get reinforced in school, and troubled children are in our schools without medication.

So, Madam Speaker, I am not pointing the finger. I am speaking out of anguish and I am speaking out of pain. I cannot go another day without us doing something about these guns. We must pass legislation this week as we come back.

While I am home in the district this weekend, whoever will hear me, I will be talking about are we going to stand up for our children? Tomorrow at a press conference on Head Start I will be talking about our children and guns.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we can collectively indicate to the American people we have heard them. This is a crisis and we know their pain.

The Federal Government does not want to take over education of their children. We just want to take over the fact that we want our children to survive and we are going to help them with legislation and money.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we will all stand together next week as we return to this Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1141) ''An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.''

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d–276g, of title 11, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group during the First Session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress, to be held in Quebec City, Canada, May 20–24, 1999——

the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY);

the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE);

the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE);

the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS);

the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH); and

the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA).

HISTORY OF YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I come tonight to give maybe a little different perspective on the war in Kosovo than most people have seen from the spin from NATO and the White House. I would like to give some information that has not been widely disseminated but I think is important before any solution in the Balkans is possible.

First of all, Rambouillet, which was an attempt at an agreement which was not an agreement, to bring the Muslim and Serbian Yugoslavs together. Let me go back first with Rambouillet and explain where Rambouillet was a very failed foreign policy effort.

I use the quotes of both Larry Eagleburger and Henry Kissinger in

saying that Rambouillet was a failed foreign policy from the start.

Look at history, and I met with the Reverend Jesse Jackson, who I disagree with probably more than I agree, but one thing I respected about Reverend Jackson was not necessarily that he brought our prisoners back, that was good, but his ability to place himself in the shoes of either side of an argument. Even if he disagrees with one side or another, he understands that before someone can ever have a solution that they have to understand the feelings and what is in the mind and the heart of both sides, or there is no choice whatsoever.

Part of that understanding is the history of greater Yugoslavia. On April 5, 1941, just last month the anniversary, Germany bombed Belgrade. They put over 700,000 Nazis into Kosovo in the area. The Nazis were supported by a half a million Croatians, and about a quarter of that number of Muslims. One in three Serbs died in Kosovo fighting the Nazis, the Croatians and the Muslims.

The civilians in Kosovo had to flee across the Danube River for their lives, while the forces under a General Miholevic, not Milosevic but Miholevic, supported both the partisans and the loyalists. The Chetniks were more of a guerilla warfare.

In the three-year period of over a million Nazis, the Chetniks, the partisans and the loyalists either killed or pushed out every Croatian, Muslim and Nazi out of Kosovo.

In 1387, the Serbs celebrate still Kosovo and the founding of their Orthodox Catholic church at 1,600 different churches and shrines.

So Rambouillet, I would ask after that kind of history, would a person if they were in any of the United States, if they were in Texas, if they were in California and say Mexico populated either one of those States by 90 percent and all of a sudden they wanted California or Texas to go to Mexico, does anyone think the United States would allow that to happen? I do not, absolutely.

The second part of Rambouillet said that, oh, by the way, you cannot have any of your police force in Kosovo; that even though Kosovo is part of greater Serbia or Yugoslavia, none of your laws apply; only the laws of the majority which are the Albanians, and in 3 years there will be a vote as to whether Albania remains part of Serbia.

Not Milosevic but the Serbian people, and the understanding of what Kosovo means to the Serbs, was a great, great failure of this administration and the President to recognize. Either the President recognized it and wanted us to go to war or he did not recognize the importance of Kosovo to the Serbian people. Either way, it is why we are at the position we are today.

To say that diplomatic efforts were exhausted is far from the truth, and there are still ways for us to get out of this particular nightmare.

I fought in Vietnam. I spent 20 years of my life in the military as a senior commander, responsible both for a Navy fighter weapons top gun and at Naval staff on the planning, the invasion of Southeast Asia and European countries, and my friends from the Pentagon have told me that they told the President not to conduct air strikes into Kosovo.

Why? They said, first of all, air strikes alone would not achieve a single goal that the President wanted. Secondly, that every one of the problems that existed then would be exacerbated, would be increased. They told the President that it is highly probable and most likely that the Serb forces would force evacuation of Albanians, since that had been, in their eyes, a big problem over the last two decades.

Madam Speaker, take a look at the children's eyes that are refugees today, a million refugees walking through the snow. I have two daughters and I looked as if my own daughters had to go through this, and we need to thank God every day that we live in a country where that does not happen. In my view, there are two people that have caused that mass evacuation and forced the refugees. One is Milosevic and the other is the President of the United States by forcing the bombing.

Most people do not realize the hysteria: This is another Nazi, this is another Holocaust. Most people do not realize the total number, the total number of people killed in Kosovo in a 1-year period prior to the United States and NATO bombing was 2,012 people killed. We kill more people than that in New York City and Washington, D.C. every year. Now, each individual is important, but it is also important to realize that one-third of those 2,000 people were Serbs that were killed by the KLA.

Did they have a fight? Yes. Were there atrocities? Yes, on both sides. Until one puts themselves in the shoes of either side and both sides in the eyes of what is important to them, what are their fears? The Serbs fear the Germans. They did not want NATO troops with Germans in there. They fear that Kosovo will be taken away from them, much like if California or Texas was taken away from the United States.

The Albanians want some kind of participation in the government. They have about 90 percent of the population, but most people do not realize 60 percent of that 90 percent of the Albanians are there illegally. They are not citizens of Kosovo. They have come across the border from Albania illegally.

□ 1700

And that, in itself, is a problem.

Listen to the briefs. Watch the television, Madam Speaker, and listen to the Albanians talk about how they were forced out of their homes by the Serbs. Were they forced prior? No. There are 300,000 Albanians that live in Belgrade and not a single one has left because they live there peacefully. They live there peacefully together.

But listen to the debriefs from Kosovo. They were forced out of their homes. They were not fleeing prior to the bombing, but like the military told the President, upon NATO's strikes, the Serbs started forcing the Albanians out of Kosovo. They knew that the KLA on the ground was a threat to them. Is it right? No, I am not saying it is right, but I am saying we have to look at the total picture.

Well, Mr. President, if you are trying to change your legacy with a war or be nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, one is not nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize by killing more civilians in these strikes than the Serbs killed in the one-year period prior. One does not get nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize for forcing millions of people to evacuate and then claiming it is a Holocaust, which it was not.

I spoke to General Clark face-to-face in Brussels a month ago, and I asked General Clark, I said, how many of the sorties, how many of the flights is the United States participating in? There are 19 nations in NATO, 18 other nations. The United States, part of NATO in a European problem, is flying 75 percent of the strike missions. The United States, 75 percent.

Tony Blair gets up and says, put in ground troops, put in ground troops. He only has 18 airplanes in Kosovo in those strikes, but yet he beats on his chest and says put in ground troops.

Madam Speaker, 75 percent of the strikes does not include the B–2 strikes out of the United States; it does not include the C–17s, it does not include the tanking and the logistics flights, which puts the United States' flights in Kosovo at over 86 percent, Madam Speaker. Ninety percent of the weapons dropped are from the United States, and yet there are 18 nations, other nations in this.

I asked General Clark, I said, well, why are we flying all of these missions? He said, Duke, most of the NATO nations do not have these stand-off weapons. They do not have these stand-off weapons, and the weather is bad. You think they might have checked the weather to know that there was a two-week forecasted bad weather over Kosovo before they ever started air strikes. No, they did not.

Ninety percent of the weapons. Our next supplemental should be a check from those nations. If they cannot fly the strikes, if they cannot support NATO, if they cannot supply the ordnance, then they ought to be at least burden-sharing and paying the United States for it.

This ad hoc war, ground troops, in all of the tactical experience that I had in the military, working with all services and most of our friendly allies, not once would I ever tell an enemy that I was not going to use a certain type of force like ground troops. It is lunacy. It is idiotic in a tactical environment to tell your enemy that you want to

change his heart and mind, but you are only going to use air strikes, to allow him to focus on one phase and not have to prepare for ground troops, not have to station his troops and deploy his weapons.

Do my colleagues think that the President might have told Russia, Chernomyrdin, knowing how Russia feels, do you think they might have told the Russians that they were going to bomb Kosovo when Chernomyrdin was on his way to the United States and actually turned his airplane around and went back? Is that acceptable foreign policy? I do not think so.

This ad hoc war. People said well, Duke, how can they possibly look at a map and bomb an embassy like China's? Well, when one is doing something so fast, so ad hoc, and one rips maps off without any prior planning, it is very easy to see. When one is scrambling to find targets, when one is scrambling because one's missions are not being successful, then it is easy. And they took the wrong map. Even today, they hit two other embassies and they hit a hospital, killing hundreds of civilians. Again I say, the United States and NATO has killed more civilians in Kosovo than the Serbs killed in the entire year prior to the bombing. And that is wrong.

Madam Speaker, if one comes from the 1970s and one was a left-wing antiwar protestor or belonged to a protest group, and one is in leadership and one attempts to use a vehicle like the military that one neither understands or supports and even loathes, most of one's decisions, in my opinion, are going to be inept, they are going to be incorrect, because one does not have the gut feelings of what it should take.

A classic example of that was in Vietnam with the President we had then that controlled every single strike, and that was Lyndon Johnson. I lost a lot of my close friends in air-to-air. I was shot down on May 10, 1972 over North Vietnam, and many of my friends died because of inept decisions by a left-wing person that neither accepted, supported or understood the military.

When the President, knowing that he has surrounded himself with the Tony Lakes, with the Ira Magaziners, with the Strobe Talbotts, and he disavows, does not accept the advice of the military warfighters, that is even more of a problem, and it has been disastrous.

We had a briefing from a source which I am not allowed to say, but it is a very important governmental source, and the KLA is supported by the Mujahedin and Hamas from Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan. Are they in large numbers? Are they entire armies? No. But they have evidence of those individuals infiltrating the KLA units.

I will say that if I was an Albanian citizen and put myself in their shoes, I would be a member of the KLA, fighting for what I believed in. But on the other hand, if I was a Serb, I would be a Serbian soldier fighting for what I believed in. And until the President recognizes that, there is no solution. The Mujahedin and Hamas have a small influence, but it is there and it has to be removed.

They said, is it likely Osama bin Laden, like the Washington Times reported, has influenced and is supporting the KLA? Well, I will let my colleagues draw the inference. Osama bin Laden has organizations in over 150 areas, and everywhere there is a Muslim issue, he is involved. They said there is no direct evidence, but it is likely.

It was also reported in all of the European press and the United States in The New York Times that the number one heroin dealer, the number one heroin dealers were the Albanian Kosovars. And yes, the source said that that money is going in to support the KLA. They will take money from anybody they can. They consider it their survival.

General Clark, when I was in Brussels, I looked at him and besides asking him how many sorties were flying, he said, Duke, at the beginning of this NATO only wanted to fly one day and quit, because of all of these other things. They did not have their hearts and minds into this. General Clark said the President called Tony Blair from England, the German Chancellor, and they pushed this, that it is a must, it is a must. What that agenda is I do not know. All I know is that this ad hoc war has been disastrous not only for the American people, but for the Albanians and for the Serbs.

Madam Speaker, I think it is improper to say that all Germans were Nazis in World War II. There were a lot of innocent people. A lot of people did not support the Nazis. There are a lot of people that are not Mujahedin and Hamas, that are fighting for their lives, and if we look into the eyes of those children, we should have as much sympathy for those children and the innocent civilians on the Albanian side and the Serb side of the innocent people that are being killed because of war. That is important also.

Madam Speaker, I remember Madeleine Albright saying that if we allowed Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary into NATO, the United States would not have to participate in any European war. Well, guess what? They are all three part of NATO. And during the conflict Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary would not even let us fly over their airspace, and it took some serious arm-twisting by Madeleine Albright and others, the President, to use their airspace or even their bases and deploy.

They had a NATO summit here, anniversary, and the President says that all NATO is speaking with one voice. Well, Mr. President, if that is true, why is Hungary, why is France, why is Greece, why is Russia still shipping oil to Serbs in the greater Yugoslavia? They are not speaking with one voice, and the spin that NATO and the White House places on this is atrocious, in my opinion.

Take a look, Madam Speaker, at what NATO is today. We no longer have Ronald Reagan or Margaret Thatcher types. I ask my colleagues to look at the Germans. It is a green socialist government. Look at France. France has a socialist, communist coalition in their government. They threw out the conservatives. If we look at England with Tony Blair, labor left. Israel just yesterday, labor left. Germany, as I mentioned. Italy, Communist.

So NATO is made up today of not Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher, but people that are socialist and Communist and left. And it is difficult to make decisions using the military when those individuals historically have fought against the military itself.

Another little-known fact, Madam Speaker, briefed again by a source, the same source as I quoted a minute ago, said 70 percent of the Russian military support the overthrow of the Yeltsin government. We have seen just this week and last week an attempt of an impeachment of President Yeltsin.

Seventy percent of the Russian military who support their leadership are the hard-line communists that support Milosevic. They want us to go in with ground troops. It would give them the catalyst that they need to return the former Soviet Union back to communism. And it is a very difficult problem.

Look at Greece. Greece has ties to the Serbs because when the Serbs kicked out the 1 million Nazis, look at Thessalonica in northern Greece, where millions of Greeks and Jews and Serbs were annihilated by the Nazis, and Greece with its orthodox church, along with the Serbian orthodox church and their tie-in with World War II, makes them an ally.

And look at what we have done with China and Russia and Greece, people that we have been working with through trade with China, through trying to start a democracy going and light the fires of a young democracy in Russia, and even working with the Greeks has been disastrous foreign policy for the United States.

□ 1715

All of this, and they say, DUKE, you are a hawk. I am not a hawk, Madam Speaker. I am a dove, but I like to be a well-armed dove. And those that have fought in war and held, like in Private Ryan, held our friends and watched them die, maybe we are a little more reluctant to get our people involved in a conflict to where we know there is going to be a lot of loss of human life, and where we also know that diplomacy would work.

The President talks about wanting to save social security with a surplus, to save Medicare with a surplus, education from the surplus. I would like to see medical research, because it is exciting, what NIH is doing today as far

as the cure and the elimination of disease. We would like to double that.

I was in a group yesterday that wants to increase prostate cancer research by $100 million total. Madam Speaker, we cannot do that by spending $50 billion in Kosovo. We spent $16 billion thus far in Bosnia and we are only supposed to be there 1 year, $16 billion.

Do Members know that we still spend $25 million a year building roads in Haiti? And Haiti had no national security to the United States. The extension of Somalia, which most of us opposed, we got 22 Rangers killed and we got our butts kicked out of there. We had to run out of Somalia.

Every time the President had a personal political tragedy, we went into Iraq four different times. Let us not forget the hasty decision to go into the Sudan and bomb an aspirin factory. They just asked for $45 million to pay back the Sudanese, and the President said, okay, $45 million. Who is responsible? Has anybody been held accountable? Absolutely not.

Let me tell the Members, besides taking up the surplus, our military today, we are retaining only about 23 percent of our military, of our enlisted. We are retaining only about 33 percent of our aviators, our pilots. Why?

When I talk to these young men and young women who are flying and the people who are servicing those aircraft and that equipment, they say, Duke, I am away from my family 8 months out of a year. I am worried about my family, because their benefits are eroding. Our equipment is 1970s technology.

I had a briefing last Friday from a very classified source, which I will not go into, but there is an asset that Russia has in the air that if our pilots would engage it, we lose the dogfight and the intercept 90 percent of the time because we have shut down our research and development and we have not been able to compete.

I am alive today, and the airplanes I shot down in Vietnam, because I had better equipment and better training. Today our troops are getting less training, and the equipment is 1970s technology. Fortunately, this asset has not been deployed to Kosovo, but it is to North Korea, it is to many of our other potential enemies in this world. That is scary.

Our ships are going out with thousands of sailors short. We are $3 billion short in ship repair for our military ships. I could go on and on.

Madam Speaker, they say, Duke, you have told us all the problems, but what would you do if you were president? And no, I am not running for the presidency, Madam Speaker. My daughter would like me to because then she could have two dogs, but I do not plan ever on running for the presidency. I have my hands full right here.

Let me give some ideas. I stated from the day that we went in to Kosovo, and I would start it off first, Madam Speaker, by saying, some of the people can remember a movie called the Jazz Singer. I am old enough to remember Al Jolson playing in that part. Later on Neal Diamond played in the movie Al Jolson.

The whole movie is based on a Jewish proverb. It is about a jazz singer, a gentleman that is the son of a cantor, and the father wants his son to be a Jewish cantor. The son, of course, wants to be a jazz singer. There is so much hurt by the father that he rips his jacket in the Jewish fashion and denies that he has a son, and there is great consternation between the two.

The father, after a while, is so distraught at losing his son, not to death but from an argument, and the Jewish proverb goes like this. The father cries out, and I have two daughters, so I think you can do the same with a daughter, but he says, son, come home. We have argued too long. And the son replies, father, I cannot, because there is too much between us. And the father replies, son, come as far as you can, and I will come the rest of the way.

Sometimes that bridge is too far. If you do not understand and put yourself in the shoes, like Jesse Jackson did, and understand, even though you may disagree with the perceptions of an individual group, you still have to understand that before you can ever come the rest of the way.

The President of the United States has not recognized that. So I think that is the first step into any diplomacy. First of all, we have to halt the strikes, leave our force in place in case it does not work.

Let us, instead of having the Russians as a problem and a threat, and maybe even going back to communism, let us help the Russians. Let us let them be part of the solution, not only in Kosovo but in their own political world back in Russia. Let us have Russian and Greek and Scandinavian and Italian troops go in and act as the peacekeepers.

Again, we have to recognize, the Serbs fear the Germans, they fear the United States, and they fear Great Britain. We have become an enemy to a once ally. Let us let them be the solution. The Greeks the same way. They have supported the Serbs. Let us let them be part of the solution.

Milosevic must withdraw his armor prior to Rambouillet, but we have to have a different kind of Rambouillet, one that is achievable and realistic, with options and realistic and achievable goals, unlike Rambouillet I.

There is going to have to be an international body, Madam Speaker. There are nearly 1 million Albanians that have been thrust out of their homes. A large portion of those are illegal. They are not citizens of Kosovo. But the Serbs have caused part of their own problem by tearing up many of those papers that identify who is a citizen and who is not a citizen. It is going to take an international body to repatriate the Albanians.

When I was 15 years old I worked on a farm in Shelbina, Missouri, population 2,113 folks. Rather than work for my dad, who was a store owner, I would go out in the hayfields and put up hay.

Well, there was a lady named Ms. Featherall that always took care of the young boys and fed us probably 10 times the amount that we needed. And during the noon hour, we sat on a rocking chair up on her porch to get cool. She was afraid we would work too hard, and we loved that lady.

A Siamese cat came around the corner and jumped up in my lap. I petted that cat, Madam Speaker. A few minutes later around the corner came a Persian cat, a barn cat. I picked up the Persian cat, and immediately the two cats tensed and they started hissing, as you can imagine.

I petted them both and they calmed down, and I was going to make those cats friends. I moved them a little closer and I moved them a little closer. Each time they would tense up and I would pet them. I did not have a shirt on, Madam Speaker, and in a split-second, those two cats hit each other, and I was blood from head to toe from the claws.

We cannot repatriate Albanians and Serbians together who want to kill each other. If you killed my children or my wife or my mother or my father or my in-laws, it would take a long time and a whole lot of psychologists to sit me down next to the people that I felt had done that. It is going to take a long time of work to make that happen.

Then when you bring them back, are you going to have them stay in tents, for those that do not have homes? You have to establish some type of security. That is where the peacekeepers of the Russians, the Greeks, the Scandinavians, the Italians, are; not NATO.

The President and Tony Blair are all bent, it has to be NATO, it has to be NATO or nothing, it has to be NATO. The ego and prestige of NATO is not the issue here, it is people that have been thrown out of their homes. It is people that feel that they have been persecuted. That is the issue, Madam Speaker; not NATO, not the prestige and ego of Tony Blair or the President of the United States.

That inner body is going to have a difficult time and a long time to repatriate those citizens from Albania. The President has to look the Albanian president in the eyes and Izetbegovich, the head of the Muslims in Sarajevo, and demand that all Middle East fundamentalists be deported within 30 days.

Why? Because if they do not, these mujahedeen and Hamas from Iran and Afghanistan and Syria are the ones that want a worldwide Jihad. They want to kill all Americans. They are going to stir the pot, they are going to cause problems over the next decades. If we allow and the President allows them to stay there, even a small number, it is going to be a problem.

I have talked to the Orthodox Catholic Church both of the Serbs and the

Greek Orthodox Church. I have talked to groups of about 200,000 Serbian Americans. They support Kosovo remaining a part of greater Yugoslavia. But at the same time, they realize there may have to be a cantonization of the area, much like the Scandinavian nations do, where you might have a separate area where the speech and schools are French or German or Swiss. They support that initiative. That may be the first start for a new Rambouillet. But in my opinion, if you try and take Kosovo away from greater Serbia, it is a no win policy.

NATO in Europe has to rebuild Kosovo, France, Germany, England, Italy, not the United States. We have already spent $14 billion in 6 weeks. This is a European issue. The United States is part of NATO and should have leadership, but we should not pay more than the lion's share.

The United States can use its intelligence services and the number of CIA that we have. George Tenet told me that our assets around the world that monitor terrorism are extremely limited; that because of Kosovo, we have had to pull those assets into Kosovo, which leaves us vulnerable in the United States.

So I feel that our intelligence assets have to be increased greatly, and the support that this Congress gives them is necessary.

□ 1730

The United Nations, who has become part of the problem in this, votes against the United States 90 percent of the time. We only have one vote in the United Nations. They vote against this 90 percent of the time, and we pay the lion's share of the United Nations again. Until those reforms are done, the President should say, ''No more money, United Nations.'' In my opinion, I would like to do away with them permanently.

There needs to be an international body. If my colleagues expect Milosevic to negotiate, knowing that he is going to go before a war tribunal for war crimes, do my colleagues think he is going to ever stop? No. But I think an independent body should be established to look at Tudjman, the head of the Croatians, that murdered 10,000 Serbs in 1995 and forced ethnic cleansing out of Croatia of 750,000 Serbs.

When we talk about Holocaust, that comes much closer to a Holocaust than Kosovo. The gentlewoman just before and the gentleman was talking about, look at the Kurds. Look at 25 different areas around the world that are far worse than this. Are they despicable? Yes. Are they Holocaust? No. The spin will not gain the President the Nobel Peace Prize.

Our United States military, we have got to rebuild it. I believe that peace does come through strength. Our 300-ship Navy that was established by the QDR, which is a report that says this is what we need to fight two wars. The bottoms up review for the services, our service chief said we cannot fight two wars. Is that why we have left the no-fly zone in Iraq? I do not guess Saddam Hussein is a problem anymore, because he is left unattended to do his will.

We need to build up our military, to replace the benefits of our military, and give them the strength so that we can walk softly and carry a big stick, instead of the President walking softly and carrying a big stick of candy for everybody.

I read this week where the President plans on paying the Albanians who house Albanian refugees, paying for that. Are we establishing a welfare system in Albania while we cannot support Social Security and Medicare and education and medical research in our own country? I think that is wrong.

The President has got to look at the President of Albania and demand that, since in 1850 the Albanians have wanted to take over through expansionism, Macedonia, Montenegro, parts of Greece and Kosovo, and he has got to say no more. We have got to recognize the borders that have been formed and stay within them.

I think that we also need to take a look, and the President, to get very tough on the foreign policy of Russia and China. We know that Russia today still, even though they say they are not, ships chemical and biological weapons and nuclear components to Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, and we let it happen, and to North Korea.

The President in 1996 was briefed that there was espionage at our laboratories here in the United States and did nothing until 1999, where the Secretary of Energy has just started to do some things with Mike Richardson. He is doing what should have been done back in 1996.

The President was briefed in 1996 that the Chinese had stole our W–88 nuclear warhead, which is a small nuclear warhead, which took us billions of dollars, billions of dollars to develop and years.

We have an asset, but I cannot tell my colleagues what it is, where we reverse-engineered, that we were going to use that asset. We were building a system to combat the asset. Our system would not have worked, but we had that asset, so it saved us billions of dollars by having that asset and seeing how it worked so that we did not go the wrong direction.

Now the Chinese have got not only the W–88 warhead, but they have got secondary and tertiary missile boosts, which they did not have the capability to do.

George Tennet told us that Korea was 10 years away from being able to hit the United States with a missile, a nuclear missile. Guess what. They have it today with a Taepo Dong 1 and Taepo Dong 2 that China gave to them that we gave to the Chinese and they are exporting.

If that is not bad enough, the capability to MIRV, to put several of those W–88, and the President knew that China had these, the White House gave them the capability to use the MIRVing techniques that, again, took us billions of dollars to engineer.

If that is not bad, the targeting methods to use those missiles to make them accurate within a meter, a nuclear weapon. That was done after $1 million was donated by Loral and $1 million from Hughes and $300,000 from Liu Cheng Ying, who is the daughter of General Ying, head of technology in the PLA, to the Clinton-Gore campaign.

So, Madam Speaker, we have a monumental foreign policy problem. It is not just Kosovo. It is Russia. It is Greece. It is Libya. It is Kosovo. I feel that we need to chase the Turks out of Northern Cyprus, which they have held illegally for 25 years, and we have done nothing, because we need the Turk's support. But, yet, we let them stay in Northern Cyprus against international law.

Madam Speaker, it grieves me to see our Nation at war, especially when I think that we do not have to be there. From all of my military experience, to see a war run ad hoc and so desperately misused, it has cost human life, it has cost human suffering, and it is going to prevent many of us on both sides of the aisle from doing some of the things that we want with our domestic issues here in the United States such as Social Security, Medicare, education, medical research and defense.

It is not a pretty time, Madam Speaker. The President has got to get off his pulpit, whatever his agenda is, and he has got to recognize and put himself, as Jesse Jackson recommended to the President, to see both sides of this issue, to come, whether he has to admit defeat or have a small victory and declare a victory, I do not care, but we cannot put ground troops in, because even if we put ground troops into Kosovo, we are going to lose people.

The Chetnik type individuals, the guerillas will kill our people. I feel that the KLA, Mujahedin and Hamas will kill our people and blame it on somebody just to keep the pot going. Then if we do, we have just bought Kosovo for $3 billion to $5 billion a year, when we are already in Bosnia at $16 billion and Haiti. We are still in Korea for 25 years.

It is time to get out, Madam Speaker. It is time to build up the United States, to pay down our debt, and to take care of some of our domestic problems here.

COLUMBINE HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, today is the 1-month anniversary of the tragedy at Littleton, Colorado. I hoped to come to the floor today to speak on what we as a Nation need to begin to

do to solve this epidemic of youth violence. I did not expect that we would have had another shooting at another high school, serving as another alarm, as if we needed one, prompting us to act.

During the memorial service in Littleton, a singer, Phil Driscoll, sang a song that he wrote for the occasion. In the song, he sang a line that I cannot get out of my mind. The line was, ''This is a wake-up call. How many innocent have to fall.''

Today we received another wake-up call coming from Conyers, Georgia. What a wake-up call it was. But what can be done to solve the problem? What can we do to address the concerns of students and parents?

I think there is a lot we must do and a lot that we can do. I refuse to accept the defeatist attitude which says this is a complex problem, and, therefore, there is nothing that Congress can do about it. That is wrong, and that is unacceptable.

We have a national security crisis in our schools. We have lost more American children in our schools than American soldiers in Kosovo. This is a national security crisis which requires the same kind of mobilization that we apply to any military threat abroad.

Obviously attention must be paid to the accessibility of guns in our society and the frequent and intense images of violence in our mass media. Clearly, we can make guns less accessible to kids. We can try to give parents better tools to supervise what their children are watching or playing on the TV or the Internet.

Legislation has been debated and passed on the floor of the Senate over the past week that tried to make progress on limiting the access of kids to guns. I favor effective legislation to keep guns out of the hands of kids and hope the House will take up this legislation before we leave for Memorial Day.

This makes sense and should have no impact on law-abiding citizens who want to purchase and own guns for sporting use and their own protection. We are talking about passing commonsense, child-safety legislation to make sure that children cannot get easy access to guns.

I hope the House can follow the Senate's lead and move this kind of legislation forward without loopholes.

But child-related gun legislation is only one part of the puzzle. There is a lot we must do to make sure that our children are not exposed to inappropriate violent material in the media.

The Vice President has begun a discussion with Internet companies to publish the same ratings for on-line gaming that most TV shows have already. The President has called on the movie theaters to better enforce the rating process that is already in place there. Newspapers must also do a better job of making the rating systems clear to parents.

Even if we are able to make the progress we hope for in these two areas, we know that these steps alone will not solve the problem. We need to address the broader issue of the quality of our children's education and how to give them the attention they need to grow up to be healthy in both mind and body.

At the President's meeting on school violence at the White House, various experts on violence repeatedly made the point that this problem of school violence is a problem with many layers. They also said that such a complicated problem demanded more than single simple solutions.

One cause of the problem is that parents spend nearly one-third less time with children than they did a generation ago. With more single-parent families and more parents working more jobs and more hours and spending more time in traffic, there is just a lot less time for parents to be with and communicate with and raise their children.

□ 1745

In many families today, the kids are left alone most of the time. And as we all know, kids do not raise themselves.

When parents are home, they often do not spend as much time talking with their children. With television, the Internet, pagers, and other distractions, parents communicate less with kids even when they are able to be home. Before television, time around the dinner table was a time for family communication. Now if a family has time for dinner together, many families have the television on during dinner and nobody really talks to one another.

Another factor that was mentioned was the amount of domestic violence and child abuse that some young people are exposed to today. We have always had these problems, but the problem is far worse now than it has ever been. It is obvious that children exposed to abuse are much more prone to resort to violence in their own lives.

Another factor is the size of high schools. Most of our schools were built after World War II when we were trying to accommodate the baby boom. The schools were built large for economic reasons, and the size did not matter when families were intact and parents could spend more time with children. However, in today's world, it is unwise to have anonymous children in large schools.

Another problem is the increasing diagnosis of mental illness among children. One of the experts at the summit said that mental illness is more prevalent than ever but health insurance covers these problems less than ever. Consequently, many kids have problems but cannot get the professional mental help that they need.

One expert said that our problems stem from what adults do to children or do not do for children. The answers to our problems lie with adults and what we can do to raise children properly.

We spend so much of our debate and our time addressing the symptoms of violence but not the causes of violence. We talk about guns or conflict resolution or school violence programs. And it is right that we do so. But we spend far too little time discussing how we can prevent these problems in the first place.

It is obvious that the modern family needs help in filling the time holes that exist. The only institution, in my view, that can possibly fill these holes are our public schools. Schools have complained about the need to fill all these holes. But the truth is that only through the public schools can we achieve the scale that we need to solve these problems with all the children of our country.

We need nothing short of a revolution in our public schools to deal with the modern problems that children face in the modern world. Nostalgia for the past, criticism of other institutions for not meeting these challenges, or finger pointing at institutions that are not doing enough will not get us to a solution of these problems.

We must really begin to build the public will to do what is necessary to really solve these problems. Raising and educating children correctly is a huge task and will not happen without human will to achieve that goal.

In World War II, everyone thought America was way behind and would not win. What critics misunderstood was the will of the American people. Once every American internalized the goal of winning the war, each one of them did what was necessary on a daily basis and the war was won. The same can be achieved with our children, but a similar effort to what took place in World War II must be achieved.

All of us, whether we have children or not, has a responsibility to enter into this effort to educate and raise our children. It is in our deep self-interest to do this. Government at all levels must help, and local government has the major responsibility. I hope in the days ahead we will work together to find answers to this crisis.

Before the memorial service in Littleton, I went with Colin Powell and Vice President GORE and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), other members of the Colorado delegation, to meet with the parents of the dead children. We met with them for an hour and a half before the memorial service. We hugged them. We cried with them. I told them that the whole country was there with us standing with them at this time of terror and sorrow.

One of the mothers, after sobbing uncontrollably and shaking in my arms, pulled back with a picture of her child and she said, ''Congressman, I hope you will lead in the Congress to make sure that my child did not die in vain.'' I will never get her face out of my mind.

And now we have more fathers and mothers in Georgia who today are saying, ''I hope my child was not injured in vain.''

How many more children have to go down for all of us to accept the responsibility that we have to see that children are cared for and loved and respected and disciplined so that this does not happen again?

We may not be able to agree on much here, but we owe every parent who has lost a child to violence our best, honest efforts to work together as a Congress to solve some of these problems.

I am not so arrogant to think that we have the power to single-handedly solve these problems. But we need to start the process of reaching out to one another for comprehensive, meaningful, effective solutions. We need an honest discussion of the profound changes that are happening in our society and what we can agree will begin to change our culture so that all of our children, every one of them, is raised to be a productive, law-abiding, contributing citizen in this great society. If we cannot somehow do that, we will be consigned to more and more Littletons and more and more Conyers, Georgia.

Every day in our country we lose 13 young people to suicide and violence. Every day there is a Littleton. And it has to come to an end. If we cannot act on something as important as our families and our futures, then we will fail in our most basic duty to promote the safety and well-being of all of our people.

We must do it now, not a month from now. We must do it before the next breaking news on CNN about another school shooting. We must do it before we see the pictures of children running across the lawns of schools trying to find safety. We must do it before we get another wake-up call and another specter of death among our young people in our schools.

We have already waited too long. We have overslept. It is time to wake up. It is time to hear the wake-up call and to say, this must stop, this must end.

And as another parent at Littleton told me, ''Surely,'' as tears rolled down his face, ''we can do better.''

This is the greatest country that has ever existed on Earth. We have a national crisis. The crisis is among our young people and it is in our schools. And surely we can summon the goodness and the greatness of our people and all of us to face down this death and to bring it to a final and lasting conclusion.

CRISIS IN OUR SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader, for those words. And I would also like the RECORD to note that earlier today, when we finished business, that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) also came down and spoke about recent shootings and tragedies facing this country.

I want to speak tonight, as the Speaker's designee in our special order, about what we Democrats as a party have been trying to do here to address this very, very serious national crisis, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our Democratic leader, stated.

But what we say here tonight, I want everyone to understand, is not a Democratic or Republican issue. We want to work with both sides to try to bring some consensus if we can on things that we should take as a Nation. But I think it is important for us to understand where some of us see as where we are going.

And things I say here tonight are my beliefs as the convening chair of the Crime and Drug Task Force for the Democrats, not just this Congress but the past Congress, and does not necessarily reflect the views of everybody in our caucus. And I am sure they do not reflect the views of my Republican friends.

But some of us are beginning to sit back and try to meet individually and bipartisan; and, as a Democratic caucus, we have been convening the chairs of the Education Task Force, the Health and Human Services Task Force, of the Crime and Drug Task Force and we have been meeting.

We were meeting before the tragedy of a month ago out in Colorado and really since the first of the year really. We had numerous meetings. In fact, today we had another one that we convened and tried to kick around more and more ideas and bounce ideas off people. I know many of us, both Democrats and Republicans, have been in schools and talking with teachers and parents and what can we could.

As the convening chair, my qualifications before I came into the U.S. Congress was I was a police officer for 12 years as a city police officer and as a Michigan State police trooper and worked with juveniles, worked in juvenile crime areas, and taught criminal investigations at the academies and constitutional law and everything else. And the school violence issue that has swept across the Nation the last 18 months, it is hard to put into words how it has torn at so many of us and how do we best address it.

What we have found through all of the meetings, through everything that has happened, even with the shootings today in Conyers, Georgia, I think the only thing we can see say is this is a very complex issue and there is no single solution, there is no magic program that we can pass that would solve this. And we have got to get past blame games.

I know the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader, again has asked the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) to try to put together a bipartisan group. And I hope we can do that.

As we looked at what has happened, many of us see America has become alienated from each other. We see increases in hate crimes. For our children, we see and the experts tell us that we spend over the last 15 years one-third less time with our children than we did 15 years ago. So there is maybe less structure, maybe less discipline there, less guidance for our children.

For our children, the alienation that we see is now surfacing in schools. Society's problems are beginning to surface in schools. And even from our own leadership, I think when we have disputes on the floor which end in harsh words amongst each other does not speak well of the House as a whole or elected leaders and contributes to that alienation.

It is time for people to come together to try to reconcile our differences, the ill will that exists not only on the House floor of the U.S. Congress but the ill will that may exist in our families, our homes, our schools, our communities, our leaders, and even within ourselves.

So how do we end alienation and begin reconciliation to end the school and personal violence that we see that is gripping the headlines every night? How we do it is probably as varied as America. What works in North Carolina may not work in Michigan. Or we know the program that may work in North Carolina, character education, as they tell me, we may know it by a different name in Michigan where I represent. But what works in my northern rural district certainly will not work in the inner cities of our great cities.

☐ 1800

But what we understand is this. We understand that 100,000 weapons, be it guns or knives, come to school each day. We know that there are four times more guns out there, handguns, than there are children going to school, so there is access to guns readily available. We know as the Democratic leader said, there are 13 deaths per day of young people in America. We know that school psychologists tell us that probably 20 percent of the kids, students from K through 12 probably 20 percent of them need some help in dealing with problems at home, call it mental health problems, if you will. They also tell us that 3 to 6 percent of the students in our schools have severe mental health problems.

So when children lash out with those statistics, with the ready availability of weapons coming to and from school, you can see how the violence erupts and comes out and we see the headlines we see each and every day. We ask the statisticians and others in our meetings, is there a large enough sample of violence with the shootings that have occurred in the last 18 months, enough of a sample to say, are there similar characteristics of school violence in America? They have told us, no, the

sample is not large enough, that any kind of conclusions you may draw from the incidents may very well be skewed because they have been small.

Let us hope the sample does not get any larger. But we should not wait until there is enough violence in our schools to say, ''Okay, now we have enough sample, what can we do?'' I think there is enough for us to work together as Democrats and Republicans to come together and start to look at what can we do.

There have been many ideas kicked around. I would just like to share some of them tonight, not that any one of these ideas would be a solution but at least I want the Congress and the American people to know we are thinking, we are looking, we are probing, we are asking the questions and we need your input. Many of us feel that maybe there should be a national commission to examine not just the short-term but what are the long-term impacts, what is the long-term approach that we want to take here?

It seems like violence in America is constantly shifting. Maybe we need a national focus, much like maybe the Carter Commission we had in the late 1960s to address the problems facing the country then that actually put forth some proposals and some solutions. How do schools and communities access what may work or may not work? What ideas are out there? How do they reach out? You have so many programs going on in the Federal and State governments and Department of Education and Department of Justice and the Health and Human Services and public health, can we not somehow put these programs under an umbrella so schools can easily access to learn what is working in northern Michigan that may work in southern California. Can we have a national clearinghouse? Can we be under a commission and an agency? Can we do a one-stop shopping area, if you will, so we know what is working?

We have plenty of studies out there across this country that says this works up here in Boston, Massachusetts, or character education based on this model will work in North Carolina, or school resource officers work in Michigan. How do we allow everyone to access it? New Jersey has a program called crisis intervention officers. Is that different from a school resource officer which is really community policing where parents and teachers and students work together in a partnership to keep down crime and violence in the schools.

We have met with former pro football star Jim Brown. His program AmeriCan is a great program that may help us and is being used in 14 different States right now to address after-school problems and self-esteem that young people need. His program looks like one that may work. It may not work again in my northern Michigan area but it certainly is one we should look at. Each community, each State is unique unto themselves, but as we have seen in the last 18 months, we are all subject to the same violence in families and in schools and communities.

From the victims families, from all the folks we have had a chance to talk to, it seems there is a lot of confusion and hopelessness and despair out there. As I said, there is no simple solution. There is no political quick fix. We need vision. That is why I was so pleased today to see both the Democratic leader and the Speaker speaking of a willingness to work together and a need of a vision in this country, an action and a long-term commitment. Unfortunately in the United States Congress, we authorize and pass programs that will last for 1 year or we do a pilot program for a year or two. Then if it looks pretty good, we will use a 3-year program or a 5-year program. But I think we need a long-term commitment here. We need at least a commitment of a generation. I think it is incumbent upon this generation to start putting forth and thinking long-term so we can save not only this but also future generations.

As I said earlier, the family situations, the situations that we see in school are reflective of so many families that are surfacing in the schools. So you cannot say it is a State issue. You cannot say it is a local issue. I think the Federal Government must show some resolve. By that, we in the Democratic Party believe that it is not just something that we pass a program and then block grant it to the States. We at the Federal level must show the resolve. We cannot shirk from this responsibility. We just cannot block grant away another national problem.

This is a national problem and it is begging for a national solution. But if you are going to get at the root of the problem, I think you have to strike at maybe four main elements we have seen, we have looked at, we have studied, we have discussed in our many meetings and discussions with experts. It is what is happening in our communities, what is happening in our homes, what is happening in schools and yes, what is even happening with the proliferation of guns when we have four handguns for every student going to school floating around these communities, the easy accessibility of them. Do you address all four of them? I think you have to address all four because all are interrelated. They are interconnected. All are branches, if you will, on a tree that combine to form a trunk or the base but underneath there lie the roots and the roots which anchor the tree, the forbidden tree, if you will, the anchor of school violence and death that we have unfortunately seen once again here today. The branches on this tree, be it guns, schools and communities or the home, look remarkably similar, and it probably should, because it is us. It is really America. It is what we teach. It is what we teach the baby roots, our children, if you will. So when they grow, they become the anchor of the tree of school violence and death.

So let us not fail to see the forest but for the trees and let us not fail to see America for the violence we are experiencing because America is the greatest country there has ever been. We have an opportunity here now to stop and look at what is going on in this country, in our communities, in our schools, in our homes, and what can we do as a Nation? The violence, we just cannot look at it in other people. We have to look within ourselves. Because the violence is ingrained. It is not just what we do or what we say, but I think we also have to go beyond that and the violence or the signals we send can also be caused by what we do not do or what we do not say. By what we do, like reconcile differences within our homes, our families and our schools and our communities would be a start. So where do we start? If we focus with the schools, as I said earlier, I believe society's problems are surfacing here, for all to see, to place our sons and daughters and children in with the schools, let us focus on the schools and what should we be advocating, what should we be doing? Again, there is no simple program to pass, if the Congress would pass it and fund it, it would go away. Congress cannot reconcile America's alienation within the family or within each of us, but we certainly can encourage you, support you and assist you. And here are some of the ways some of us believe we should start. The Federal Head Start program. Can we not expand that program? Many of us for years have said, look, at 3 to 5 years old, they should be in Head Start. We should fully fund it. But if we expand that program, can we not teach mandatory in the curriculum violence prevention and conflict resolution? Why can we not take that one and expand it? It has been interesting as we have had the Law Enforcement Caucus, we have had experts in many times and it has been interesting that the larger cities have noticed the problems they were having in their schools and part of their curriculum is violence prevention and conflict resolution. It is interesting to note it has not been the larger school districts that we see that are having the violence that we have been witnessing lately. Maybe there is something there that we should teach and why not start it at the Federal Head Start program? We have the healthy child program. It is a program that coupled aspects of it, last year in the balanced budget agreement, we put in CHIPs, Children's Health Initiative Program, CHIPs as we call it for short. That was to help young people who do not have health insurance have health insurance. In the State of Michigan, we are like 20,000 applications behind. People are waiting 6 months to access this program. They are either going to be in the Medicaid program or the CHIPs program. Why do they have to wait 6 months? Why are we 20,000 applications behind, when I was bringing it up with

the governors representatives and then we really do not have a good idea or a good answer on why they cannot expedite the program and provide it to these people, to the young people who are uninsured, especially when we talk about the mental health provisions that 20 percent of the students are coming to school with mental health problems or difficulties or need someone to talk to and 3 to 6 percent of them have severe mental health, how come we are not addressing that? Why are we not expanding these programs to address these needs? If you take the K through 12, we have heard from school counselors and probably everybody across America says, ''Yeah, I know a school counselor,'' but when you talk to the counselors, we say what are you doing, are you there to counsel, are you there to help, are you there to be there for the students, to interact with them. Basically they tell us, ''Well, we really don't have time because we're busy with the busing schedule,'' or ''We're busy doing the curriculum,'' or ''We're busy preparing the students for the next round of testing going on by this group or that group or the State,'' or ''We just really are helping the students who want to go on to college with their college applications and things like this.'' The counseling that we envisioned or we saw when we were in school just is not there anymore. So if the counseling, be it nurses, psychologists, school resource officers, crisis intervention officers, counselors, cops in the schools, should we not make sure that if they are going to do this, they have the opportunity to do it and not get bogged down and not be utilized for busing or for curriculum development or testing or college applications? Should they not really have it, should there not be a professional staff that could help there? And should that not in order to protect them from the budget cuts that occur all the time as local taxpayers struggle to keep their millage rates low to provide a quality education? If they are the first people who are cut every time there is a budget cut, is there a place then for the Federal Government to step forward and say, look, if there are going to be professional staff, should the Federal Government not at least put forth the majority of their salary so they are not subject to these cutbacks, so they can be there to interact?

And what about before and after school programs? Everyone tells us that the juvenile crime rate is the highest between 4 o'clock and 8 p.m. at night when the students are out of school and they have idle time on their hands. Can we not have programs? I have often wondered why these so-called after-school programs are only run during school but when young people are out and about the most during the summer, there is no program. Should there not really be a year-round program for them? Should cities or schools not do sponsorship? Like in our city we have the summer recreation program but after school starts, what about those who are no longer in sports, what is for them? In my hometown after that?

Again can we use these professional Federal staff people to assist there? That is something I think we should take a look at. We talked a lot about school hot lines. School hot lines, ones that have been used out East here quite a bit with some success. Those were the school hot lines we talked about the student using if they have a concern, be it safety or just a concern, they can use the hotline to call in and someone would get back with them, be it one of those counselors or nurses or crisis intervention people or school resource officers.

With the recent incidents from Colorado and now too in Georgia, the superintendents are telling us and even in my district, even last Monday we had another bomb threat, how do you crack down on that if you have a hotline? Does that become the hotline for the bomb threats or the assaults or alleged assaults on the school? Then do you put in the caller ID? Can you crew the trap lines? Can you backtrack it, to cut down on these? And why could the hotline not be a parent's link to the school to see what is going on in the school, what events are going on, what is the drama club doing, what is their next event? Also why can the homework assignments not be there so the parents know if there is homework assignments, so they can take an active role in there?

Another suggestion we have heard in our many, many meetings is why can we not do hold and safe rooms? Hold and safe rooms is, I mentioned earlier, 100,000 weapons come to school every day with young people. If you are with a weapon in school, what happens? Do you hopefully not like what happened in one school shooting incident where the student came with a weapon in school, was sent home, got more weapons and unfortunately violence erupted.

□ 1815

So holding safe rooms, should each district have one, have one designated, that is a program that does not even cost anything, but what it tells us is a student comes here with a weapon, we are just not going to release them back into the community without holding them and making sure they are safe and making sure all precautions are taken to protect that student, other students and the community itself.

And what if the student is removed from school? I have heard governors say throughout this great Nation of ours, that first student that comes to a class with a weapon, just throw them out of school, no questions asked. Then where does it go? Where does the student go? Back into our communities? Do they work? Where do they go?

There is nothing to help them, and just letting them loose back into the community does not seem to be the answer of all we have seen in these recent months, in the last 2 years. So some States have what they call alternative schools. Some of us like to call them reentry schools.

And if you are going to be suspended for whatever, be it weapons or whatever it may be, why not, before you come back into your school, there is a reentry which must address the reasons for your suspension, and especially if it had something to do with weapons or drugs or alcohol. Let us answer, let us answer those questions before you reenter.

I indicated earlier that guns unfortunately are readily accessible and four guns for every one student we have, and 100,000 weapons come to school a day, and we have 13 deaths a day of young people. How do you begin to address that? If you are going to start addressing legislation such as that, I think not only you have to address what is happening in communities but also in our homes.

And in the last week you have seen many dramatic votes in the Senate on it, everything from 21 years old to purchase hand guns to closing the Brady loophole on checks at gun shows and pawn shops and child safety locks and liability and storage, and these are things I think that we have to address and at least talk about. Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, conservative, liberal, it is something we have to have a discussion about, and hopefully it can be a meaningful discussion.

We have talked, many of us, and I know even today the Speaker mentioned about ratings on games and Internet access and things like that; and besides all the meetings we have been having, we have been hearing articles and experts talk about are we really training our children to kill, and they talk about the desensitization which is going on with children.

And many experts have said, and if I can quote from one or two articles, children do not naturally kill, they learn it from violence in the home, and most pervasively from violence as entertainment and television, movies and interactive video games. And they go on to say that every time a child plays an interactive video game, he is learning the exact same conditioned reflex skills as a soldier or a police officer in training.

Mr. Speaker, every parent in America desperately wants to be warned of the impact of TV and other violent media on children, but unfortunately we have seen, I said on the Committee on Commerce, unfortunately we have seen a lot of our TV networks sort of stonewall what it really means in our key means of public education in America, and I hope we are not stonewalling them.

These are all issues that we have been trying to address, and there have been again many, many articles that we have looked at, we have argued about, we have debated, and we continue to look for answers. As I said,

there is no one single program, there is no one single solution, there is no Democratic or Republican solution here. We must work together on this.

As we talked about the counselors, there are about 90,000 counselors right now in America, and they are in the public schools from middle to high school. We have 90,000 counselors for 19.4 million students. That comes out to about 1 counselor for every 450 students.

But as we spoke to those counselors and their representatives, they said, ''We do not get a chance to counsel anymore like we used to. We actually spend time,'' as I said earlier, ''helping on developing core curriculum, helping on the busing schedule, helping out with kids wanting to go on to college,'' and how do we help them out there, ''and just basically doing testing, testing, testing so our school scores well on the test so we can hopefully get more resources.'' But the kids are lost in the whole shuffle.

So is it feasible to put in 100,000 more counselors, much as we did 100,000 cops on the street, to stop this violence that we see in our schools? And if you looked at it, that would add about 100,000 more counselors, would bring it down to 1 to 250 students. But then we got to make sure those counselors are not bogged down doing busing, or testing, or core curriculum development, or college preparation.

And what about after school programs? We think there are many of them, good programs that can work, whether it is Amer-I-Can or Boys and Girls Clubs or whatever, why can we not do those things?

As my colleagues know, we just did an emergency supplemental appropriations that the President asked for $6 billion, ended up being $15 billion, and we passed that. Can we not put forth an emergency school supplemental appropriation?

And what about family, school and teacher initiatives? Why can we not have these hot lines? Why can we not expand the family medical leave that we tried to do, to make it available so parents can go to school to spend some time with their children, whether or not, not just at report card time but other times? Why can we not expand that?

These are just some of the ideas I said that have come out of the Democratic Caucus. We have been working on it since the first of the year. It has taken on new urgency with the situation in Colorado and again here today in Conyers, Georgia, but I want you to know that we have been working and thinking and trying to take your suggestions and ideas that have come from the American people and from the psychologists and National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers and everyone we met with, and as House Members we have even met with Senate Members. And again, we are all trying to pull together, and unfortunately today's incident once again leads me to come to the floor tonight to join with the Democratic leaders and others to try to talk about what we are doing, what we are doing.

And I notice one of the leaders in this area, Mr. ROEMER from Indiana, is here, and at this time I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), from the Midwest, right next to Indiana, my home State, for having this special order on a very, very important topic in America today. I want to commend our leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for taking the time to come to the floor to address this very, very important issue for all Americans in facing, and not only are we facing trying to come up with creative and bold and innovative solutions to make our schools better, we need to make our schools safer.

I was sitting in my office just minutes ago making phone calls back home to Indiana to talk to and listen to farmers, and our farmers are going through a very difficult time in small town communities with the price of beans and corn and hogs being so low. And I was speaking with some of them, and some of them were saying, well, we are in danger of going out of business and we are having all kinds of problems in our small town communities, but we have our family and we have our children, and we will get through this.

Imagine, imagine what some families in America are going through today in Paducah, in Jonesboro, in Springfield, in Littleton, in Georgia today, that had their children shot at school, have children injured and sent to the hospital, are scared about sending their children to a public school or a private school to get an education in America today. That is a compelling issue for this Congress to address and address in a bipartisan way, address in a thoughtful way, address in maybe a short term way but in also a long term way, with vision, with perspective, with a lot of thought and with, hopefully, a lot of answers.

I cannot imagine, as a parent of three children, being in the shoes of some of the parents that are in these cities across America, in these suburbs across America, in these situations across America where their children are in danger, where their children are being harmed, where their children might be shot. And just on CNN tonight in a Gallup poll, they did a Gallup poll to 13 and 17-year-olds, asking our 13 and 17-year-old children in schools today, ''Do you feel safe?'' Asking them what some of the biggest problems are in our schools: peer pressure and the cliques and standing up for what you think is right and against somebody putting down other students in very harmful and mean ways.

But we have to get back, and I think my colleague from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) understands this, we have to get back in Congress to helping try to have a national dialogue, as education is the number one issue across America. Every single union hall I go into, it is the number one issue, every single business I go into it is the number one issue, every single home I knock on in Indiana it the number one issue.

And now not only are we concerned with better schools, innovative schools, creative schools, helping with charter schools, helping with this Ed-Flex program that we just passed, but we must be concerned with safer schools. We cannot let this happen over and over and over again, from Arkansas to Mississippi to Kentucky to Colorado to Oregon to Georgia. We do not want this happening in Indiana, and I know in my good friend's home State of Michigan and Port Huron the other day we had another instance of potential violence.

So I would hope that the Speaker and the Leader could get together, I would hope Democrats and Republicans could join together to discuss in a national way, with national dialogue and input from a lot of different sources, teachers and parents and principals and counselors, people that think that families are the number one concern and the number one answer, people that think that media violence is the number one concern and the number one answer, people that think that metal detectors and safety and security measures in schools are the number one concern and number one answer, people that think that there are too many guns in society.

Mr. Speaker, let us have these debates. I do not necessarily think that we can legislate everything here to answer this compelling problem on the House floor, but we can talk about the importance of family and the role of bringing up our children, we can talk about how parents must be at that kitchen table and talking and listening to our children. We can talk about how this has to be done more in America. We can talk, and hopefully talk and respect the First Amendment about the number of media games, of games on the Internet that companies are putting out there for our children, that do not need to be sold to our children, that escalate the number of violent activities on the programs, that reward kids for the more people that they harm on these video games, the more points they get and the more harm they can do. We do not need to be selling those products to our children.

And we can talk about some, yes, some answers that maybe Congress can come up with. We can talk about maybe some ways to put some programs together to allow our local schools to pick from a host of different answers, whether those answers be that the school picks from looking at putting more metal detectors in the schools, to having more counselors in the schools, to having more mental and psychiatric resources available in the schools, to more D.A.R.E. officers in the schools, to other proven research

methods that make our schools safer, allow our local schools to pick and choose as they should, as the local schools should do, from a host of different measures.

□ 1830

Let us in this great Chamber, where George Washington peers down on us and godly trust is above us, where we have had so many historic debates in this great place, let us discuss the issues of the day. Let us bring education front and forward to improve schools, to make them better and to use more creative approaches to do that, but also look at the safety issues, to look at what we need to do to give more assurances to our parents and our families, that our schools and the United States of America are going to be safe places for our children.

We can do an emergency supplemental. If we can make that a priority in this country, and I voted for it, to make sure our troops have the resources overseas to be successful in battle, we should make sure that our families are talking about the right things. Where we can help, where we cannot, where we cannot legislate this, we can have a national dialogue, but we can talk about many of these other things here in this body, with Republicans and Democrats together, sharing in some of the answers, disagreeing maybe on some of the answers but at least proposing some solutions to these problems, with safety in our schools, with better schools in all of our neighborhoods across this great land.

So I really want to say that there cannot be anything more important that we as a Congress can deal with in this session of Congress. There cannot be anything more important to parents than better schools and safer schools. There cannot be anything more important in the history of the country as we move into this new millennium than better and safer schools and Congress working together to improve those schools.

So I just want to say, in just the few minutes that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) has the special order tonight, that I share in his concern; that I applaud his leadership on drawing many people together in the Democratic Caucus to look at a wide variety of answers, whether they be long-term answers, such as I think fully funding Head Start programs and preschool programs, long-term answers like helping our families, encouraging our families to stay together and not implode, looking at counselors and metal detectors and letting local schools pick from a host of solutions, but we need to draw people together in our caucus, we need to draw people together across both lines of our parties. We need to come together to discuss and debate these issues today, in America, at our kitchen tables, in our great halls for debate and help solve some of these problems.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for having this special order. I again want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for taking the time to come to the floor to talk about these issues, and I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for trying to put some packages together on the crime side, on the juvenile justice side, to also look at some solutions to these vexing and very important problems.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for joining us tonight and thanks for coming down and joining us. As one of the leaders in the education field, as the gentleman has been, with a new Democratic coalition and others, we really appreciate the insight he has given us as to what works in Indiana, in his district, as I said earlier. What works in New Jersey or Michigan or wherever it might be, it may work in that community or that State unique unto itself but all of our communities in this country right now are basically subject to violence in families, in schools and communities. No matter how one cuts it, no matter where one stands on the issues, there just seem to be so many weapons available and so much alienation out there and so many opportunities for violence. I am sure if the gentleman looks closer in his polling results that he has seen, he will see there is sort of like this hopelessness out there, confusion and despair on what we should do, and the gentleman is absolutely right, there is no simple solution. There is no quick political fix to this vexing problem.

We need vision, we need action, and we need long-term commitment, and again not just for 1 year or 3 years or 5 years, but at least a generation.

I know that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has always worked in a bipartisan way with Democrats and Republicans and that is what we are asking here. As the Democratic Caucus, we have been reaching out and we will continue not just to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle but also over in the Senate to try to find some kind of solutions.

All these things, whether it is the community, the schools, the homes or guns, they are all interrelated, interconnected. We have to be prepared to start addressing all parts of the problem.

I wish we could but the Federal Government just cannot pass a law, the Federal Government just cannot reconcile America, or alienation within the family or even within each other, but we certainly can encourage; we would support and do anything we can to assist.

So I certainly appreciate the gentleman's time and effort in coming down here tonight to speak with us.

There is another issue, of course, that is on the minds of all Americans and that is, of course, Kosovo. One of our colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), wanted to take a few moments, so I am going to yield him some time to talk about that situation.

So while we talk about school violence or what is happening, we still have other matters that we must address again hopefully in a bipartisan way, and I would yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for yielding. Let me just say that I certainly endorse everything that he has said about violence and about the terrible tragedies taking place in our country, in our schools today. As the father of three children, I know that every parent grieves when we hear of these tragedies at our schools. We obviously need to put our heads together, Democrats, Republicans, Americans all. There are no easy solutions, and none of us has the magic answer.

We certainly cannot legislate these things. I think as leaders of our great country we need to have a dialogue and we need to put our heads together and come up with something with which all Americans can identify. So I thank my friend from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for his leadership in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak a bit about violence that is happening on the other side of the world in Europe, and that is the situation in Kosova. I had not intended to speak but I earlier heard the remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), and I just felt that some of the things he said really should not be left unchallenged.

I believe what the United States is doing in Kosova is noble, and I believe what the President has attempted to do is noble. We could have easily stood by and let the genocide and ethnic cleansing continue and not done a thing and that would have been the easier thing for us to do, but I think to the President's credit and to our great country's credit we decided that we just could not stand idly by 55 and 60 years after the Holocaust and see another tragedy going on on the continent of Europe.

To those people who say, well, why is the United States involved when there is genocide going on all over the world, obviously we are involved with our NATO allies. NATO is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and so NATO is primarily concerned with what goes on in Europe, and this has a terrible destabilizing effect in the Balkans and indeed on the whole continent of Europe.

So we, as one of the lead nations in NATO, as the lead nation in NATO, I believe we need to be very responsive to genocide and ethnic cleansing.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a tendency in some quarters to unfortunately equate the victims of genocide with the oppressors who are carrying out the genocide. We cannot equate those two. It is very, very clear what is going on in Kosova today. The ethnic Albanians are the victims and Mr. Milosevic and his Serbian government are the oppressors. That is clear.

There were two million ethnic Albanians routed from their homes. I think when we get into Kosova we are going to see 100,000 or more people in mass graves ethnically cleansed. There are already at least 100,000 missing, and we get reports day in and day out of mass graves. We cannot allow that to happen.

There are some people that say, well, this did not happen until the bombing started. That is nonsense. This has been going on for years. We have called it slow ethnic cleansing. It is true that the pace has accelerated since the NATO bombing but ethnic cleansing has been going on against the Kosovar Albanians for many, many months and years, a systematic campaign and every negotiated attempt was made to try to get Milosevic to come to his senses, and only when that failed did the bombing start.

I went to Rambouillet during the negotiations in France to speak with our American officials and to try to help convince the Kosovar Albanians to accept Rambouillet. They accepted the Rambouillet Accords. Even though it was far short of what they would like, they believe and I believe that they are entitled to independence and to self-determination. When the former Yugoslavia broke up, and it broke up because of Milosevic, every other group in the former Yugoslavia was given the right to independence and self-determination.

The Croatians, the Bosnians, the Macedonians, the Slovanians all were given that option and opted for independent nations. Why are the Kosovar Albanians not given the same option? Why do they have to live in second class status? I think it is very, very clear that Serbia has lost any moral authority ever again to govern the people of Kosova. They have no right to it. The people of Kosova have the right to independence and self-determination.

Ethnic cleansing cannot be tolerated, and I think the principles with which we lay down to stop the bombing remain firm and must remain firm. There should be no erosion of those principles.

Milosevic knows what he needs to do. In order for the bombing to stop, the Kosovar Albanians need to return to their homes and they need to be protected by international armed forces led by NATO and they ought to have the right of independence and self-determination.

We ought to, in my estimation, be arming and training the KLA, the Kosova Liberation Army. They are the only counterbalance to the Serbs on the ground. If we do not want American troops on the ground, and many people do not, then they are the only counterbalance to the Serbs.

I have introduced a bill along with my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) that says that we ought to be arming and training the KLA. In the long-term and in the short-term, we ought to be airlifting and air dropping anti-tank weaponry to them because they want to turn to us. The KLA wants to work with the west. The KLA wants to work with NATO. If we continue to rebuff them, they are going to go elsewhere for their arms. They may go elsewhere, Iran and other places that we do not like, and then if they do that we cannot then point and say, aha, because it will have been a self-fulfilling prophecy.

They want to be pro-west. They want to work with us. They want to defeat the Serbs. They want to aid NATO and we have been rebuffing them. It is ashame. It is wrong. It is morally wrong, and it is wrong in terms of what we should be planning.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to fight this war, all options ought to be on the table, including the possible option of ground troops. I do not say this lightly, but I think we cannot tell Milosevic in advance what we will do and what we will not do, because if we tell him what our game plan is he can plan accordingly. That is why he has dispersed his military, he has dispersed his armaments because he does not fear a ground evasion. If we keep him guessing, we will take away a number of options from him.

Let me say this about Milosevic: We continue to treat him as if he is somehow the solution, we are going to negotiate with him, we are going to deal with him. I read reports where Milosevic supposedly is ready for a deal as long as we state first and foremost that Kosova will remain part of Serbia. That would be a disgrace to give him that. That would be a disgrace to say that we are somehow pretending that since Rambouillet nothing has happened, when we know there are tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of people executed and ethnically cleansed.

So we should not give in to Milosevic's demands. We should hold firm and adhere to those principles.

Again, all options should be on the table. We have Apache helicopters in Albania. In my estimation, we ought to be utilizing them. We ought to be doing humanitarian air drops, dropping food to half a million starving Kosovar refugees who are trapped in Kosova, who are in the mountains and do not have enough food.

I was at Kennedy Airport last week, welcoming the first round of Kosovar refugees coming home to the United States, to be with their families, and they were tears streaming down people's eyes, hugging and kissing. It was something really to behold. These people are suffering. Milosevic is a war criminal who ought to be indicted by the International Tribunal in the Hague. We should not be giving in to him, capitulating to him or in my estimation even negotiating with him.

We need to win this war. We need to guarantee that those people come back to their homes and we need to put those responsible for genocide on trial, and we need to be very, very firm and, again, I believe that we need to arm and train the KLA.

I want to enter into the RECORD two letters. One is from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which states that the veterans of foreign wars of the United States is resolved that in order to bring this conflict to a rapid and successful conclusion on terms favorable to NATO we will support the United States acting as part of the NATO alliance, taking decisive action with the full range of overwhelming military power to eject, remove or otherwise force the withdrawal of Serbian military and paramilitary forces and to restore Kosovars to their homes.

☐ 1845

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD the Kosova Coalition, which is signed by many, many people, Christians, Muslims, Jews, all kinds of ethnic groups in this country to Members of Congress urging our support for NATO's efforts to stop the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. One paragraph says, ''We, therefore, call on Congress to request that it take all necessary steps to end Serbia's campaign of ethnic cleansing, force the withdrawal of all Serb forces, create a secure environment for the return of Albanians to their homes, and allow them to govern themselves and to rebuild Kosovo.''

Finally, I want to say that the smears that have been leveled in some quarters against the KLA talking about them using drug money and whatever have no basis in fact. Intelligence reports and everybody else say that it is nothing but a political smear campaign, and again today in the Wall Street Journal it says, The U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency says claims that the KLA raises money from drugs quote, ''have not been corroborated and may be politically motivated.''

So I am tired of the smears. This country is doing the right thing, the noble thing. We are to make sure that the Kosovar Albanians get their legitimate rights. We are to stay the course; we are to be firm, and I am proud of the United States of America standing up at this very important point in time.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

APRIL 20, 1999.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Untied States is gravely concerned about the worsening situation in the Balkans. As the combat veterans who for the last 100 years have fought all of our country's wars, we have until now opposed the deployment of U.S. forces to the former Yugoslavia. Our opposition was based on our concern for the safety of our servicemen and women in the midst of the Yugoslav civil war. Also, we have been uncertain what vital U.S. national security interests were at stake in that country's conflict.

Since we took that position, however, the situation has changed. In the past few weeks Serbian leaders have used their military and

paramilitary forces to overrun Kosovo, destroy the social and economic fabric of the province and terrorize the populace into flight.

Despite, and in defiance of NATO's diplomatic efforts and its air campaign, Serbia now has achieved its objectives in Kosovo. By doing so it has raised the stakes in this conflict. Having waged unrestricted war on the people and province of Kosovo, NATO's credibility and U.S. leadership have been directly challenged by Serbia. NATO will neither continue as a credible, unified alliance, nor will the U.S. retain its world leadership role if the Serbian challenge goes unmet and Serb aggression is not stopped.

Many of our members are deeply troubled by the situation we face. Some realize the long history of this conflict, the skill of our adversaries, the inhospitable weather and terrain and the political difficulty of maintaining alliance unity are important factors that will affect our actions and their outcomes. Others are mindful of the lessons of past wars. The gradual applications of force that allow adversaries to seize objectives before our power peaks and the limits placed on the use of our military power which can prolong conflicts, increase casualties and erode public support are lessons that seem to some to apply equally to today as to yesterday.

Nonetheless, in consideration of the current situation, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is resolved that in order to bring this conflict to a rapid and successful conclusion on terms favorable to NATO, we will support the United States acting as part of the NATO alliance, taking decisive action with the full range of overwhelming military power to eject, remove or otherwise force the withdrawal of Serbian military and paramilitary forces and to restore Kosovars to their homes.

We also believe that careful consideration should be given to the formation of a NATO peacekeeping force to guarantee Kosovars' freedom from further oppression and the right to its self-determination.

Finally, Mr. President, with such important questions before us we believe and urge you to ensure first that the American people are behind this effort and then to take this issue to the United States Congress for its advice and consent.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. POULIOT,
Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

KOSOVA COALITION,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1999.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We are writing to urge your support for NATO's efforts to stop the ethnic cleansing of Kosova.

We are horrified by the atrocities, including mass murder, systematic rape, and widespread expulsions, committed by Serb forces against the civilian population of Kosova. We strongly support NATO's military campaign in Kosova, but are concerned that our efforts thus far have not been enough to stop the atrocities there. In fact, the State Department recently reported that Serbia has forced nearly 90 percent of the Kosovar Albanians from their homes and is continuing its effort to cleanse Kosova of its Albanian population. We cannot allow Serbia to succeed.

We, therefore, call on Congress to request that NATO take all necessary steps to end Serbia's campaign of ethnic cleansing, force the withdrawal of all Serb forces, create a secure environment for the return of the Albanians to their homes, and allow them to govern themselves and rebuild Kosova.

We also support the efforts of the UN War Crimes Tribunal. We strongly believe that those individuals who committed or ordered others to commit crimes against humanity must be brought to justice.

Lastly, we believe that the international community should continue to help alleviate the circumstances facing the Kosovar refugees. To the extent possible, the refugees should be able to remain in the Balkans to better enable their eventual return to their homes. All countries bordering Kosova should keep their borders open to refugees and treat them with dignity and respect.

Although we are disheartened by the events unfolding in Kosova, we are supportive of NATO's mission there. But the ethnic cleansing must stop. NATO can help achieve that goal by expanding its mission in Kosova.

Sincerely,

Ilir Zherka, National Albanian American Council; Bruce Morrison, Former Member of Congress; Richard D. Heidman, B'nai B'rith International; Glenn Ruga, Friends of Bosnia; John Cavelli, Conference of Presidents of Major Italian American Organizations; Hisham Reda, Muslim Public Affairs Committee; Marilyn Piurek, Polish American Leadership Council; Jess N. Hordes, Anti-Defamation League; Steve Rukavina, National Federation of Croatian Americans; Bob Blancato, Italian American Democratic Leadership Council; Mark Lazar, Federation of Polish Americans; Abdulrahman Alamoudi, American Muslim Council Foundation, John Pikarski,* Gordon and Pikarski; Rabbi David Saperstein, Religious Action Center of Reform Judiasm; Dr. Jim Zogby,* Arab American Institute; Steven Schwarz, Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Tolga Cubukcu, Assembly of Turkish American Associations; Phil Baum, American Jewish Congress; Peter Ujvagi, Hungarian American National Democratic Leadership Caucus; Jason Isaacson, American Jewish Committee.

*These individuals are signing the letter in their own names. Organizations they represent are included for information purposes only.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for coming down and sharing his concerns.

I know the gentleman from Virginia would like to speak on school violence, and I would like to yield to him at this point in time.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me. I also want to say a word about the comments of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), my friend and colleague. He is absolutely right. Mr. Milosevic is a war criminal and he is a bully, and we cannot yield to him. We must not let him prevail, nor can we as a society ever become apathetic to the suffering, the murder, the genocidal campaign that has gone on in the Balkans. We must stand firm; we must stand with NATO, and that means whether it is politically popular, or whether it is not the popular will, it is up to us to show leadership. The President is showing leadership. Most of the leaders of NATO are showing leadership, particularly in the United Kingdom, and we applaud them for doing that. History will give them credit if they do not get it from their electorate today.

As we approach the dawn of a new millennium, we as a people, individually and collectively, must stand up for a civil society, a society under the rule of law, a society where democracy determines leadership, a society where people are rewarded for their effort within a capitalist economy.

So we have a major role internationally. But we must also set a standard domestically, and there is an area where this society falls short of meeting that standard, and that is in the area of gun control. Because the statistics will show that that is one area where we trailed the rest of the industrialized nations. In fact, there are more children killed by firearms in the United States than all 25 other industrialized nations combined.

Now, when we stand for principle internationally, it would seem that it is incumbent upon us to do the right thing domestically, and it is not right that 13 young people every day lose their lives due to firearms, whether it be through homicides, suicides, or unintentional shooting.

Mr. Speaker, there are events such as happened today, such as happened recently in Littleton, Colorado where that enters the radar screen of our mind. But it should be an objective every day, particularly in this House, to bring us in line with the other civilized nations and to stop the proliferation of handguns and assault weapons.

The last year for which we have statistics, we know that about 3,000 children and teenagers were murdered with guns, over 1,300 committed suicide with guns, and about 500 died in unintentional shootings, just in one year. A total of nearly 5,000 young people were killed by firearms, and that is a relatively typical year. In fact, in a typical year, we have over 20,000 people, adults and children alike, killed by firearms. That is way out of sync with the rest of the civilized world. There is no country that even registers on the same radar screen as the United States. They do not reach 100 deaths by firearms in a year, and we have 23,000.

Mr. Speaker, two in 25 high school students, so we are talking about tens and tens of thousands of high school students, report having carried a gun in the last month. Where are they getting these guns? Why are they getting these guns? They are getting these guns because we have lax laws, because of our gun control policy which is too determined by politics and by political campaign contributions.

I speak particularly of the gun lobby and of contributions from the National Rifle Association. If the Republican Party does not want this to be a campaign issue, if they do not want this to be a partisan issue, then they should not be accepting the millions of dollars of campaign contributions from the National Rifle Association. Because it is going to be a campaign issue when 85 percent of those campaign contributions are going to Republicans, when one can go right down the line of the people who lead the fight against gun

control, and look at the campaign contributions, and most of them have gotten $9,900 a year. Some have gotten as much as $14,000. I do not know how they do that, because they are supposed to be limited to $10,000 a year, maximum. But we have the numbers. The numbers are available. People should look at it. People should compare those to votes. People should also respect the fact that an important vote was cast today. It was a deadlock, it was decided by the Vice President of the United States, and it was the right thing to do.

I hope that this will not continue to be a partisan issue, that we will do the right thing in the House of Representatives. That, in fact, we will be able to add the same amendments to the Juvenile Justice Authorization, and lacking those amendments, that we will be able to at least add them to the appropriations bill on Treasury and Postal Operations.

It is long past time. Thousands of people have died because we have not been willing to stand up to the kind of political bullying that comes from many in the gun lobby.

Mr. Speaker, we should not miss this opportunity to focus on this very serious problem in our society. We must start to do the right thing legislatively. We must stop this violence. I am not suggesting that to take away guns is a magic bullet. But I am suggesting that when we went to school, we had the same kind of psychological problems with peers and girlfriends and so on, but we did not have dead victims as a result. We might have done silly things, but gosh, we did not have access to guns; we did not shoot people, we did not leave people dead in a pool of blood. And that is happening because guns are much to easily accessible to our young people who do not have the maturity to be able to use them. We ought to increase the age of accessibility to guns, we ought to put safety locks on guns, and we ought to reduce the proliferation of them, whether it be through pawnshops or through gun shows or retail or wholesale or whatever. The time has long since passed for us to take the lead in this very serious issue and restore a civil society and reduce the violence that is prevalent throughout this American Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan taking this time to speak about school violence. School violence is a reflection of society. This is an important issue. We ought to be addressing it today.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, realizing my time has expired, I once again would just like to thank the Speaker for his courtesies here tonight and understand that of course that as we address this issue, it is more than just guns, but things are happening in communities, in schools and in homes, and we invite Democrats and Republicans to come together and address this in a bipartisan manner

A GREATER QUALITY OF LIFE FOR AMERICA'S DEFENDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I found it interesting, the comments tonight on Kosovo. It is my firm belief that we are involved in an illegal war. We speak glowingly about the rule of law, and yet the Constitution requires that the Congress raise up armies and declare war. The War Powers Act clearly defines the limits within which the President may engage in war-like activities such as we have become involved in in Kosovo. The U.N. charter requires that no Nation see this kind of violent activity in a sovereign manner when there is internal conflict. So I do not care where one looks, whether it is international law, constitutional law, or statutory authority, this is an illegal war.

As we think about the war in Kosovo, Mr. Speaker, I want us today, as we begin to approach the time when we remember the veterans, the men and women who have served so bravely overseas, as we begin to enter into that season in our year, I want us to think about them and not forget them. Because in today's military, a young enlisted person serving out his or her first contract can expect to make only $1,075.80 a month. Over a 40-hour work week, this averages to $6.70 an hour. But most of our military personnel do not work 40-hour work weeks. We all remember the famous army slogan: We do more before 9 o'clock a.m. than most people do all day. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is true. These young enlisted personnel can expect to be at work before first light and not home again until long after dark.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, we do not pay them overtime. These young people train for weeks at a time away from home. They keep themselves in a state of top physical readiness, and they live their personal lives according to the high standards of integrity and honor we mandate for them. These young servicemen and women must uproot their families on a moment's notice, moving to a new duty station across the country or across the globe. A lot of them do it for as little as $6.70 an hour.

For members of the military with families, the situation is even worse. Despite a modest living allowance, 12,000 families currently serving our armed forces are dependent upon food stamps, food stamps. We have government employees living off of government subsidies. Mr. Speaker, why do we not skip the intermediary step and just pay them properly in the first place?

During the holidays at the Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho, a network of military spouses work together to collect donations of money and toys for the enlisted families who cannot afford to give their young ones Christmas or Thanksgiving.

Last November and December, the Mountain Home Warm Heart organization, run by the spouses of servicemen, distributed over $18,000 worth of food and toys and cash to needy military families.

Where did this money come from, Mr. Speaker? From the pockets of servicemen who already had very little to give. If this were not bad enough, many military families have more serious concerns than just Christmas and Thanksgiving.

At the Mountain Home Air Force Base, 459 women and children are receiving regular food assistance. That is not a proud record for us. One hundred and seven of those are infants. The Mountain Home Air Force Aid Society made $131,000 in emergency assistance loans to military families. I am very concerned about what will happen to these families when the money runs out and they still have to make monthly payments on their loans.

In the 18th century, citizen soldiers won our independence and secured our liberties. We hailed them as heroes, and revered the courage and commitment they demonstrated in defense of our Nation. Today that Nation is protected by citizen soldiers with the same integrity and that same sense of duty. Only in 20th century America, we do not even pay them a living wage. We should be ashamed of ourselves.

From 1988 to today, there have been 32 deployments of our military. In the previous 60 years, there were only 10 deployments. Put another way, Mr. Speaker, prior to this administration, the military was deployed an average of once every 6 years. During the Clinton administration, the military has been deployed an average of four times every year.

Furthermore, since 1987 we have depleted our ranks by 800,000 servicemen, 800,000 servicemen. In practical terms, that translates into more frequent deployments and dangerously long hours. It is illegal in this country for truck drivers to be on the road longer than 8 consecutive hours without rest. We have pilots now patrolling the Mediterranean in 14-hour shifts.

In short, this administration is expecting our servicemen and women to do 100 times as much and place their lives at risk 100 times as often with 800,000 fewer people for as little as $6.70 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I recently paid a plumber $90 an hour to unplug my garbage disposal. An auto mechanic can expect $50 an hour. A teenage person working as a bagger in a grocery store can earn up to $12 an hour. None of these jobs requires 24-hour dedication to duty and a constant threat to their lives.

Mr. Speaker, one young Marine I know of has taken a second job to supplement his income. Every night this Lance Corporal goes home and trades his Marine uniform for a blue and red

tee shirt and matching hat from Dominoes. This young Marine, this hard-working father of two, delivers pizza because he is too proud to accept welfare.

He is not alone in this endeavor, but it is nearly impossible to know how many young servicemen are in this position, because most of them hide it from their commanders.

A young Lance Corporal serving in the Marine Corps today can anticipate being combat-deployed at least once in a 4-year enlistment. I wonder what this Lance Corporal's family will do when he is away and they have to make do without the supplemental income from Dominoes? I am humbled by this young Marine, and many others like him who work so hard to protect us. I am ashamed that we do not do right by them.

I urge this body to seriously consider the ethics of our government's continued overextension of our military in light of our complete lack of gratitude for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I have a request to make of the Members of this body. Tonight, when they go home to their families and when we go to the security and comfort of our own homes, when we tuck our young children in bed and say a prayer, we need to say a prayer for the men and women of our armed forces.

As we sleep, approximately 100,000 of them stand watch away from their own loved ones, ready to give their very lives to protect us, for as little as $6.70 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Congress must begin to understand that there is a direct correlation between the effectiveness of active duty military today and the treatment of the veterans of yesterday's service. Retention, morale, readiness, these words are euphemisms used to disguise the real problem our military faces: A complete lack of faith that their government will take good care of them.

Why should our active duty servicemen believe us? Veterans in my district are feeling the effects of cuts in the veterans budgets. Veterans hospitals in Salt Lake City and Spokane are suffering from cutbacks and layoffs which impact patient care, as well as those hospitals, veterans hospitals, in Boise, Idaho. There are waiting lists for surgery and fewer options for long-term care. We have broken our promises.

A sign in front of the Boise Veterans' Medical Center reads ''The price of freedom is visible here.'' But indeed, it is. Unfortunately, in our society, a select few pay that price. They are our veterans. They are our heroes, and they must fight for the health care benefits that we promised them.

We expected our veterans to fight for us abroad, but it breaks my heart when they have to come home and fight for their privileges that were promised them at home.

Mr. Speaker, veterans are forced into one final choice between their home and their patriotism. No Idaho veteran may be laid to rest in his home State in a dedicated field of honor. That is because my home State is the only State in the Union which does not have a veterans cemetery.

Veterans represent approximately 10 percent of Idaho's population. There are nearly 100,000 combat veterans in Idaho, about a third of whom served our Nation in World War II. Our average World War II veteran is 76 years old. These heroes are now passing away. This summer when veterans organizations call the roll of those who have died in the last year, they will read 3,500 names in Idaho, and not one will be able to be buried in an Idaho veterans cemetery. There is not an Idaho veterans cemetery.

That is why I am introducing legislation which will provide Idaho with a veterans cemetery. This bill answers a critical need Idaho faces. In pressing for a veterans' cemetery, I have the support of the entire Idaho congressional delegation, the State veterans organizations, our Governor, the Idaho legislature, and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP).

In fact, last month, the Idaho legislature passed Joint Memorial No. 1, which urgently requested a veterans cemetery, stating, and I quote, ''It is fitting and proper that a grateful Nation should provide a burial site within a reasonable distance from the homes of those Idahoans and others residing in the northwestern States who honorably served their country in a time of emergency.''

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this case can be overstated. We in this body must begin to take very seriously our commitment to the armed forces. We cannot just try to make piecemeal repairs. We must begin to demonstrate a genuine commitment to improve the quality of life for our veterans and our active duty servicemen and women.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I was forced to vote no on the Kosovo emergency supplemental. That was a very painful and difficult vote for me. On the one hand, I hate to pass up a chance to rectify the wrongs brought down on our military in the past 6 years.

I always welcome the chance to give something back to our servicemen, but I cannot fund an illegal war. I cannot condone this military action, this terrible descent into a protracted conflict in which the American people have no stake whatsoever. I care about our troops too much to remain silent as they are led to this battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, last month this body had the opportunity to fulfill its constitutional role and declare war on the people of Kosovo. All but two, all but two 2 Members balked from that final act. It seems that the only thing this body can agree on in this matter is that the people of Kosovo are not our enemies. Why, then, are we bombing them? Why are we destroying their capital?

I do not understand the answer to this question, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot let the temptation to provide our servicemen their due at this time dissuade me from my obligation to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution.

Had I voted to fund the war I had voted against declaring, I would have compromised the very principles these young people have fought for in the past. I would have voted to violate the Constitution. Worse, Mr. Speaker, this supplemental amounted to nothing less than blackmail. The Members of this body were offered a choice: Support the troops and the beluga whale and the House pages and the University of the District of Columbia and Washington Metropolitan Air Traffic and whatever other random provision was added, or do not support the troops at all. It is a shameful situation, what was added to the so-called emergency supplemental. It is a testament to the way the military has been constantly used by us, improperly used.

The fact is our military is being attacked by its most dangerous opponent, our own civilian command. This Kosovo supplemental was proof that we are not committed enough as a government or powerful enough as a Congress to undo the damage that already has been done. It is time to move from piecemeal repairs after the fact to proper recognition, support, and honor throughout.

In a time when we were threatened, they defended us. In a time when we were afraid, they kept their courage. In a time when we have discarded patriotism, they still salute their flag, honor their Commander in Chief, and serve the ideals of American freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we must show them, our heroes of past conflict and those who stand guard as we speak, that we care, that we are grateful, that we will not fail them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEUTSCH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for after 3:00 p.m. today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. STARK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for after 1:00 p.m. today on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for after 1:00 p.m. today on account of receiving an honorary doctorate degree from Northwood University.

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. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HASTERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, 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. 1141. Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 24, 1999, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2252. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99–915–1 FR] received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2253. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (RIN: 0560–AF46) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2254. A letter from the Acting Associate Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Landownership Adjustments: Land Exchanges—received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2255. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Mepiquat Chloride; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions, Correction [OPP–300719A; FRL–6075–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2256. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethyl phosphate of 3-hydroxy-N-methyl-cis-crotonamide (monocrotophos) Final rule; Tolerance Revocations [OPP–300836; FRL–6074–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2257. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Sulfosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300853; FRL–6078–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2258. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Methacrylic Copolymer; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP–300848; FRL–6077–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2259. A letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Processing Requests for Farm Labor Housing (LH) Loans and Grants (RIN: 0575–AC19) received April 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2260. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishing and Maintaining a Facility Representative Program at DOE Facilities [DOE STD 1063–97] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2261. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Notice of Availability of Grants and Selection Criteria for PrintSTEP Pilots [OPPTS–00267; FRL–6066–8] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2262. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Phosphoric Acid Manufacturing and Phosphate Fertilizers Production [IL–64–2–5807; FRL–6329–5] (RIN: 2060–AE40 and 2060–AE44) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2263. 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 for Arizona and California; General Conformity Rules [CA126–0129a; FRL–6233–1] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2264. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Air Pollutants: Regulations Governing Equivalent Emission Limitations By Permit [AD–FRL–6343–1] (RIN: 2060–A128) received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2265. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Air Pollutants: Amendment to Regulations Governing Equivalent Emission Limitations by Permit [AD–FRL–6343–2] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2266. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Deregistration of Certain Registered Investment Companies [Release No. IC–23786; File No. S7–31–98] (RIN: 3235–AG29) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention; Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No. 990416098–9098–01] (RIN: 0694–AB67) received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2268. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Appeals of MMS Orders (RIN: 1010–AC21) received May 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2269. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Financial Disclosure [Docket No. 970728182–8272–02; I.D. 071697A] (RIN: 0648–AG16] received May 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2270. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Amendment 13 [Docket No. 990219053–9114–02; I.D. 011999B] (RIN: 0648–AK83) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2271. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Connecticut River, CT [CGD01–99–032] received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2272. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Hutchinson River, NY [CGD01–99–031] received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2273. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone: Dignitary Arrival/Departure New York, NY [CGD01–98–006] (RIN: 2121–AA97) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2274. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Port of New York/New Jersey Fleet Week [CGD01–98–170] (RIN: 2121–AA97) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2275. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast

Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Ellis Island Medals of Honor Fireworks, New York Harbor, Upper Bay [CGD01–99–034] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2276. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Corporation Model Beech 2000 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–17–AD; Amendment 39–11160; AD 99–10–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2277. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–53–AD; Amendment 39–11161; AD 99–10–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2278. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–100, 747–200, and 747–SP Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–100–AD; Amendment 39–11162; AD 99–10–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2279. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–200, –300, and –400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–286–AD; Amendment 39–11163; AD 99–10–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2280. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS332L2 [Docket No. 99–SW–09–AD; Amendment 39–11168; AD 99–10–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2281. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC–12 and PC–12/45 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–03–AD; Amendment 39–11081; AD 99–06–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2282. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Thomson, GA [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASO–4] received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2283. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–104–AD; Amendment 39–11172; AD 99–11–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2284. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100) and CL–600–2B16 (CL–601–3R and CL–604) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–99–AD; Amendment 39–11170; AD 99–09–52] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2285. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney R–1340 Series Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. 97–ANE–58–AD; Amendment 39–11173; AD 99–11–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2286. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Model YS–11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–92–AD; Amendment 39–11169; AD 99–10–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2287. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Tax Relief for Those Affected by Operation Allied Force [Notice 99–30] received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2288. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Section 467 Rental Agreements; Treatment of Rent and Interest Under Certain Agreements for the Lease of Tangible Property [TD 8820] (RIN: 1545–AU11) received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2289. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Public Disclosure of Material Relating to Tax-Exempt Organizations [TD 8818] (RIN: 1545–AV13) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2290. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Credit [Revenue Ruling 99–18] received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2291. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Closing agreements [Rev. Proc. 99–27] received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2292. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Credit [Revenue Ruling 99–18] received April 16, 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. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 905. A bill to provide funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1378. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out pipeline safety activities under chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code; with an amendment (Rept. 106–153, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COMBEST: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 17. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to require the President to report to Congress on any selective embargo on agricultural commodities, to provide a termination date for the embargo, to provide greater assurance for contract sanctity, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–154, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration of H.R. 45.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of the rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 45. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on the Budget for a period ending not later than June 2, 1999, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(e), rule X (Rept. 106–155, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker.

H.R. 17. Referral to the Committee on International Relations extended for a period ending not later than June 11, 1999.

H.R. 45. Referral to the Committee on Resources extended for a period ending not later than June 2, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1880. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require candidates for election for the House of Representatives or the Senate to raise at least 50 percent of their contributions from individuals residing in the district or State involved, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 1881. A bill to modify the rate of basic pay and the classification of positions for certain United States Border Patrol agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, 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. TALENT (for himself, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. EWING):

H.R. 1882. A bill to amend provisions of law enacted by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 to ensure full analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules proposed by certain agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 1883. A bill to provide for the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran certain goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Science, 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. FORD (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1884. A bill to provide for the disclosure of the readiness of certain Federal and non-Federal computer systems for the year 2000 computer problem; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for facilitating the importation into the United States of certain drugs that have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CANADY of Florida (for himself, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOYD, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 1886. A bill to amend the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act to clarify the application of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish the depiction of animal cruelty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 1888. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a mandatory minimum prison sentence for certain wiretapping or electronic surveillance offenses by Federal officers or employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1889. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to impose stiffer penalties on persons convicted of lesser drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FROST, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. KILPATRICK):

H.R. 1890. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified acupuncturist services under part B of the Medicare Program, and to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for coverage of such services under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Government Reform, 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. HULSHOF (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TALENT, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 1891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a partial exclusion from gross income for dividends and interest received by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. JOHN, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida):

H.R. 1892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide assistance to homeowners and small businesses to repair Formosan termite damage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1893. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain individuals who would be eligible for military retired pay for nonregular service but for the fact that they did not serve on active duty during a period of conflict may be paid such retired pay if they served in the United States merchant marine during or immediately after World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 1894. A bill to provide that a plaque be placed at the diplomatic entrance of the Department of State; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FROST, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WISE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CARSON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. REYES, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. LEE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida):

H.R. 1895. A bill to develop programs that enhance school safety for our children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARY MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. EHRLICH, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1896. A bill to designate the Republic of Korea as a visa waiver pilot program country for one year under the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 1897. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of personal Social Security investment accounts under the Social Security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. STABENOW:

H.R. 1898. A bill to provide for school safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1899. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations to eliminate or minimize the significant risk of needlestick injury to health care workers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 1900. A bill to expand the use of competitive bidding under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1901. A bill to designate the United States border station located in Pharr, Texas, as the ''Kika de la Garza United States Border Station''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 1902. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to correct poverty data to account for cost of living differences; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH:

H.R. 1903. A bill to regulate the sale of firearms at gun shows; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.J. Res. 55. A joint resolution to disapprove a rule relating to delivery of mail to a commercial mail receiving agency, issued by the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Con. Res. 110. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the July 20, 1999, 30th Anniversary of the first lunar landing should be a day of celebration and reflection on the Apollo-11 mission to the Moon and the accomplishments of the Apollo program throughout the 1960's and 1970's; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H. Res. 184. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Federal Government procurement access for minority-owned businesses; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 8: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 19: Mr. LEWIS of California and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 25: Mr. OWENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 49: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 85: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 175: Ms. CARSON, Mr. WU, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 323: Mr. MOAKLEY.
H.R. 325: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 330: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 353: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 363: Mr. WU.
H.R. 425: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WEYGAND.
H.R. 443: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 483: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 486: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 531: Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 534: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 555: Ms. CARSON and Mr. SCOTT.
H.R. 557: Mr. GOODE and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 561: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 570: Mr. HOBSON.
H.R. 591: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 629: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 655: Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. STABENOW.
H.R. 697: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 698: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 735: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 764: Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WYNN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. LEE,, Ms. CARSON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 772: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 789: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 815: Mr. WAMP and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 826: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 828: Mr. WISE.
H.R. 835: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 838: Mr. TAUZIN.
H.R. 840: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 859: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 864: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WISE, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 868: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. SAWYER.
H.R. 876: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
H.R. 896: Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 902: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 939: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 941: Mr. QUINN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 953: Mr. WEINER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 957: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 976: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 984: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 989: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1001: Mr. SHAW, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HILL of Montana, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 102: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1044: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 1070: Mr. MINGE, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1079: Mr. THUNE, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. KING.
H.R. 1080: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 1082: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. KLECZKA.
H.R. 1083: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 1090: Mr. QUINN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1092: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1093: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mr. HILL of Indiana.
H.R. 1105: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1111: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 1177: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 1180: Mrs. BONO, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1182: Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 1187: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 1193: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. MOAKLEY.
H.R. 1214: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1219: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 1221: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1244: Mr. BACHUS and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1248: Mr. TALENT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WISE, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 1259: Mr. TOOMEY and Mr. STUMP.
H.R. 1260: Mr. KUYKENDALL.
H.R. 1276: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1278: Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 1300: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. FOLEY, and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1317: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1323: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1324: Mr. WOLF, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1326: Mr. PHELPS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1344: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1355: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 1358: Mr. COOK
H.R. 1360: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 1388: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1399: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1414: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1421: Mr. LUTHER and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1429: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1432: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 1456: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1463: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1476: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1484: Ms. CARSON and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1485: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1494: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1507: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 1514: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1516: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1546: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 1567: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1579: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FROST, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 1606: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 1620: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1621: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1629: Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1644: Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 1645: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1658: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1671: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1676: Mr. JEFFERSON and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1694: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1706: Mr. LARGENT.
H.R. 1710: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. REGULA.
H.R. 1732: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. WU.
H.R. 1734: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 1736: Mr. FROST, Ms. LEE, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1764: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1765: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1776: Mr. WEYGAND, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WELLER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1777: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1786: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1791: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1824: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1837: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. UPTON, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1839: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1857: Mr. MOAKLEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.J. Res. 7: Mr. BAKER.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. METCALF, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 79: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. ARMEY.
H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. RAHALL.
H. Res. 41: Ms. CARSON and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 60: Mr. GEJDENSON.
H. Res. 90: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 95: Mr. PACKARD.

H. Res. 144: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Res. 146: Mr. LUTHER and Mr. WU.

H. Res. 178: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. MCNULTY.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Mr. TURNER on House Resolution 122: BENNIE G. THOMPSON and MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ.

Petition 2 by Mr. CAMPBELL on House Resolution 126: DAVID D. PHELPS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

Amendment No. 1. At the end of title II (Page __, after line __), insert the following new section:

Sec. __ . TEST AND EVALUATION OF MOBILE EXPEDITIONARY ACCURATE NIGHT VISION COMPATIBLE PORTABLE AIRFIELD LIGHTING SYSTEM.

(a) TEST AND EVALUATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the test and evaluation by the Armed Forces of the Mobile Expeditionary Accurate Night Vision Compatible Portable Airfield Lighting System, which is known as ''MEANPALS'' and is designed to use enhanced vision technologies, such as laser guidance systems, to provide accurate runway centerline lineup cues and approach information for up to 10,000 foot runways at both improved and unimproved aircraft landing sites.

(b) ELEMENTS OF TEST AND EVALUATION.—The test and evaluation of MEANPALS shall include the following components:

(1) Use by the Army of two MEANPALS at a location that serves both fixed wing aircraft and helicopters.

(2) Use by the Marine Corps of one MEANPALS at a location that could serve Marine Corps aircraft as well as direct amphibious landing craft and ground vehicles.

(3) Use by the Air Force Reserve or the Air National Guard of three MEANPALS at three separate locations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mrs. CLAYTON introduced A bill (H.R. 1904) for the relief of Abimbola Oyebade-Balogun; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1999 No. 74

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Rabbi Moshe Feller, Upper Midwest Regional Director of the World Lubavitch Movement, St. Paul, MN.

We are pleased to have you with us.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, Rabbi Moshe Feller, Upper Midwest Chabad Lubavitch, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and God of our fathers, sovereign Ruler of the universe and all mankind, tomorrow we mark Your biblical holiday—the Festival of Weeks. On this day 3,311 years ago, You descended on Mount Sinai and gave the Ten Commandments amidst ''thunder and lightning and the powerful sound of the ram's horn.''

Before issuing Your Commandments, the most crucial of which are: Thou shalt not commit murder; Thou shalt not commit adultery; Thou shalt not steal, You awesomely declared, ''I am God, your God.'' You declared so because, in Your infinite wisdom, You knew that only by constantly focusing on Your sovereignty could humans control their negative impulses.

Almighty God, this august institution, the Senate of the United States of America, responds daily to Your declaration at Sinai by opening their convocations in this historic and noble Chamber with the recognition of Your sovereign presence and by publicly offering prayers to You.

Reward this sacred practice by granting the Senators good health, good cheer, good fellowship, long life, and abundant wisdom. May this wise and sacred practice be an inspiration to all convocations and assemblies which are convened daily throughout our blessed country and throughout the world to do likewise, in light of today's event in the school in Georgia, especially in the Nation's public schools, so that mortality, safety, tranquility, and happiness prevail throughout our country and throughout the world. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able chairman of the Judiciary Committee is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank the President pro tempore.

SCHEDULE

Mr. HATCH. This morning the Senate will resume debate on the juvenile justice bill. Under a previous order, the Senate will begin 60 minutes of debate on the Smith and Lautenberg pawnshop amendments. Following that debate, at approximately 10:30, votes on or in relation to the amendments will occur. Additional amendments are expected, and therefore votes will occur throughout the day and into the evening.

In addition, consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill will begin today. It is hoped that a time agreement on this legislation will be made and a vote on final passage will also take place today.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. What is the pending business?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

VIOLENT AND REPEAT JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now under that order resume consideration of S. 254, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 254) to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by and rehabilitation of juvenile criminals, punish and deter violent gang crime, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Frist amendment No. 355, to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 to authorize schools to apply appropriate discipline measures in cases where students have firearms.

Lautenberg/Kerrey amendment No. 362, to regulate the sale of firearms at gun shows.

Lott (for Smith of Oregon/Jeffords) amendment No. 366, to reverse provisions relating to pawn and other gun transactions.

AMENDMENT NO. 366, AS MODIFIED

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send a modification to the desk and ask unanimous consent that the Smith amendment be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have no objection to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 366), as modified, is as follows:

At the end of the act, insert the following:

SEC. . PROVISIONS RELATING TO PAWN SHOPS AND SPECIAL LICENSEES.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the repeal heretofore effected by paragraph (1) and the amendment heretofore effected by paragraph (2) of subsection (c) with the heading ''Provision Related to Pawn and Other Transactions'' of section 4 of the title with the heading ''General Firearms Provisions'' shall be null and void.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 923(m)(1), of Title 18, United States Code, as heretofore provided, is amended by adding at the end the following subparagraph:

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

''(F) COMPLIANCE.—Except as to the State and local planning and zoning requirements for a licensed premises as provided in subparagraph (D), a special licensee shall be subject to all of the provisions of this chapter applicable to dealers, including, but not limited to, the performance of an instant background check.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will withhold.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this is an important day because this is the day on which we hope we can finally pass this juvenile justice bill. We have had another shooting of students just today at a high school in Georgia. The shooting occurred at 8 a.m. at the Heritage High School and a number of children were wounded. I won't go into the details, but the shooting was exactly a month after the April 20 slaughter at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, where two students killed 13 people before taking their own lives.

It is apparent that we have to do something about this, and this bill is a very considered attempt to do exactly that.

Now, we are going to have two very crucial amendments this morning. The Smith amendment is first to come up, and this amendment is to resolve the pawn shop issue and the special licensee issue. I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Vermont in particular for their thoughtfulness in trying to resolve this difficulty. We want to do this in a bipartisan way. I surely hope people quit trying to score political points and help to get this bill done.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, look where we are today—another high school shooting incident in Atlanta, four young people, at least in the initial news, injured, not killed. I talked about it with the Attorney General a few minutes ago. She had expressed her concern. I also commended her for her strong words of last week because I believe that helped move this bill forward. We are considering it during the eighth legislative day. We have not spent full days on this important bill. We will not be able to spend a full day. Notwithstanding that, we have made significant progress.

Today, we will also consider the long-delayed emergency supplemental appropriations bill to provide relief for victims of Hurricane Mitch, humanitarian aid in the Balkans, aid for farmers, and aid for the victims of natural disasters, as well as military and other appropriations.

In the time available to us today, I do hope we will be able to move to final passage on this bill. The bill has been much improved since its predecessor was introduced 2 years ago as S. 10. I detailed some of those improvements yesterday, and yesterday the Senate took a giant step forward with the adoption of the managers', the Hatch-Leahy amendment. Those modifications go a long way toward improving the bill. I predicted all week long that once we adopted Hatch-Leahy, we would have fewer than 10 amendments offered from the Democratic side.

As we begin this morning, I am sure of that. I am working with other Democratic Senators to see if the number of amendments can be reduced even further. Thanks to the hard work of Senator REID and others, the Democratic amendments have been pared down from 89 to a precious few left to be offered. They are still pending; they are still to be offered. I am hoping, though, that none will pose a stumbling block.

I know that in a little while the President of the United States will travel to Colorado for events in connection with remembering and honoring those who perished in Littleton, CO, recently as a result of school violence. I hope the visit from the President will help heal the wounds and ease the suffering. He is right to go to Colorado, just as he went to Oklahoma and has gone to the side of other Americans in other places where tragedy has struck over the last several years. I had hoped that perhaps the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I could place a joint call to the President before he leaves Colorado this afternoon to tell him the Senate is doing its job, the Senate has completed its initial work on the juvenile crime bill, and the Senate is sending the bill to the House for its prompt consideration. I would like for the President to be able to share that news with the people of Colorado and the Nation so that parents and youngsters everywhere can be reassured we are making progress in our work and that the Senate of the United States is acting as the conscience of the Nation.

There is one set of amendments that still threatens final passage of this bill. The Frist-Ashcroft amendment, which proposes modification of IDEA, is a matter of significant controversy and turmoil. Because that amendment threatens completion of the bill, I made a series of suggestions over the last couple of days in an effort to try to avoid that risk to the underlying measure. We need the cooperation of the Republican sponsors of that amendment if we are to complete our work on the juvenile bill today.

We are also working our way through a series of gun-related proposals to the bill. Last week, the Senate adopted a pattern of tabling Democratic amendments one day, and the next day it adopted pieces of those amendments if they were offered by Republicans. I suppose I should be glad to see our amendments finally get in one way or the other, but it is petty to say the amendments aren't worth anything if they are offered by Democrats, but they are wonderful if the same amendment is offered by a Republican. We have to do better. This should be a bipartisan bill.

Unquestionably, the Senate hit a real snag on this bill when it rejected, on a virtual party-line vote, the Lautenberg amendment. They didn't solve the first Craig amendment and Hatch-Craig II, seeking to reconstitute the ill-advised initial votes on the gun show issue.

Senator SCHUMER and I tried to point out problems with the Craig amendment, only to be told we were wrong last Wednesday night. In fact, we were told in fairly scathing terms how wrong we were. Of course, the next morning after the press looked at it, and after the Senate adopted the initial Craig amendment, it was clear to almost all throughout the country that mistakes had been made, the Senator from New York and I were correct, and matters needed to be fixed. So we saw another partial fix.

Today, we will see yet a third Republican amendment seeking to rectify what the Senate did when it rejected the Lautenberg amendment in favor of the Craig amendment last week. The Smith-Jeffords amendment is the most recent Republican amendment in that series of Republican amendments making corrections. As President Reagan said in another context, ''There you go again.'' Unfortunately, the Smith-Jeffords amendment closes only 2 of the 13 loopholes created by adoption of the Craig and the Hatch-Craig amendment.

The Smith-Jeffords amendment is baby steps toward background checks. That is what it is, baby steps toward background checks. It closes one loophole by requiring special licensees under Hatch-Craig to conduct background checks on firearm sales at gun shows. It closes the pawnshop loophole by repealing the Hatch-Craig amendment provision that allowed criminals to redeem guns at pawnshops without background checks—the same loophole adopted by the Senate last week.

The Smith-Jeffords amendment still leaves 11 loopholes that were created by adoption of the Craig and Hatch-Craig amendment of last week. The Smith-Jeffords amendment does not close the legal immunity loophole created by the Craig and Hatch-Craig amendments. Those amendments dismiss pending lawsuits against some gun dealers and perhaps even gun manufacturers. Giving gun dealers and manufacturers a get-out-of-jail-free card is wrong.

The Smith-Jeffords amendment does not close the loophole that weakens all background checks at gun shows by giving law enforcement only 24 hours to complete the checks. Most gun shows take place on weekends when courthouses and record departments are closed. Law enforcement may well need the full 3 days to do the job right.

Now, at the rate of the Smith-Jeffords amendment on closing only 2 of the 13 gun show loopholes—the ones the Republicans voted for last week—by closing only 2 of the 13 gun show loopholes at a time, I believe the Republican majority will need to offer 6.5 more amendments to finally fix all the

problems in the amendments they adopted last week. The Senate does not have the luxury of time to follow the ''baby steps toward the background checks'' approach.

Fortunately, Senators LAUTENBERG and KERREY are offering the Senate another chance to right this matter by adoption of the modified version of the Lautenberg amendment this morning. The Lautenberg and Kerrey amendment closes all 13 gun show loopholes. I hope we will finally step past party labels and close all 13 loopholes.

If we hear that we have already voted on this matter, be careful. We did. It was tabled. But didn't we find after that more loopholes were opened up? We have to come back. Let's close the loopholes once and for all. After all, the Senator from New Jersey should be commended for offering the Senate a second chance to do the right thing.

We have had three amendments on the subject from the other side, first opening huge loopholes, and now—and I commend Senator SMITH for trying to close the same loopholes that he voted for last week. I hope that all Members will step back from the heat of the debate and vote on the merits of these proposals. They can be corrected today. The way to do that is to vote for the Lautenberg-Kerrey amendment and close all the loopholes—not the baby steps but the one giant step.

Let's not keep coming back, and let's not be in a position we seem to put ourselves in. We open up huge loopholes, the American public reacts with great unanimity against those loopholes, and then we come back and say let's close a few and wait and see what the reaction is. Let's do what the American people are saying: Close all the loopholes.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the vote we are about to take is about compromise. It is an attempt to try to get a bipartisan bill. It is about finding common ground to resolve an issue vital to the Nation. We should join together and show the American people that it is in a bipartisan manner that the Senate can responsibly deal with the issue of guns.

As a Senator who voted for the Brady bill, I understand the importance of background checks. I understand the need to keep firearms from felons. I have long supported the concept of background checks at gun shows.

This amendment mandates that every gun transaction at a gun show must include a background check, period. There are no loopholes. This is not a smokescreen. This is strict language, strong language, that will force gun sellers and purchasers to follow responsible actions in trading and selling guns.

The system we created with this amendment mandates that people purchase firearms legally and, therefore, go through the background check. It is time to tell gun owners and buyers to be responsible. It is time to show the Nation that we understand their concerns and we are acting.

The tragic shooting at Littleton and today in Atlanta further demonstrates the need for both sides to come together and to work on this issue to find a common solution to the escalating level of school violence.

The amendment Senator SMITH and I are offering will help ensure that timely background checks are performed on a purchase of firearms at gun shows. The Smith-Jeffords amendment should bring this Senate together with the common goal of any illegal firearm sales. The amendment is a bold, bipartisan step and should be adopted. Now is the time for action. Now is the time for reason to prevail over rhetoric. Now is the time to show our Nation's parents that we can get together and end this senseless violence.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise first to thank the cosponsor of this amendment, Senator JEFFORDS; and also Senator MCCAIN, who was instrumental in helping me and others to bring attention to the need to get a bill we can be proud of and that actually works.

Second, I extend my condolences, my thoughts, my prayers to the people of Atlanta. I know whereof they suffer this terrible day. It was a year ago, and a few days, that Oregon, in Springfield, at Thurston High School, suffered a similar tragedy. Now we must add Atlanta to the roll of Littleton and Springfield and Jonesboro and Paducah and many other places.

We stand here today as elected representatives of the people of the United States, to try to do right by them. But too often in this Chamber the focus seems to suggest there is only one answer and that answer is to go after guns. But the problem is so much deeper than that. I am willing to admit there are things we can do, and things we are doing now, that will separate law-abiding citizens and gun owners from the fanatics and the kooks and the criminals, the dangerous and the deranged in our society. We do not want them to have guns. We do not want obtaining guns to be easy for them. But we want to construct a system that encourages the law abiding to come and participate in an instant check, a system that encourages, that incentivizes, and does not just regulate and drive things into the back alley and into the parking lot.

The amendment that Senator JEFFORDS and I offer today does two very simple things. We do close the pawnshop loophole. We use the very language of my colleague and friend from New York, Senator SCHUMER, to go back to current ATF regulation to make sure if someone comes in and hocks his gun he cannot then go, commit a felony, and then retrieve that gun without a background check. I have no intention of leaving that loophole open. We are going to close it today.

Second, because there is a dispute as to the Hatch-Craig language in terms of licensees, we are clarifying that. We are saying simply those in the new Federal firearms dealer category of a ''special licensee'' must comply with all dealer provisions of the Gun Control Act and always do a background check with no exceptions.

This morning we have heard there are apparently 13 additional loopholes. Let me suggest the difference between our amendment and theirs. What our amendment does is incentivize. What their amendment does is regulate. The special licensee, if he obeys the law, comes in and is entitled to an instant check, access to the instant check system. He is not charged a fee, because we are not interested in increasing taxes here. He is immune from civil liability and fines of up to $10,000 and 5 years in prison. We are trying to get people to understand we want them to come in. We do not want to drive them into the back alley and into the parking lot and into the street. We want them to come in, in the light of day, because they are proud of their second amendment rights, and will protect their second amendment rights through instant check.

Let me tell you what else we do. There is a huge difference between this amendment and the one my friend from New Jersey is proposing. He is allowing for 72-hour checks. If it takes 72 hours to get a background check, it is not an instant check. If you have ever been pulled over for a traffic violation, you know the policeman will check your car, check your license, check your registration, and he will find out if there is any additional reason, other than a traffic violation, to hold you. We have instant check now. Why do we not make instant check available to people who are exercising their second amendment rights? I want to be real clear: 72 hours is not an instant. We are going down to 24 hours because we want to incentivize this Government to finally go to work and produce instant check, make it available.

One of the most appalling revelations to come out of the tragedies of Littleton is that gun laws are not prosecuted by this administration. We can pass all the laws in the world on guns but if they are not enforced they are of little value to this country. So, where it makes sense to add, we are adding. But we call on the administration also to enforce. If we enforce our laws, we will begin to make them efficacious; we will begin to change conduct.

But there is an important additional reason for supporting this amendment versus that of the Senators from New Jersey. Many States, as we speak, my own included, are debating the issue of gun shows, are debating the issue of instant check. You and I know very well that law enforcement takes place where crimes occur, at the local level. There are Governors and legislators

who are working with gun advocates, gun opponents, and police forces who are trying to come up with definitions that will work for their States and their localities. That is happening as we are talking. It is happening in my State. If we go to Senator LAUTENBERG's definition, all we would do is nullify much of the work that has already been done and has been passed into law. I am saying we should not do that. Because law enforcement, while we have a role, will remain primarily a local concern because it is locally administered.

So I would like to trust the States, to leave them some room, some discretion to fix this problem on their terms, in ways that work in their communities. We cannot know it all here, even though we too often pretend to. So, if you care about the issue of States rights and law enforcement, Smith-Jeffords is the way to vote. If you want Washington to dictate every principle and every definition, then Senator LAUTENBERG's approach is the way to do it.

There is another reason. I talked about incentives. I congratulate the Senator from New Jersey. His amendment today is much better than the one I proudly voted against on Wednesday night. That one made sure taxes were raised, Government bureaucracies were built, and everybody in sight got sued. What we are trying to do is not raise taxes, not grow Government, and to provide some immunity, therefore some incentives to get people to comply with these laws. We call upon this administration to enforce these laws.

I hope my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, will vote for this amendment. We are using Senator SCHUMER's language. I thank him for that. It works. It clarifies. It ties it up. But if you try to tighten every loophole you see, I promise you the effect of your work today will be to create a black market, an underground, a back alley business, a parking lot exchange. I want them to come inside.

Because second amendment rights do come with second amendment responsibilities, let's make it easier; let's not make it harder. We are doing this in this amendment. We are applying instant check, we are trusting the States, and we are not growing Government. We are protecting kids in the schools, we are protecting the second amendment right to bear arms, we are protecting law-abiding citizens, and we are getting after the kooks and the criminals, the deranged and the dangerous who haunt our society, to make sure this is not a huge loophole that will give them access to dangerous weaponry.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for this amendment and vote against the Lautenberg amendment. It is too much and it will drive this issue into the back alley.

Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield my remaining 5 minutes—I believe I have 5 minutes—to the Senator from New York. He is going to speak right before the Senator from New Jersey who, under the original order, is guaranteed time in any event.

Mr. SCHUMER. I now, in the 5 minutes yielded to me generously by the Senator from Vermont—I believe I have 20 minutes. I will speak for 10—I will control 10 and yield 10 to the Senator.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. To be sure, the Parliamentarian may be able to tell us. How much time will we have on the Smith and Lautenberg amendments combined?

Mr. SCHUMER. I believe there are 20 minutes left, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 20 minutes total. The majority has 15 minutes 58 seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. And the Senator yields——

Mr. SCHUMER. I will be yielding 10 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this morning while we are compromising with the gun lobby, ambulances are rushing to Heritage High School to save children from another shooting. It is profoundly disheartening. How much longer are we going to embrace the gun lobby instead of the mothers and fathers of America? Why are we compromising on such simple issues?

It should not have taken us a week to come to the view that we should close the gun show loophole. It never should have been opened, and it now should be closed, and it should be closed cleanly and simply by passing the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

We are making progress. At the beginning of the week, we started way apart, and because of the American public, we have come closer and closer together. I commend my colleague from Oregon. He has adopted language which I believe closes the pawnshop loophole. That is a major step in the right direction.

But, I say to my colleagues, there are other loopholes to close, and this very morning when there has been another shooting, why are we afraid to close those as well?

There is the new 24-hour loophole when the instant check system does not work, when the records are not immediately available, the FBI says they need 72 hours to check to see if the person asking for the gun is a felon. We now make it 24 hours. If a gun show is held on Saturday, there is no way—no way—to check. So what we will have is felons getting guns at gun shows. We will have children even being able to buy guns in many different ways.

The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is simple. If we want to do it, let's do it. Let's not do an elaborate minuet where we take one step forward, two steps back, two steps forward, three steps back. That is what we have been doing this week. Yes, we are making progress, but on such a modest amendment like closing the gun show loophole, why does it take us 7 days of debate? Why does it take three different fixes that still do not close all the loopholes?

It is time for this body to come clean. It is time for this body to simply say, yes, we believe in the right to bear arms, but we also believe there are practical limitations that do not interfere with the rights of legitimate gun owners that we can make, and we can make them forthrightly and cleanly without all of these tiny baby steps.

I guarantee you, the American people are fed up with compromises with the gun lobby. Since the beginning of time, some teenagers have been crazy and angry and mixed up and sometimes disturbed, but they have never been armed. Until now, a teenager who was truly disturbed had his fists, and there might be a broken thumb and there might be black-and-blue eyes. There would not be dead children being taken out of our schools in every corner of America.

There are still loopholes, significant loopholes, that will be left in the law if we do not vote for the Lautenberg amendment. We can close them. We can stand up to the gun lobby. If anything, the actions this morning should have taught us that winking at the NRA and then smiling at the American people just produces more carnage.

It is not hard, it is not technically difficult, and it is not bureaucratic. The law for licensed dealers has worked since 1968. The Brady law has worked since 1993. It has prevented 250,000 felons from buying guns. What are we saying now? At a gun show, maybe; the FBI doesn't need 72 hours to check when it fails.

What the heck is going on in this country? Why do we let the gun lobby continue to pry open more loopholes for the Klebolds and the Harrises to crawl through? Because those who want to get guns for illicit purposes have ways to do it. Even if Lautenberg should be adopted—and I pray to God that it is—they will have means. But let's at least do our best to close those loopholes.

This week has been a week of both encouragement and discouragement for the American people. There has been encouragement. Because of the efforts of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Arizona, we are closing the pawnshop loophole, but it is discouraging overall, Mr. President. It is discouraging that it takes us such time to close a simple loophole like the gun show loophole and not do it cleanly and not do it completely. It is discouraging that when we close certain loopholes, somehow we feel obligated to open two or three more. It is discouraging that the gun lobby still seems to rule the roost, not in America, not in urban, suburban, or rural America, but here in this Congress.

I am going to support the Smith amendment because it does close the pawnshop loophole, but I am going to vote for, and urgently and prayerfully urge my colleagues to support, the Lautenberg amendment because it does not open or leave open other loopholes.

This is a test of the soul of America. I watched television this morning, and I said to myself: What is going on in America? The American people are asking themselves not only what is going on in America, they are asking, What is going on in the Senate of the United States? Let us show courage. Let us step up to the plate. Let us be strong, let us close the gun show loophole, let us not open new loopholes, and then let us move to do the other things that will prevent children and criminals from getting guns.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be an extra 6 minutes per side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, this morning we stand on the floor of the Senate in the wake of another shooting at a high school in America. My colleague from New York has just said in rather plaintive but appropriate terms: What's wrong in America?

We know there is something desperately wrong. Yes, we struggle with this problem here. I do not question the sincerity of anyone who comes to the floor today to debate this issue. But it is very important for some of us to stand and make as clear as we possibly can the differences between the amendments about which we are talking.

The reason there are an alleged 13 loopholes in the Craig-Hatch amendment is because there are 13 paragraphs, and the other side would suggest the whole thing is a loophole. That is simply not true—it has never been true—because, as the Senator from Oregon says, we are attempting to craft a very fine but important constitutional line between law-abiding citizens and their right to own guns unfettered by a Federal Government and the criminal who will seek and find a gun anywhere he or she wants and, of course, the disaffected youth of America who in some way find it necessary to express their frustrations or their sicknesses with the use of a firearm.

What the other side has not said, but what they whisper loudly, is: The second amendment is a loophole. Let's wink and nod at it and then try to close it up.

I cannot do that. I really do believe in our Constitution and I do believe that law-abiding citizens have rights. I must tell you, the other side is winking and nodding and saying: Oh, yes, they have rights, but we will close all of the doors up to that right and see if you can find the key to get through.

So we came to the floor a week ago and began to strike a balance, recognizing that those constitutional rights must stand supreme for the law-abiding citizen, because the law-abiding citizen, in owning a gun under that right, accepts the responsibility of that gun.

The Senator from New York is right; all he wants to do will not stop the criminal from getting a gun, because it never has. It is law enforcement that stops the criminal. It is the handcuff provision of this bill that says to Janet Reno: Put your cops on the street and arrest the criminal who uses the gun. Janet Reno, your record of law enforcement is dismal. You have winked and nodded at the law. And now it is time you wide-eyedly move to the streets and arrest the criminal who uses the gun.

That is what the juvenile crime bill says. It says it loudly. It says it very clearly. Let's not wink and nod at our Constitution. Let's go at the criminal element of our society. Let's not create the kind of provision that the Lautenberg amendment does. It is not 72 hours; it is the old 3-day waiting period. Even that side said, once we get instant check, that goes away. That is what the law said. Now they want it back, even though we tried to honor our legal citizens by providing an instant check system.

That is what the Congress has said for a decade: We will fund it. We will implement it. And we will demand that it be used. The law-abiding citizens, the gun owners of America, in gun-owning America, say: We agree. There is no argument there.

So as the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee worked with his committee and here on the floor to craft a juvenile crime bill, it is so tragic that the other side tried to make it a gun control bill only.

Let's see what we did. We put juvenile Brady in the bill. We said to violent juveniles: You lose all of your constitutional rights when you act violently as a juvenile felon.

We have gone after gangs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the distinguished Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CRAIG. I ask my chairman for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. CRAIG. We have gone after gangs. We have gone after the juvenile offender. We have built in youth protection. We are concerned about gun safety.

This Senate has put in gun laws. The Senator from Vermont said: OK, if you don't believe CRAIG and HATCH, let's say it one more time for the record: People who sell guns at gun shows will do background checks on those who purchase guns.

I am sorry I sound as if I am stuttering, but that is what the other side demanded, that we say it again. And we have said it again. We have not changed the law; we just said it again for the record. I hope that is enough.

We are going after crime control. We are giving our schools of America the tools of safety. If they had those tools maybe in Georgia this morning it might have worked.

So I hope we will withstand the vote on the Lautenberg amendment, vote it down, and let the Craig-Hatch amendment stand with its corrections——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. CRAIG. And serve the law-abiding citizens of America as we search out the criminal element.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise in strong support of the Lautenberg amendment. It would close a number of serious loopholes that were created by the Hatch-Craig amendment. As the Hatch-Craig amendment stands today, any number of places where people could buy large quantities of guns would not be deemed gun shows, would not be subject to these types of regulations. The Lautenberg amendment closes that loophole.

The Lautenberg amendment would allow for 72 hours in certain circumstances for background checks. That is absolutely necessary. As the Senator from New York said, on a Saturday, when many of these gun shows take place, there is no possible way of doing a 24-hour background check.

It would also allow the individual who is a weapons dealer to be subject to liability if they are not following the law. That is very critical.

All of these provisions together are in the Lautenberg amendment. That is an amendment the American people support overwhelmingly, because they want a structure of laws that actually protects their children and does not simply provide some slick cover for the gun lobby. They want their children protected. They want us to do it in a sensible way. They want us to pass laws which are not cynical exercises in self-preservation but will actually protect the children of America.

The Lautenberg amendment will do this. I strongly support it. Gun control is absolutely essential to the process of protecting children, but so many of these incidents we have seen—as just this morning—show that we also need to take preventative action to ensure that children, with or without access to firearms, do not feel self-destructive

and destructive of others. That is part of this overall legislation. In fact, we could do much more. Today we are here to make a clear choice between laws that work to protect children and an exercise in simply protecting the gun lobby. I support the Lautenberg amendment.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KERREY. I thank the chairman, Mr. President.

The largest gun dealer in the State of Nebraska is Guns Unlimited. The owner of that operation is a man by the name of Tom Nichols. I turned to Tom when this legislation was first introduced and when the issue of gun control came up because I trust him. I believe that he understands what works and what does not work.

As I said on this amendment when I first came to the floor, I have supported things that work. If I believe it is going to make the public safer, I will support it. If I don't think it will work, and that all we are doing is sort of a political figleaf, which happens from time to time on these issues, then I am not going to support it, because all we are going to do is add regulatory friction or interference with people who are law-abiding citizens, and it is just an irritant; it does not do anything other than perhaps make our press releases sound a little bit better.

But I asked Tom about this amendment. I have great respect for the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Vermont. I think they have come a long way in closing the loophole on pawnshops, which is very important, because oftentimes people who are criminals or who have guns that they have stolen will go to a pawnshop and pawn the gun. They need to have a background check done.

There is still a significant weakness in this amendment. Again, I urge colleagues to vote for the Smith-Jeffords amendment—or is it Jeffords-Smith, whatever it is. I urge them to vote for that and to vote for the Lautenberg-Kerrey amendment.

Here is the reason why. In the words of Tom Nichols, the owner of the largest gun shop in the State of Nebraska—he sells more handguns and other kinds of guns than anybody in the State of Nebraska—80 percent of the people who come in to buy a gun in his shop are cleared in 24 hours. The instant check system gets them just like that. These are the law-abiding citizens. These people have absolutely nothing in their background at all that would indicate there is any kind of a problem. But, he said, the people of greatest concern aren't those 80 percent. The people of greatest concern are the ones who take a longer period of time, require a special agent to get into their background to find out what is going on.

If it is only 24 hours, what is going to happen is, yes, the law-abiding citizens will be OK; you will clear those out with no trouble at all. But those aren't the people who are the problem. Those people are getting cleared out in the 24-hour instant check, just like that. It is the people who require a little bit more work who are the ones we want to deny the opportunity to own a gun.

I urge colleagues, as they come down here, if you really want to try to change the law to increase public safety, my recommendation is to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Vermont, but then also vote for the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Jersey and myself. Ask your own gun dealers why and who and what happens with that additional 48 hours. They will tell you. The answer is, that is when you get the people who are the biggest problem. That is when you create the most public safety with the Brady bill background checks.

I understand that this issue has been highly charged and there has been a lot of heat and rhetoric and hard feelings on both sides which has occurred as a consequence of that. But if you are trying to write a law that will increase public safety, that will decrease the number of Americans who are either felons or dangerous or have something else in their background but own guns, I urge Senators to vote for both of these amendments, which we will have an opportunity to do, I guess, in about 10 minutes.

Again, I thank the Senator from New Jersey and others who have taken the leadership on this. I thank, again, Tom Nichols from Guns Unlimited in Nebraska. You put yourself out a little bit in this kind of situation. He is basically saying we need to have a level regulatory playing field. You have 2,000 or 3,000 gun shows a year. The Senators from Oregon and Vermont will allow instant checks for those gun shows, but we need that other 48 hours in order to be able to level the playing field between licensed gun dealers and gun shows. That is all we are doing.

There is no more money that they will be paying in, no more regulatory burden. It merely levels the playing field so people who buy a gun in a gun show and people who buy a gun from a licensed dealer will have to go through the same thing. If you want to make Americans safe, I urge you to vote for both of these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I inquire, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has 16 minutes, and the Senator from New Jersey has 9 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Is there anybody on their side who cares to speak at this time, or should I?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I would like to give the proponents time.

Mr. HATCH. I am happy to do that.

We are hearing a lot in the media and on the floor of the Senate demonizing those who believe in the second amendment, those who strive to protect the rights of American citizens. The sincere steps taken today to try to find a middle ground are slapped aside by some. And, quite frankly, I find that to be discouraging and dispiriting.

I still hold out hope that the Littleton shooting can bring out the best in all of us. We have come together on some issues and have before us a bill that responds to Littleton and does so in a way which respects the rights of law-abiding citizens. But to suggest, as one of our colleagues did yesterday, that in defending the second amendment rights of law-abiding citizens the Senate is ''whistling past the graveyard of Littleton'' is contemptible, in my view. Given what is in this bill already, how can anyone in good conscience really say such a thing.

If today's shooting in Atlanta isn't a wake-up call to those who want to play politics with this bill, I don't know what is.

Americans still believe that gun ownership is a basic right of our people. If any community would change its views as a result of the Littleton shooting, it would be the residents of Colorado, where prior to the shooting 70 percent believed firearms ownership was a basic right. Has support for gun control increased in Colorado? No, just the opposite. A recent poll found that 75 percent of Coloradans believe gun ownership is a basic right. The people of Colorado and elsewhere recognize that this is a complex problem and that going on a gun control feeding frenzy is not the answer. Those who think otherwise should take a deep breath, take stock in what we have accomplished to date with this bill, and bring this bill to passage, because this bill can have a dramatic effect on helping us to resolve some of these problems with teen violence in our society today.

We have had a vigorous and lengthy debate about gun shows and how best to limit criminal access to guns at these shows. There have been numerous unnecessary delays on this matter. Today I hope we can bring closure on this matter. This is an evolving process. After several days of debate last week, Republicans took a step to require background checks at gun shows without substantial cost and without overregulatory burdens.

We all realize our duty to do what is best for our children and to uphold the Constitution of the United States, including the second amendment. We all realize that the political benefits of scoring debating points lasts only for the hour, while the real benefits of protecting our children last for a lifetime.

The evolutionary process continues. The supporters of the Lautenberg amendment have made changes to their proposal to bring it closer to our

plan, and we are proposing the Smith-Jeffords amendment to deal with the pawnshop exemption and to clarify the special licensee provision. Our plan, however, does not impose substantial disincentives to obey the law. My sense and hope is that our efforts will continue to evolve and that we will be able to find common ground, a common ground that protects the rights of law-abiding citizens to legally use guns but punishes criminals who illegally use guns.

There is one firearm-related provision on which I hope we can reach bipartisan agreement. That is the treatment of pawnshops that have traditionally been exempt from the requirement to conduct background checks when they simply return a firearm to its owner.

Contrary to what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska said, if a stolen gun is pawned, it will be discovered when the gun comes into the pawn shop. State law requires pawn shops to notify state or local law enforcement agencies concerning the gun. These state and local agencies then check to determine if the gun is stolen. If the gun is stolen, the police can investigate and, if necessary, arrest the pawning customer. This all happens before the gun is returned to the customer and thus, before a Federal background check would be required.

The pawn shops protested the 1993 Brady law that required them to do a federal background check in addition to the state check they were already doing. Further, they complained about the 3-day waiting period. If a pawn shop had to wait 3 days under the orginal Brady law to conduct a federal background check, it could not return the gun to the customer when the customer repaid the loan. That is why Congress amended the Brady law in 1994 to exempt pawn shops from the requirement to do a federal background check.

The Craig amendment which we passed last Wednesday simply restored the exemption for pawnshops that had been part of the Brady law for 4 years and had been approved by some notable people, even some here on this floor. Thus, the Craig amendment did not effect a major change in law, but a change back to how the Brady law read from 1994 to November 1998 when the exemption lapsed as the instant check system became effective.

As I have stated repeatedly, it is my goal to find common ground on these issues. Wherever possible, I want to do what is best for our children and for the public, which is consistent with our oath as Senators to uphold the Constitution. Frankly, I viewed the pawn shop provision as a technical matter, one which should not be politicized. I am glad that Senators SMITH and JEFFORDS have made a bipartisan proposal to resolve this matter so that both sides can get together.

With respect to special licensees, last Wednesday the Senate passed the Craig amendment which provided that persons who wished to engage in the business of selling firearms but just at guns shows must obtain a special Federal license to do so. Subsequently, however, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle complained that the Craig amendment was not clear enough in requiring special licensees to conduct background checks. We have looked at the language and think it is clear.

Nonetheless, to address the concerns of our colleagues, I offered a simple one-page amendment last Friday which made it absolutely clear, beyond any shadow of a doubt, that special licensees were subject to the background check provisions of the Gun Control Act. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle rejected this clarification. Instead of dealing with their concern, they wanted to debate it, and, boy, have they debated it.

Today the Smith-Jeffords amendment contains the clarification I offered last Friday with a bit more explanation. It states:

> Except as to the State and local planning and zoning requirements for a licensed premises as provided in subparagraph (D), a special licensee shall be subject to all of the provisions of this chapter applicable to dealers, including, but not limited to, the performance of an instant background check.

The key language of the amendment states:

> A special licensee shall [not might, but shall] be subject to all [not some, but all] of the provisions of this chapter applicable to dealers, including but not limited to, the performance of an instant background check.

This could not be any clearer. Special licensees must perform a background check before selling a firearm at a gun show. So let's get rid of the talk about loopholes.

The Smith-Jeffords amendment deals in a bipartisan fashion with the pawn shop exemption and with the clarification of the requirement for special licensees to perform background checks.

There has been a lot of talk about loopholes, and the Smith-Jeffords amendment should lay most of that talk to rest. But the biggest loophole for criminals is the lack of enforcement of criminal laws that currently exist by our Attorney General and this administration. If we in Congress pass a law prohibiting a criminal transaction, it is the duty of the Attorney General to enforce it. But she has not. Our bill includes the CUFF program to fund more prosecutions of gun crimes and orders the Attorney General to report on her progress in prosecuting gun crimes. By enforcing criminal statutes, we can protect our children and our schools. If a criminal knows that the statutes we pass will not be enforced, however, we expose our children to more crime.

Let me make a point with these charts. Is this a record to be proud of in this administration? We are quoting the Executive Office of the U.S. Attorneys for these figures. Prosecutions under the Brady Act background checks: In 1996, zero. They claim that the Brady Act stopped 200-some-odd-thousand felons from getting guns. There was not one prosecution in 1996, not one prosecution in 1997, and just one prosecution in 1998.

If there is a loophole, it is in the failure of the Attorney General and the Justice Department to enforce the laws that are already on the books. Yet, you hear this hue and cry for more gun control laws. But this is only for political purposes because they know that their own Attorney General will not enforce these laws.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I wonder if the Senator can address this. He is into this issue, but I think we have to answer the question the Senator from Nebraska has raised, Why do you need the 3 days, 72 hours?

My point really is this. I wonder if this amendment isn't so regulatory that it really isn't trying to end gun shows, and not an attempt to provide the service that we are asking be provided. If they find that there is a question, shouldn't the Justice Department, the FBI, deny the check in 24 hours, 1 hour, or whenever it occurs, and then go investigate it?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator really poses an interesting question. The current law requires no background check for sales at gun shows between non-licensed individuals. For sales by dealers, however, an Instant Check background check is required. If there is a question, the FBI gets 3 days to resolve the question. Of course, because a gun show generally lasts only 3 days, the show will be over by the time the FBI is through checking.

Our bill requires the FBI to resolve any question within 24 hours. This strikes a balance between the time constraints of a gun show and the time needed by the FBI to resolve any Instant Check question.

Further, this is an evolving process. As technology advances and more records are placed on the Instant Check database, the FBI will be able to resolve any question in less than 24 hours.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. If the Senator will yield for another question. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, don't you believe that if the Justice Department needed more resources to do this to provide the service, we would find the ways and means to accommodate them?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator makes a good point. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I will work with the FBI and the ATF to ensure they have the resources to get the job done. We will do everything in our power to find the means to solve these problems.

Mr. President, with respect to the Attorney General's prosecution record, this is not a record to be proud of—this business of prosecutions under Brady. There were zero in 1996, zero in 1997,

and one in 1998. Yet, they want new laws. We are not enforcing the laws we already have.

Is this a record to be proud of? Prosecutions for transfer of handguns or ammunition to a juvenile: This Justice Department, in 1996, had nine prosecutions. We have had that many shootings in the last short while. In 1997, five prosecutions. In 1998, six prosecutions. Why aren't we enforcing the laws that already exist instead of making political points to have a whole bunch of other laws that there is a question whether the Justice Department will enforce?

Let me go into this one. Is this a record to be proud of by this administration? Prosecutions for possession or discharge of a firearm in a school zone. Think about that. In 1996, four prosecutions; in 1997, five; in 1998, eight.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could enforce the laws that are already on the books? We would not have nearly the problems we have today. By the way, this business of prosecutions for transfer of a handgun or ammunition to a juvenile, and others, there are thousands of cases that they know of and there are only these limited number of prosecutions.

Well, Mr. President, the plain fact of the matter is that the revised Lautenberg amendment, though improved to look more like the Republican proposal, is still not as good as the current bill as amended.

The revised Lautenberg amendment still fails to provide qualified immunity to persons who obey the law and act appropriately with firearms, even after the Senate voted on it yesterday to provide qualified immunity when parents properly use child safety locks. The revised Lautenberg amendment still fails to provide tax relief to licensees and others who perform background checks. And the revised Lautenberg amendment still fails to relieve gun show organizers of substantial new recordkeeping requirements. It is very unfair.

Thus, the revised Lautenberg amendment is a small step in the right direction, and I sincerely appreciate that step. However, in my view, it fails to go far enough.

The revised Lautenberg amendment will change an unregulated market into a very heavily regulated market overnight. In fact, by imposing this much regulation, without providing any immunity or tax protection, and without any provision for licensing temporary dealers, the revised Lautenberg amendment will create a black market in gun trading, because people will not go to the gun shows, they will go into the streets and do it. By creating a black market in gun trading, the revised Lautenberg amendment will inevitably promote gun sales where there are no Federal licenses, no records, and no background checks. We do not need a black market, but we need a free market with reasonable, nonburdensome regulations where buyers and sellers have incentives to comply with the law.

Mr. President, the current bill with the Smith-Jeffords amendment will strike the appropriate balance between the legitimate interests of law-abiding citizens to own, buy, and sell lawful products and the public interest in preventing criminals from obtaining guns. The powerful incentives included in our plan will ensure that persons will comply with the mandatory background check requirement on all sales at every gun show. The Republican plan also gives law-abiding gun owners the peace of mind that they have not inadvertently transferred a firearm to a felon, and strongly encourages the Attorney General to begin prosecuting the criminals who have violated the existing gun laws.

Mr. President, this juvenile justice bill is too important to our country's schools, parents, and children to be held up by endless debates.

Only this morning, we heard of another shooting in Georgia. So far, thank goodness, there have been no reports of death.

We have to stop debating and pass this bill. We have had enough delays. We need to protect our students and our schools now. We in the Senate have an opportunity to take a major step toward protecting our children by passing the juvenile crime bill. Our country needs it. We should do it in a bipartisan way, and we need to do it today.

I reserve the remainder of our time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senate has spent the past week attempting to clean up the mess that our Republican colleagues have made over the gun show loophole. Now, again we have a chance to do the job correctly, by closing the gun show loophole the right way, not the NRA way.

As they say in the circus, it's a big job cleaning up after a big elephant, especially when the National Rifle Association is the trainer of the elephant.

The first two attempts by our Republican colleagues to close the gun show loophole were a travesty. They left the loophole open, and they created new loopholes while they were doing it.

While the Senate dithers, the need grows greater. Gun violence has struck again at one of the nation's schools—this time at a school in a suburb of Atlanta.

Enough is enough. We will decide today whether the United States Senate is serious about closing the gun show loophole, or whether we will continue to allow young people to have almost unlimited access to guns.

The Lautenberg amendment will close this deadly loophole in our gun laws, and close it all the way, not just part of the way.

The Smith amendment only goes part way. It closes the loophole our Republican friends opened for pawn shops last week—but it leaves unchanged the other serious loopholes that put guns in the wrong hands at gun shows.

Our Republican colleagues still refuse to close another major loophole they created last week—the 24 hour loophole, which makes a farce out of the background checks on gun purchasers.

These background checks have kept thousands of guns out of the hands of criminals and others who have no business owning guns. But the NRA opposes that law, so it wants to undermine it in a way that will protect illegal transactions at gun shows.

The Lautenberg amendment closes this loophole too.

Our Republican colleagues still refuse to close a third loophole they created last week, which makes it much more difficult for police to trace guns used by criminals. They have set up a new class of gun dealers called ''special registrants,'' who can sell as many guns as they want to anyone they want, without keeping the records needed to trace guns used in crimes.

The Lautenberg amendment closes this loophole, too.

Since the tragedy in Littleton, parents and children across the country have lived in fear that their school—their community—could be next. Now, it has happened in Georgia. On some days in recent weeks, parents have kept their children away from school in an effort to shelter them from violence.

Families cannot continue to live this way—in constant fear that their children and their school could be the next gun battleground.

There is only one way to close the gun show loophole, and that's to adopt the Lautenberg amendment.

In a few minutes, we will have two important votes. The Senate can act on the urgent needs of the American people, or it can continue to play ostrich—head in the sand, ignoring the national crisis of gun violence.

It is clear that the overwhelming majority of the American people want Congress to pass responsible gun control measures. Eighty-nine percent of the people say that it is important for this country to pass stricter gun control laws.

Now, we have the opportunity to get it right. Gun laws work. The facts speak for themselves. It is time—long past time—for the Senate to act, to say enough is enough is enough is enough.

I thank the Senator from New Jersey and hope his amendment will be accepted.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I, first of all, want to say to my colleagues on the other side—to Senator

SMITH, to Senator JEFFORDS, to Senator GREGG, to Senator HATCH—I really do appreciate the fact that they are trying to arrive at a consensus. I think what was said in the earlier presentation was that it is a bipartisan agreement. I wonder whether parents in Littleton, CO, care whether it is bipartisan or not, or whether it is a compromise or not. What they want to make sure of is that it never happens again, as it did this morning in Georgia.

It is a pity we are discussing whether or not there is too much regulation, or whether or not the law enforcement people are hard at work. I want them to look at the statistics. We will talk about that in just a minute. That is not the issue. The issue is, do you want to save lives, or do you want to save the NRA? Do you want to permit them to continue to oppose all sensible legislation?

There are people sitting here, I am sure, who have children at home and they don't want to worry about them when they go to school. That is the issue. What are we talking about here? Eighty-nine percent of the American people say they want the gun loopholes closed—finally shut. What do you think the percentage might be out of Georgia today, or out of Colorado, or out of Pearl, MS; or Paducah, KY; or Springfield? What do you think the percentage of those families are? I will bet you it is 100 percent.

We know one thing. It was admitted by the distinguished Senator from Idaho, or at least suggested—not admitted. He said 40 percent of the people who buy guns at gun shows do so without any identification at all. ''Buyers anonymous.'' Buy your gun. Don't tell anybody who you are. Forty percent, by my calculation. It is around 800,000 guns a year. Maybe I am wrong by 100,000 or 150,000. Over 5 million handguns are sold in this country each and every year.

Mr. President, I want us to stand up to the American people and say we care more about your kids; we care more about your family; we care more about violence in this country than we do about whether or not this one gets credit, or whether it looks like we are imposing an extra burden.

I want to talk about the burdens for just a moment and talk about Federal gun prosecutions. The distinguished Members on that side will say they are down. I would tell you this: Twenty-five percent more criminals are sent to prison for State and Federal weapons offenses than in 1992. That is because we work more closely with our partners in State and local law enforcement.

Look at the result. Stop looking at the process. Look at where we want to come out. Overall violence and property crimes are down by 20 percent. The murder rate is down 28 percent—the lowest level in 30 years. We have accomplished something. Do you know why? Because we are asking questions about guns. Yes. There are things wrong in our culture. There certainly are. But I look at our culture, and I look at other nations which are well developed. We have 35,000 Americans killed each year with firearms compared to 15 in Japan—15 people—30 in Great Britain. Just take the murder side of that—homicides, almost 14,000; suicides, 18,000. That happens, I guess, in other countries. But I am sure it doesn't happen to the same extent with guns.

When we hear our friends decrying this extension of time that is needed to get your mitts on a gun, why should we slow down the process? Somebody wants a gun. They give it to them. That is what they are saying.

I will tell you something. If they read the law carefully—the Lautenberg law—then they would see that the law limiting enforcement to 24 hours for gun show background checks is only if—72 hours; forgive me—only if there is some detection in the first minutes that something is wrong. If there is nothing wrong, you can have a gun in 5 minutes. Is that quick enough? Is a day quick enough? I think it is quick enough for the American people. Ask those in Littleton and ask them in other places how quickly the guns ought to be available.

No, Mr. President, we are missing the boat. We are arguing about process while we are exposing more and more of our kids to accessibility to guns. It is not right. The Lautenberg amendment closes the loopholes once and for all.

Again, I commend Senators SMITH and JEFFORDS for closing the pawnshop loophole, but they don't close all of the loopholes. There is still limited liability for gun sellers. There are still people who are going to be able to buy guns without registering them. They are not registering without going through a background check. They are not insisting that everybody go through a background check, and they are not insisting that 24 hours be extended to 72 for normal purchases.

I think what we ought to do is say once and for all—I hope my colleagues will respond—to the American people, enough of the debate about the process. The process is fair.

We are not talking about increasing taxes.

We are not talking about increasing the bureaucracy.

I would like to mention one thing—that even as our friends talk about more enforcement being the difference, the fact is that when we tried to hire 280 new ATF agents, requesting over $10 million to hire those people, and over 40 new Federal prosecutors as well, the NRA has never supported backing its tough talk with real money for State, local and Federal law enforcement agencies to investigate, arrest and prosecute. They like to talk about it here. But they don't want to pay for it.

It is time to face up to reality. One is we are going to probably pass the Smith-Jeffords amendment with an overwhelming vote. That is OK, because it starts the process. But it doesn't complete the process. The process will be complete when the Lautenberg amendment is passed, and I hope we have enough courage in this room to stand up and say, ''Yes, I vote for the Lautenberg amendment.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the President.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Utah has 42 seconds.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will be very brief.

The fact of the matter is that the overwhleming majority of instant checks can be completed in a matter of minutes. If the instant check system approves the purchase, it will do so quickly. If the instant check system disappoves the purchase, it will do so quickly. The problem is the portion that instead of being approved or disapproved, raise a question. Under the 24-hour rule, the Justice Department has to work harder to resolve questions for gun show instant checks. This is because the gun show will be over in 3 days. If you allow 3 days to resolve questions for gun show checks, the questions will not be resolved until after the gun show is over. It means private people are going to take their guns to the streets and sell them there. It means a black market. It means more problems—more accessibility to those who are unsavory in our society to guns.

I can't imagine why people can't see this, because it is as clear as the nose on anybody's face. The politics of it is more important than seeing the truth.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin make a unanimous consent request not related to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, on the rollcall vote on the McConnell amendment No. 365 to S. 254, I voted no. I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as voting in favor of the McConnell amendment. Changing my vote will not affect the final outcome of that vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I hope Senators in voting for Smith-Jeffords will realize it is only a baby step towards background checks.

If they really want to close all 13 loopholes, they also have to vote for the Lautenberg amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment pending before the Senate is amendment 366, as modified, by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CRAIG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 366.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The result was announced— yeas 79, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 133 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Abraham	Feinstein	Mack
Akaka	Fitzgerald	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Gorton	Mikulski
Bayh	Graham	Moynihan
Bennett	Grassley	Murkowski
Biden	Gregg	Murray
Bingaman	Harkin	Reed
Bond	Hatch	Reid
Boxer	Hollings	Robb
Breaux	Hutchinson	Roberts
Brownback	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Bryan	Inouye	Roth
Bunning	Jeffords	Santorum
Byrd	Johnson	Sarbanes
Chafee	Kennedy	Schumer
Cleland	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kerry	Snowe
Conrad	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Edwards	Lincoln	
Feingold	Lugar	

NAYS—21

Allard	Enzi	Nickles
Burns	Gramm	Sessions
Campbell	Grams	Shelby
Cochran	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Helms	Stevens
Craig	Inhofe	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Thompson

The amendment (No. 366), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 362

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Lautenberg amendment.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask the Parliamentarian, is there a moment allotted for discussion of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In addressing the question of the Senator from New Jersey, there is no provision for comment unless unanimous consent is requested.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, very simply, we have just made a decision to close a couple of the loopholes that existed before on gun show sales, and I commend the Senators who offered the amendment. But we are still left with significant numbers of people who do not have to have a background check, and that is not the way we want to do it. We want to close all the loopholes.

They have insisted we remove the 72-hour window for investigation of backgrounds, and that is only triggered if there is something that discredits the individual. Otherwise, it is 24 hours or less. If there is nothing on the person's record, the sale goes through.

It is hard to imagine why we cannot take enough time to investigate the prospective buyer sufficiently to make sure we are protecting our people.

That is the issue, and I hope our friends on the Republican side who voted with us last time will continue to vote with us. We could have won this several times if we had support from the Republican side of the aisle. I hope they will demonstrate to the American people that there is concern about limiting access to guns as the citizens of the country want us to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we have debated this at length. The Lautenberg amendment creates more loopholes. It will be more expensive. It is going to increase taxes. And it will be more bureaucratic.

I think it is going to push people into the streets to sell guns on the black market, which I think undermines everything he is trying to do.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question in on agreeing to amendment No. 362. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Akaka	Cleland	Feinstein
Bayh	Conrad	Fitzgerald
Biden	Daschle	Graham
Bingaman	DeWine	Harkin
Boxer	Dodd	Hollings
Breaux	Dorgan	Inouye
Bryan	Durbin	Johnson
Byrd	Edwards	Kennedy
Chafee	Feingold	Kerrey
Kerry	Lugar	Sarbanes
Kohl	Mikulski	Schumer
Landrieu	Moynihan	Torricelli
Lautenberg	Murray	Voinovich
Leahy	Reed	Warner
Levin	Reid	Wellstone
Lieberman	Robb	Wyden
Lincoln	Rockefeller	

NAYS—50

Abraham	Frist	McConnell
Allard	Gorton	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Baucus	Grams	Roberts
Bennett	Grassley	Roth
Bond	Gregg	Santorum
Brownback	Hagel	Sessions
Bunning	Hatch	Shelby
Burns	Helms	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchison	Snowe
Collins	Inhofe	Specter
Coverdell	Jeffords	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Mack	Thurmond
Enzi	McCain	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50. The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative and the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 362) was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Mr. ALLARD assumed the chair.)

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the supplemental appropriations conference report and there be 3 hours for debate, to be equally divided in the usual form, and that it be in order for Senator GRAMM to raise a point of order against the conference report, and at that point there be 30 minutes equally divided in the usual form on the motion to waive.

I further ask that following the conclusion or yielding back of time and the disposition of the motion to waive the Budget Act, if successful, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to amend the consent agreement to allow me to offer a bill immediately following the adoption of the conference report regarding an across-the-board cut in nondefense discretionary spending to offset the supplemental appropriations conference report. I understand that the conference committee has been disbanded since the House of Representatives has voted to adopt the conference report. Therefore, I understand that it will require unanimous consent for the conference report to be amended.

Having said that, I now ask unanimous consent that following the adoption of the conference report, I be recognized to offer a bill that would call for an across-the-board cut in nondefense discretionary funding to offset

the supplemental appropriations conference report, and there be 30 minutes for debate on the bill, to be equally divided, and no amendments or motions in order.

I further ask consent that immediately following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, without any intervening action or debate.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe we are proceeding under a reservation of the right to object. Senator ENZI was explaining his reservation, and he is asking to be recognized to offer a bill that would call for an across-the-board cut in the appropriations process in order to pay for the additional funding here. Is that the gist of the Senator's reservation of the right to object?

Mr. ENZI. Yes. There are a few questions we want to ask in regard to reserving this.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I want to note my support for what Senator ENZI is stating, and that I am concerned that what we have in the underlying bill is not paid for and we ought to have appropriate offsets to this supplemental. It is an important supplemental bill, but I am reserving the right to object and I am saying that we should pay for this. It should be offset with other cuts in nondefense discretionary and domestic spending.

We have a $15 billion supplemental appropriations bill. We are asking in the nondefense areas that there be offsets to that. This is not a major thing for us to do. I think it is fully appropriate that we move forward and have offsets taking place in this supplemental bill. There is important spending taking place in the supplemental that I think is appropriate. There is some for my home State and the disaster we had. But let's pay for it. That is why I am reserving the right to object.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, also reserving the right to object, I share Senator ENZI's concern and making this UC request to introduce a bill that would allow us to have offsets. We have an appropriations bill, as so often is the case with these emergency spending bills that come before us, traveling like a freight train. The ''freight train'' has little stowaways hidden all through it. So in the very short period of time that I began to look at some of the little stowaways hidden on this ''freight train,'' I found $1.8 million for safety renovations of the O'Neill House Office Building, $1.9 million for the Northeast Multi-Species Fishery, $250,000 for the L.A. Civic Center, $1.5 million for the University of DC, and $3.76 million for the House page dormitory. These may all be good things, but they are certainly not going through the right process.

There is $100 million for aid to Jordan; $77 million to the Census Bureau, Postal Service, USTR, et cetera. The Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians gets $22 million. I don't see how that can be termed an emergency coming before us. There is $8 million dollars for an access road to Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota. On and on go these little stowaways. There is a high school, White River High School, which receives $239,000.

The point is, Mr. President, we have a process that is being perverted, a process that is being circumvented.

Mr. DORGAN. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for.

Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

Mr. GRAMS. Reserving the right to object, I also rise in strong support of Mr. ENZI——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has no right to reserve the right to object when the regular order has been called for. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. In light of the objection, I renew my request for time agreements on the supplemental conference report, as stated earlier in my remarks, with 15 minutes of the Democrats' time under Senator DORGAN and 10 minutes of the Republican time under Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, what we have now—if I could explain it to the Senate—we have set aside the juvenile justice bill for now. We are going to do the supplemental appropriations bill. We have a 3-hour time agreement with some specific time set up for individual Senators. We also have a waiver of a point of order, with 30 minutes of time equally divided on that.

So there will be a vote on that point of order and, I presume, the vote on final passage. At that point, it is our intention to go back to the juvenile justice bill.

I say to the Senators who reserved their right to object, I certainly understand why they are doing it. I appreciate it and I want to support their effort. There is no question that more of this bill should have been offset. I know the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is probably in the vicinity, does not agree with that. But I have indicated all along I thought there should be more offsets. To Senators ENZI and BROWNBACK, HUTCHINSON, GRAMS, and perhaps SESSIONS—and I am not quite sure if Senator MCCAIN is here to raise that concern also—I certainly am sympathetic, but there was objection heard from Senator DORGAN.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. DORGAN. I want to observe that the unanimous consent proposal offered by the Senator from Wyoming had not been cleared on our side. We were constrained to object. I also observe, if we are going to establish an order for legislation to be brought to the floor following disposition of the supplemental, for example, we may want to bring to the floor the proposed amendment that died in conference committee by a 14–14 vote dealing with the agricultural fund.

Our point was that there are other priorities as well. But the unanimous consent request had not been served on our side. That is why we were constrained to object.

Mr. LOTT. I wonder if other Senators want me to yield.

I yield the floor.

1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the conference report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1141), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report. (The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of May 14, 1999.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is the conference report accompanying H.R. 1141 before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. That conference report is not amendable? There are no amendments in disagreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I first want to start off by commending the chairman of the House committee, Congressman BILL YOUNG, for his leadership in the conference on this bill. He was the chairman of this conference, and through his efforts we have achieved passage not only by the House but we achieved the result of getting a bill out of committee. Chairman YOUNG and I have worked very closely in the past. He chaired the defense subcommittee before becoming chairman of the full committee. I look forward to continuing that partnership during his tenure as chairman of the House committee.

We face a difficult task in reconciling the funds needed to respond to hurricane damage in Central America, the

Federal Emergency Management Agency and agriculture disasters—those FEMA disasters are national disasters declared by the President—and continued military operations in Kosovo, in Bosnia, in Iraq, and in the high state of alert in South Korea.

This is not an easy period to be chairman of this committee. We have what amounts to four major crises going on at one time. We are trying to maintain our defense capabilities to preserve our interests worldwide. This is very difficult, apparently, for some Members to understand. It is a difficult process, at best, to handle a supplemental and an emergency bill together, but it does take consideration of the Members of the Senate to understand which versions in these bills are emergency and which are just a normal supplemental.

They have been joined together. The President has sent us two bills and the House has passed two bills. They address the needs and the formal requests of the President. The Senate passed one bill, the Central American agriculture bill, in late March, prior to the Easter recess. At that time, before the recess, I urged that we have a chance to come to the floor and pass that supplemental. We knew there was going to be a second supplemental, but we could not get the time on the floor and the Senate did not act on the separate Kosovo package.

Due to the emergency nature of the funding for military operations and the availability of the first bill, it was our intention to merge the two bills into a second single bill in conference, which we have done. That is consistent with rules of the Senate and the House. These were matters which were emergency in nature, and we have added them as emergencies.

Now, as I think Senators are aware, there are many ideas in how we can address other needs in this bill. Supplemental bills have routinely been amended by both the House and the Senate. Questions have been raised about some of the matters in these bills—assuming that we have no right to add any amendments to emergency bills.

Now, this is both a supplemental and an emergency appropriations bill before the Senate. I hope Senators will keep that in mind. As most of the Senators are aware, these matters are brought up by individual Members of the Senate or the House and are considered and adopted by majority vote. I am not that happy about some of the provisions of this bill but, again, I have the duty to carry to the Senate floor those amendments that were included by action of the conferees. I hope Senators will keep that in mind as we proceed.

The conferees decided that some of these matters that are before the Senate and were presented to us should be reserved in the fiscal year 2000 bill, which the Appropriations Committees will start marking up next week. We cannot get to the regular appropriations bills until we conclude the action of the Congress on the supplemental and emergency matters in the bill before the Senate now.

Again, I know there are objections to this bill; there are objections to the process we are following. Many of those objections are brought forward because we do not have a point of order against legislation on appropriations bills.

That is not my doing. I have sought to restore that point of order and I continue to support the concept of that point of order. But we have several matters included in the Senate-passed version of the bill that were deleted by the conference.

One of them was a matter that was very close to my heart, and that is the Glacier Bay provision which was offered by my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI.

What I am saying is there are matters before the Senate some people object to. There are matters not in the bill that people object to, and one of them is that Alaska provision of my colleague. Obviously, a conference report is always a compromise. That is why we go to conference. We have disagreements with what the House has done, the House has disagreements with what we have done, and we meet in conference and try to resolve the problems.

This bill, for instance, contains more money for defense needs than were proposed by the Senate. After we went to conference with the House, we concluded they were right in seeking additional moneys for our defense readiness. There is no question it also contains more funding for refugees and for agricultural relief than was proposed by the House. The House has come towards the position of the Senate on both refugees and agriculture relief. Again, I think that is the process of compromise that should take place in a conference. This conference report needs to be passed today. The men and women of the Armed Forces must understand we support them, regardless of our points of view on the war that is going on in Kosovo.

Refugees ousted from their homes and their country by Serbian atrocities need our help also. I was honored to be able to go with other Members of the Senate to visit Albania. We saw the camps in Macedonia. We visited with the President of Macedonia and the Prime Minister of Albania. We went to see our forces in Aviano—that is our air base in Italy—and we visited with the NATO people in Bosnia.

Many Senators here have also visited the region since that trip I took with my colleagues and Members of the House. There were 21 of us on the first trip. All the Senators who went there know what needs to be done; there is no question in our minds. It is unfortunate we cannot take more people over there to let them see it, because I think uniformly the people who saw the troubles over there are supportive of this bill. We have provided additional funds in this bill for the Kosovo operation and for the victims of the war there in Kosovo. They are sort of an insurance policy.

We have faced this in the past. We went into Bosnia. We were supposed to be there 9 months and be out by Christmas. That is 5 years ago this Christmas. We have had to add money every year, take money from various portions of our appropriations process and pay for the cost of Bosnia.

We also have increased the level of our activity in the Iraq area. Even during the period of the Kosovo operation, there continue to be retaliatory strikes on Iraq because of the their failure to abide by the cease-fire agreement.

In South Korea, the North Koreans are continuing to rattle the cage, as far as we are concerned, and we are on a high level of alert in that area.

What I am telling the Senate again is this bill reflects those pressures on our defense forces. We want those people who are defending this country to know we support them when they are out there in the field representing our interests. The funds provided in excess of the President's request are contingency emergency appropriations for agriculture, for defense, for FEMA and for the refugees. The amounts added by the House and the Senate can only be submitted if the President declares an emergency requirement exists. We are going to get into that question of the emergency requirement here when the Senator from Texas raises his point of order. But we worked in conference very hard to assure adequate resources will be available through the remainder of this fiscal year to meet the needs in the areas we visited, in the Kosovo area, and to meet the needs of the military worldwide. Some of our systems are being taken from the areas I have described before—from South Korea, even from Bosnia and from Iraq—to move them into the area of the conduct of the hostilities in and around Kosovo and Serbia. Those funds that are needed on a global basis are in this bill. Some of them, as we know, the President did not request.

We believe we have taken action. Hopefully we will not have to see another emergency supplemental with regard to the conduct of the Kosovo operation during the period of time we will be working on the regular appropriations bills for the year 2000. In effect, we have reached across and gone in—probably this bill should be able to carry us, at the very least to the end of this current calendar year. The initial requests of the President took us to the end of the fiscal year on September 30.

I am happy to inform the Senate I am told today the President will sign this bill as soon as it reaches his desk. He has specifically asked us to complete our work and pass the bill today. I understand he has a trip planned and it would be to everyone's advantage if we get this bill down to him today and

have it signed. Therefore, I am pleased we do have the unanimous consent which does allow us to vote on this bill. I take it that will be sometime around 3:20 we will vote on the bill.

I do earnestly urge every Member of the Senate to vote for this conference report. To not vote for this conference report because of some difference, because of the process, would send the wrong message to the young men and women who represent this country in uniform. One of the things that impressed me when I was on the trips, both to Bosnia and into the Kosovo area, was if you go into the tents where these young people are living when they are deployed, do you know what you find? You find computers. They are on the Internet.

Right now, some of them out there will be picking up just the words I am saying. We are not back in the period, like when I served in World War II in China, when we did not hear from home but maybe once or twice a month at the most. We had to really just search to find news of what was going on at home and we were starved for news from home. These people are force fed news from home and many times what they see are rumors that come across the Internet. We don't need any more rumors going out to the men and women serving in the Armed Forces overseas. In this bill is the pay raise. We are committed that the money is there for the pay raise. We have initiated the concept of reforming the retirement system, which was one of the gripes we heard last year both in Bosnia and Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

This is a bill the men and women of the armed services are watching. They are going to watch how you vote on this bill. And they should. It is not time for petty differences over process or committee jurisdiction. This is a time to act and give the people in the Armed Forces the money they need so they know they will have the systems and they will have the protections they need when they go in harm's way at the request of the Commander in Chief.

I urge we not only vote to pass this bill, but Senators listen carefully to this point of order the Senator from Texas will raise, as it is raised against specific provisions of this bill.

Mr. President, there is no question in my mind, as we look at this bill, it is a different bill. When I woke up this morning, I looked in Roll Call and I was interested to see the statistics on supplemental appropriations, 1976 through 1996. We had no supplementals in 1995. We had one supplemental in 1996. I will get that number for 1997. People who are saying we are having too many supplementals—they are just wrong. We have not had too many supplementals. We go through a process of predicting how much money we will need. The departments of the Government start the process of sending their requests to the President through their agencies. They come up in the department, they go to the Office of Management and Budget, the President finally gets them sometime in September of the year before. In January or February, the beginning of the year, the President submits his budget which will be made available the following September, following October, going through the September of the next year.

In other words, what I am saying is this is the process. The money we are spending now on a routine basis started through the agencies in the fall of 1997, came into the departments in the spring of 1998, went through the President's process and got to OMB and were presented to us, in terms of a process, to have a bill for the year 2000 presented to us and considered in 1999.

This appropriations process is a long process. I hope I have not shortened it. But it is a very long process. In the process of trying to estimate the needs, things are overlooked, concepts are developed and, particularly in the defense field, new involvements of our military erupt. Kosovo is a good example. We had no knowledge we would have that kind of operation, an immense operation now, probably the largest engagement we have had, in terms of this type of crisis, since the Persian Gulf war. Actually, I think before we are over, it may be more expensive than the Persian Gulf war was to the United States.

I recognize the comments that are coming, particularly from my side of the aisle, about greater consistency in our appropriations process. I want people to look at the record. We have not had an excess of supplementals. We had an omnibus bill last fall, and most of the comments made on this floor are about the two omnibus bills that ended up the fiscal year—the one my predecessor, Senator Hatfield, was involved with and the one last year with which I was involved.

In both instances, if the Senators look carefully, they will find the appropriations process reached a stalemate, and the stalemate had to be resolved on the leadership level with the President. That was not the two committees that added that money. It was a negotiation with the President, in both instances, by the leadership of the House and Senate, and I commend them for it. We had to get out of that impasse or we would have had another impasse like we had previously when there was an attempt to shut down the Government.

When this Government is at war, it is not going to be shut down on my watch. I want everyone to know that. We are not going to shut down the Government when there is a war going on. We are not even going to suggest it. Anybody who does suggest it better understand he or she will not be here for long. The American people will not stand for that. Their sons and daughters are out fighting, and we ought to fight to get them the support they need.

I am going to fight—I am going to fight as hard as I can —to get bills such as this through and keep funding the Department of Defense at the level it should be funded to assure their safety—not just normal safety—but every single system we can adopt that will save the lives of the men and women in the armed services ought to be approved. This is what this does. It gives them the money they need to carry through the remainder of this year.

This year is going to be a very tough year. Any one of those other crises which are going on in Iraq, in Bosnia, in South Korea, or other places could erupt. I was told yesterday that we have people in the uniform of the United States in 93 different places throughout the globe now—93 different places—and any one of those places could erupt again while this Kosovo conflict is ongoing.

I do not want to hear anyone tell me that we have provided too much money. We have not provided too much money. If the money is not needed, I can guarantee you that this Secretary of Defense and this Chairman of the Joint Chiefs is not going to spend it. We have given them under this bill an enormous amount of discretion to spend the money. We have not earmarked this money. We have suggested things in the report that we hope they will consider, but this is the money to meet the needs of protecting our men and women in the armed services abroad, and it has to be viewed on that basis.

I urge every Member of the Senate to vote for it and to forget petty differences.

I am delighted to yield now to my good friend from West Virginia, a partner in this process of trying to get this supplemental and emergency bill to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the senior Senator, Mr. TED STEVENS, the manager of the bill and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He is my longtime friend. I have served many, many years in the Senate and on the Appropriations Committee and on various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee with Senator STEVENS.

He was fair and he was dedicated to the positions of the Senate throughout the discussions on the supplemental appropriations bill when it was in conference with the other body. He stood up for the Senate's positions, and he was remarkably effective. I am proud to associate myself with him. First of all, he is a gentleman. His word is his bond. His handshake is his bond. I like that.

He is not so partisan that partisanship overrides everything else. We are all partisan here to an extent, but to some of us party is not everything, party is not even the top thing. Party is important, but there are other things even more important.

Mr. President, I intend to support this emergency supplemental conference report accompanying H.R. 1141. It is the result of a long and difficult conference with the House of Representatives. There are a number of matters in this agreement that I do not support, and there is one provision which is not included in the agreement but which I believe was as deserving as any emergency contained in the conference agreement.

That provision is the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program. Senators will recall that the Senate substitute to H.R. 1141 included the amendment that I offered to establish a 2-year $1 billion loan guarantee program to assist the more than 10,000 U.S. steelworkers who have already lost their jobs as a result of a huge influx of cheap and illegally dumped steel during 1998, last year.

This matter had strong support by the Senate conferees during the House-Senate conference. After a thorough discussion of the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program, the House conferees voted to accept this Senate provision. Not all of the House conferees. All the House Democratic conferees and three of the Republican conferees voted to accept this provision. However, that vote was subsequently overturned the next day, and the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program remained a matter of contention until the very end of the conference.

In order to expedite the completion of this very important emergency bill, not everything which I support in the Senate, but I am going to support the bill, and because of the need to get it to the President as quickly as possible, I agreed to drop the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program in return for a commitment from the House and Senate congressional leadership that this loan guarantee provision would be brought up as a freestanding emergency appropriations bill in the very near future.

Pursuant to that agreement, I hope and expect that such an appropriations bill will be brought up in the Senate prior to the upcoming Memorial Day recess. I hope, because it is vitally important, that we act expeditiously, this being a real emergency.

The plight of many of the steel companies in this country is serious. The Speaker of the House has agreed to permit a motion to go to conference within 1 week of receiving the Senate-passed bill and has agreed to allow normal appropriations conferees to be appointed and to permit the resulting conference report to be brought up before the Houses.

Subsequent to Senate adoption of the substitute on H.R. 1141, the House Appropriations Committee marked up a second emergency supplemental appropriations bill to provide emergency funding principally to support the military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo and for military operations in Southwest Asia for fiscal year 1999.

In light of the House action in relation to the Kosovo supplemental, and in hopes of being able to move both the Central American emergency spending bill, H.R. 1141, as well as the emergency funding for Kosovo, it was determined by the joint leadership that the Kosovo funding should be taken up directly by the House-Senate conferees on H.R. 1141. As a consequence, the Senate Appropriations Committee never marked up the funding measure for Kosovo, nor did the Senate have an opportunity to debate that measure at all—no opportunity to amend it, no opportunity to debate it, no opportunity to vote it up or down. In other words, the first time the Kosovo funding has been before the Senate is today in the form of this conference agreement on H.R. 1141.

I generally do not support the handling of appropriations matters in a manner that does not allow the Senate to work its will on each of the issues in appropriations bills, but in this instance, I agreed to allow this procedure to be followed because of the importance of the matters contained in this particular conference report.

This conference agreement contains appropriations totaling some $15 billion, of which $10.9 billion is for the support of our men and women in uniform in Kosovo and Southwest Asia and $1.1 billion is for Kosovo-related humanitarian assistance. These amounts represent an increase of $6 billion—$6 billion—above the President's request for Kosovo-related appropriations. The $6 billion in emergency funding above the President's request contains a congressional emergency designation, but will only be available for obligation if the President agrees with that emergency designation, only if the President also requests these funds and declares them emergency spending.

In addition to the $12 billion for our Kosovo-related expenditures, both in military and humanitarian assistance, the pending measure also includes $574 million in emergency agriculture assistance programs, some $420 million higher than the administration's request. For the victims of Hurricane Mitch in Central America and the Caribbean, the conference agreement includes $983 million, of which $216 million is to replenish Department of Justice operation and maintenance accounts which were used to provide immediate relief to the hurricane victims. Finally, the agreement contains $900 million in emergency funding for FEMA in order to address the needs of the American people who suffered from the recent tornadoes in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Tennessee.

Mr. President, as I have stated, this was a very difficult conference that consumed many days and late nights to reach agreement. This was the first time that the present chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. BILL YOUNG of Florida, had an opportunity to serve as chairman of the conference. I must say that he performed his responsibilities very capably. During the many contentious debates that took place, he was always fair and evenhanded and respectful of all members of the conference, just like our own chairman, Senator STEVENS. Yet, at the same time, he displayed the necessary firmness in order to keep the conference moving toward completion. So, I compliment Chairman BILL YOUNG for his excellent work on this difficult conference.

Let me again compliment Senator STEVENS, but also I compliment the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. DAVID OBEY, whom one will never find asleep at the switch. He is always there. He is always alert, combative enough, to be sure, and loyal to his own body, the House of Representatives, and the Democrats whom he represented in the conference. His work is always effective and very capable.

In closing, let me again say that Chairman STEVENS stoutly defended the Senate position on all of the matters throughout the conference and also made certain that all Senate conferees were able to express their view on each of the issues.

I hope that the Senate will support the conference report. As I say, there are some things in it I do not like, some things that were left out of it that I very much wanted and believe in and believe constitute as much of an emergency as some of the other items that are designated as such in the conference report. But I want to support this. I urge all Senators to support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, thank you.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of mine concerning the objectionable provisions contained in the bill be made part of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as a former Member of Congress once said, ''Every disaster is an opportunity.'' This bill proves that statement remains true today.

Scattered throughout this bill, which was supposed to be for emergencies only, is more than $1.2 billion in non-emergency, garden-variety, pork-barrel spending. When the Senate passed this bill just two months ago, I could find only $85 million in low-priority, unnecessary, or wasteful spending. By the time the conferees were done with it, the waste had grown by a factor of 14—14 times more pork-barrel spending was deemed worthy of inclusion in this conference bill.

Mr. President, I have compiled a list of the numerous add-ons earmarks, and special exemptions in this bill. Now, I know that some of these programs may well prove meritorious, but there is no

way for us to determine their merit because the process for doing so has been circumvented in this bill.

For example, the bill contains $1.5 million to purchase water to maintain sufficient water levels for fish and wildlife purposes at San Carlos Lake in Arizona, and an earmark of $750,000 for the Southwest Border anti-drug efforts. I know that these are important programs, but are they the most important programs in my state? The process by which these two earmarks were added in conference on this bill makes it impossible to assess the relative merit of these programs against all other priority needs in Arizona and across the nation.

The normal merit-based review process, which requires authorization and appropriation, was not followed, and these programs were simply added to this so-called ''emergency'' bill. The usual ''checks and balances'' were just thrown out the window.

Once again, I have to object to including programs in appropriations bills that have not been authorized. The Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Yet, without even seeking, much less obtaining authorization from the Commerce Committee, the appropriations put $38 million in this bill for the CPB to buy a new satellite. I have raised this issue before. There is a good reason for the two-tiered process that requires an authorization before appropriating any money for a program—to eliminate unnecessary or low-priority spending of taxpayer dollars. That process clearly was circumvented in this bill.

This bill contains the usual earmarks for specific amounts of money of special-interest projects, such as:

An emergency earmark of $26 million to compensate Dungeness crab fisherman, fish processors, fishing crew members, communities and others negatively affected by restrictions on fishing in Glacier Bay National Park in Alaska.

Emergency earmarks of $3.7 million for a House page dorm and $1.8 million for renovations in the O'Neill House Office Building, which were added in conference.

$3 million earmarked for water infrastructure needs at Grand Isle, Louisiana, again added in conference.

An emergency infusion of $70 million into the livestock assistance program, which is redefined to include reindeer.

Mr. President, I am sure that Santa Clause is happy today although even he would blush not only at the process but the amount of money that is included in this legislation.

Then there are the many objectionable provisions that have no direct monetary effect on the bill, but you can be sure there is a financial benefit to someone back home. For example:

Apparently, last year when we added millions of dollars to help maple producers replace taps damaged in ice storms in the Northeast, we added a bit too much money. This bill directs that leftover money be used for restoration of stream banks and maybe repairing fire damage in Nebraska.

The media has reported extensively on a provision (which was added in conference) allowing the Crown Jewel mine project in Washington State to deposit mining waste on more than the five acres surrounding the mine than is currently permitted. What hasn't been reported is that this language also reverses for several months any earlier permit denials for any other mining operations that were denied based on the five-acre millsite limit.

The bill contains language making permanent the prohibition on new fishing vessels participating in herring and mackerel fishing in the Atlantic—a protectionist policy that was slipped in last year's bill and is now, apparently, going to become permanent.

The bill contains another provision that provides a special, lifetime exemption from vessel length limitations for a fishing vessel that is currently operating in the Gulf of Mexico or along the south Atlantic Coast fishing for menhaden—an issue that should be dealt with by the authorizing committee, the Commerce Committee.

The report directs that three facilities be built to house non-returnable criminal aliens in the custody of the INS—facilities which are much-needed—but then the conferees decided to go one step further and direct that one facility had to be built in the mid-Atlantic region.

Last year's 1999 Transportation appropriations bill earmarked funding for a feasibility study for commuter rail service in the Cleveland-Akron-Canton area, and the conference report expands on the use of those funds to allow purchase of rights-of-way for a rail project before the feasibility of the project has even been determined.

There are many more low-priority, wasteful, and unnecessary projects on the 5-page list I have compiled, and is included in the RECORD.

Most of these add-ons are listed as ''emergencies'' in this bill. Do these programs really sound like emergencies to you?

A small number are offset by cuts in other spending, but that doesn't make it right to include them in a non-amendable bill that circumvents the appropriate merit-based selection process of selecting the highest priority projects.

Some of these programs, like the page dorm, were not even in the bills that passed the Senate and House. They were simply thrown into this bill in conference, at the last minute, in a bill that cannot be amended or modified in any way.

For the Coast Guard, this bill presented the opportunity to pick up another $200 million for operating expenses and readiness. This, too, was a last-minute add in conference of ''emergency'' funding—again, an issue for the Commerce Committee to consider.

I also want to note with interest the apparent prescience of the appropriators in including an additional $528 million in unrequested emergency funding, for ''any disaster events which occur in the remaining months of the fiscal year.'' Apparently, the appropriators have some inkling that bad things are going to happen in the next five months.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues understand that designating spending as an ''emergency'' doesn't make it free. It still has to be paid for. The fact is that most of the pork-barrel spending in this bill comes straight out of the Social Security Trust Fund. At a time when the American people are worried about the fiscal health of Social Security, worried about whether Social Security will be there when they retire, it defies logic that we are taking money out of the Trust Fund for these projects. The Trust Fund is estimated to be bankrupt by the year 2032, and taking another billion dollars out of it clearly accelerates that fiscal crisis. That is exactly the opposite of what we should be doing, which is taking the Trust Fund off-budget and putting more money into it to ensure benefits will be paid, as promised, to all Americans who have worked and paid into the Social Security system.

Mr. President, disasters should not be opportunities. It seems the Congress may still be suffering from ''surplus fever,'' a giddy lack of fiscal discipline because of projected budget surpluses into the foreseeable future. Last year, we spent $20 billion of the Social Security surplus for wasteful spending in the omnibus appropriations bill. I voted against the omnibus bill last year, and I will vote against this bill.

This bill is a betrayal of our responsibility to spend the taxpayers' dollars responsibly and enact laws and policies that reflect the best interests of all Americans, rather than the special interests of a few. I cannot support a bill that makes a mockery of the Congress' power of the purse and contributes to Americans' growing lack of faith in their Government.

Finally, I was very pleased to see the other Senators come to the floor. We cannot continue this practice of adding appropriations in conference. We cannot continue to circumvent the authorization process. I identified some 30 instances in last year's bill. It will stop, sooner or later. We promised the American people when we regained the majority we would not do this kind of thing, this kind of money, in this kind of unauthorized authorizations that circumvent the committee process.

I find it offensive as a committee chairman. Most of all, I find it offensive as an American citizen who also pays his taxes.

I assure Members and my friends on the Appropriations Committee, we intend to take additional measures in the appropriations process. If appropriations bills come to this floor without proper authorization of expenditures of

money or authorizations that are not agreed to by the committee chairmen who are authorizers, there are going to be a lot of problems around here.

Last fall, when we added $21 billion in unnecessary spending, some 30-odd reauthorizations, I said at that time in a letter to the distinguished chairman and my friend on the Appropriations Committee that I will not stand for it any further. I believe there are a whole lot of Senators on both sides of the aisle who are tired of this process.

I say that with all due respect for the dedication, the difficulties and the obstacles that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and other appropriators have as they go through a very difficult process, but it must stop.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

EXHIBIT 1

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN H.R. 1141, THE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1999

Bill language

Bill language directing that funds made last year for maple producers be made available for stream bank restorations. Report language later states that the conferees are aware of a recent fire in Nebraska which these funds may be used. (Emergency)

Language directing the Secretary of the Interior to provide $26,000,000 to compensate Dungeness crab fishermen, and U.S. fish processors, fishing crew members, communities, and others negatively affected by restrictions on fishing in Glacier Bay National Park, in Alaska. (Emergency)

A $900,000,000 earmark for ''Disaster Relief'' for tornado-related damage in Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, and Tennessee. This earmark is a $528,000,000 increase over the Administration's request and is earmarked for ''any disaster events which occur in the remaining months of the fiscal year.'' (Emergency)

Report language providing FEMA with essentially unbridled flexibility to spend $230,000,000 in New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, to address damage resulting from the 1998 Northeast ice storm. Of this amount, there is report language acknowledging the damage, and the $66,000,000 for buy-outs, resuting from damage, caused by Hurricane George to Mississippi, and report language strongly urging FEMA to provide sufficient funds for an estimated $20,000,000 for buy-out assistance and appropriate compensation for home owners and businesses in Butler, Cowley, and Sedgwick counties in Kansas resulting from the 1998 Halloween flood. (Unrequested)

$1,500,000 to purchase water from the Central Arizona project to maintain an appropriate pool of stored water for fish and wildlife purposes at the San Carlos Lake in Arizona. (Added in Conference)

An earmark of an unspecified amount for Forest Service construction of a new forestry research facility at Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. (Unrequested)

Language directing that the $1,000,000 provided in FY 99 for construction of the Pike's Peak Summit House in Alaska be paid in a lump sum immediately. (Unrequested)

Language directing that the $2,000,000 provided in FY 99 for the Borough of Ketchikan to participate in a study of the feasibility and dynamics of manufacturing veneer products in Southeast Alaska be immediately paid in a lump sum. (Unrequested)

Language directing the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture to remove restrictions on the number or acreage of millsites with respect to the Crown Jewel Project, Okanogan County, Washington for any fiscal year. (Added in Conference)

Language which prohibits the Departments of Interior and Agriculture from denying mining patent applications or plans on the basis of using too much federal land to dispose of millings, or mine waste, based on restrictions outlined in the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Interior dated November 7, 1997. The limitation on the Solicitor's opinion is extended until September 30, 1999. (Added in Conference)

Specific bill language providing $239,000 to the White River School District #47–1, White River, South Dakota, to be used to repair damage caused by water infiltration at the White River High School. (Unrequested)

A $3,760,000 earmark for a House Page Dormitory. (Added in Conference)

A $1,800,000 earmark for life safety renovations to the O'Neill House Office Building. (Added in Conference)

An earmark of $25,000,000 to provide for the construction and renovation of family housing units at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico. (Unrequested)

Bill language, added by the conferees, directing that $2,300,000 be made available only for costs associated with rental of facilities in Calverton, NY, for the TWA 800 wreckage. (Added in Conference)

$750,000 to expand the Southwest Border High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area for the state of New Mexico to include Rio Arriba County, Santa Fe County, and San Juan County. (Unrequested)

Bill language directing $750,000 to be used for the Southwest Border High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area for the state of Arizona to fund the U.S. Border Patrol anti-drug assistance to border communities in Cochise County, AZ. (Added in Conference)

A $500,000 earmark for the Baltimore-Washington High Intensity Drug Trafficing Area to support the Cross-Border Initiative. (Added in Conference)

Earmarks $250,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Los Angeles Civic Center Public Partnership. (Unrequested)

Earmarks $100,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Southeast Rio Vista Family YMCA, for the development of a child care center in the city of Huntington Park, California. (Unrequested)

Earmarks $1,000,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development for work associated with the building of Caritas House and for expansion of the St. Ann Adult Medical Day Care Center. (Added in Conference)

Bill language permitting the Township of North Union, Fayette County, Pennsylvania to retain any land disposition proceeds or urban renewal grant funds remaining from Industrial Park Number 1 Renewal Project. (Added in Conference)

$2,200,000 earmark from previously appropriated funds to meet sewer infrastructure needs associated with the 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Wasatch County, UT, for both water and sewer. (Unrequested)

$3,045,000 earmarked for water infrastructure needs for Grand Isle, Louisiana. (Added in Conference)

The conference report language includes a provision which makes permanent the moratorium on the new entry of factory trawlers into the Atlantic herring and mackerel fishery until certain actions are taken by the appropriate fishery management councils. (Added in Conference)

Additional bill language indicating that the above-mentioned limitation on registered length shall not apply to a vessel used solely in any menhaden fishery which is located in the Gulf of Mexico or along the Atlantic coast south of the area under the authority of the New England Fishery Management Council for so long as such vessel is used in such fishery. (Added in Conference)

Bill language directing Administrator of General Services to utilize resources in the Federal Building Fund to purchase, at fair market value, not to exceed $700,000, the United States Post Office and Federal Courthouse Building located on Mill Street in Fergus Falls, Minnesota. (Added in Conference)

Report language

A $28,000,000 earmark in FY 99, and a $35,000,000 earmark in fiscal year 2000 to the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program. (Emergency)

The conference agreement provides $70,000,000 for the livestock assistance program as proposed by the Senate, and adds language providing that the definition of livestock shall include reindeer. (Emergency)

$12,612,000 for funds for emergency repairs associated with disasters in the Pacific Northwest and for the full cost of emergency replacement of generating equipment at Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge. (Emergency)

Report language acknowledging the damage caused by Hurricane George to Kansas. (Unrequested)

Report language urging FEMA to respond promptly to the appropriate disaster needs of the City of Kelso, Washington. (Unrequested)

Language where the Conferees support the use of the emergency supplemental funds to assist organizations such as the National Technology Alliance for on-site computer network development, hardware and software integration, and to assess the urgent on-site computer needs of organizations assisting refugees. (Unrequested)

$200,000,000 earmarked for the Coast Guard's ''Operating Expenses'' to address ongoing readiness requirements. (Emergency)

Report language detailing partial site and planning for three facilities, one which shall be located in the mid-Atlantic region, to house non-returnable criminal aliens being transferred from the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). (Unrequested)

A $1,300,000 earmark, for the cost of the World Trade Organization Ministerial Meeting to be held in Seattle, WA. (Added in Conference)

$1,000,000 earmarked for the management of lands and resources for the processing of permits in the Powder River Basin for coal-bed methane activities. (Unrequested)

$1,136,000 earmarked for spruce bark beetle control in Washington State. (Unrequested)

A $1,500,000 earmark to fund the University of the District of Columbia. (Added in Conference)

$6,400,000 earmarked for the Army National Guard, in Jackson, Tennessee, for storm related damage to facilities and family housing improvements. (Unrequested)

A $1,300,000 earmark of funds appropriated under P.L. 105–276 under the EPA's Programs and Management for Project SEARCH water and wastewater infrastructure needs in the State of Idaho. (Unrequested)

Report language clarifying that funds appropriated under P.L. 105–276 under the EPA's Programs and Management for Project SEARCH water and wastewater infrastructure needs for Grand Isle, Louisiana, may also be used for drinking water supply needs. (Added in Conference)

Report language which authorizes the use of funds received pursuant to housing claims for construction of an access road and for

real property maintenance projects at Ellsworth Air Force Base. (Unrequested)

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate directing a statutory reprogramming of $800,000 for preliminary work associated with a transfer of Federal lands to certain tribes and the State of South Dakota and for cultural resource protection activities. (Unrequested)

The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the Senate that clarifies the scope of certain bus and bus facilities projects contained in the Federal Transit Administration's capital investment grants program in fiscal year 1999. The conferees direct that funds provided for the Canton-Akron-Cleveland commuter rail project in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 shall be available for the purchase of rights-of-way in addition to conducting a major investment study to examine the feasibility of establishing commuter rail service. (Unrequested)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am surprised by some of the items listed in the Senator's statement. This bill is both a supplemental and an emergency appropriations bill.

A supplemental appropriations bill that was submitted by the President in March contained a request for $48 million to replace the National Public Radio satellite system. It is in this bill not as an emergency but as a supplemental appropriation. When we passed this bill in March, the Senate version of this bill contained $18 million for the satellite system. That was less than the President's request. The President made that request because the Public Radio system satellite failed and radio programs are currently being sent through an emergency backup satellite that will not be available until around the middle of September, early fall. The supplemental funding was requested by the President and approved by the Senate at the level of $18 million. The House insisted on the full $48 million. It is an item that is not designated as an emergency.

There are a series of other misunderstandings, I think, with regard to this bill, and I will be happy to discuss them with the Senator from Arizona later. I don't disagree with him about legislation on appropriations bills. The point of order under the rules that were previously in place against legislation on the appropriations bills was destroyed through a maneuver here on the floor of the Senate before my becoming chairman. We have had a tough time trying to get that put back into our system. I will be happy to help restore the point of order against legislation.

I don't look with favor on the omnibus process that occurred last fall and occurred once before I became chairman. But clearly, my job is to carry forward the bills as they come out of the Senate and out of the House and out of the conference by a majority vote. Under the current circumstances, there is not a point of order in the Senate on legislation against appropriations.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I rise to make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if I might just confer.

How much time does the Senator from California wish?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. About 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished and very able senior Senator from the State of California, which is larger than all the nations of the globe except, how many?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. BYRD. Are there six nations that are larger than California?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Six nations that are larger than California. So the two California Senators really are here representing a State that is larger than all of the nations of the world except six. I thank the distinguished Senator and I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the distinguished ranking member. I appreciate his comments about my State. I also compliment both the ranking member and the chairman of the committee for their drive, for their motivation, and for their staying power to get this conference report done.

Mr. President, the room was crowded. The hours were long. The views were sometimes cantankerous. But both the chairman and the ranking member, I think, were steadfast in the desire to produce a conference report which could, in fact, be approved by both bodies.

I also pay tribute to the chairman from the House, Mr. YOUNG. I had never seen him preside before. What I observed, which I think is well worth noting, was his fairness, his equanimity, and really his ability to move the process along which, without rankling, can be a very diverse membership. I say the same for Mr. OBEY, who really was steadfast in pursuing his own views.

I support this report. It contains the $12 billion for Kosovo. I am especially pleased to note that the supplemental contains funding for the documentation of war crimes, including rapes that appear to have been committed as part of Serbia's brutal campaign of ethnic cleansing. As the ranking member and the chairman have pointed out, it contains the much-needed disaster assistance and the $574 million in agricultural funding to provide a measure of assistance to very hard-pressed farmers throughout this great country.

I do want to speak about one small item. As we debate the conference report on the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, I want to express my concerns about the inclusion of a ''hold harmless'' provision for what are called concentration grants authorized by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In chapter 5, on page 91 of the conference report (Report 106–143), the conferees included $56.4 million for Title I concentration grants ''to direct the Department of Education to hold harmless all school districts that received Title I concentration grants in fiscal year 1998.* * *'' The report goes on to say, ''Neither the House nor the Senate bills contained these provisions.''

This provision is very disturbing for several reasons.

First, it was not included in either the House or Senate bills. Therefore, it has not been considered by the authorizing committees of either house. It has not been considered by the appropriations committees of either house. There have been no hearings. It has not gone through the normal deliberative process under which we hear from experts, weigh the pros and cons and cast votes. Quite frankly, this provision appeared ''in the dark of night.''

Second, the hold harmless provision contravenes an important provision of the law, known as the census update, a requirement in law that the U.S. Department of Education must allocate Title I funds based on the newest child poverty figures, figures that are updated every two years. Congress adopted the census update requirement in 1994 so that Title I funds—which the law says are to help disadvantaged children—truly follow the child, that dollars be determined generally by the number of children who are eligible. The holdharmless provision in this bill before us, guaranteeing that school districts that got funds in 1998 will get funds in 1999, even if their number of poor children has declined, violates the requirement that funds be allocated based on the most recent child poverty data available. The provision in this bill effectively rewards ''incumbents,'' despite their number of poor children, despite merit or need.

Third, this provision disregards Title I's eligibility requirements. Title I concentration grants are supposed to be especially targeted to concentrations of poor children, under the law. Districts that have poor children exceeding 6,500 or 15% of their total school-aged children are eligible for these grants, which are in addition to the ''regular,'' basic Title I grants. Guaranteeing funds to districts, no matter what the number or percent of poor children in those districts, spreads limited funds to districts that are not eligible because they do not have concentrations of poverty. It effectively takes away funds from districts that do have high concentrations of poor children. It overrides the eligibility requirements we have set and agreed on in law.

In my state, some school districts could benefit from this ''hold harmless'' provision because the number of poor children changed; it went below the eligibility threshold of the Title I concentration grants program. Like most Senators, I do not want any school district in my state to lose education funds.

But we either have rules or we don't. We have eligibility criteria or we don't.

If the current eligibility rules are wrong or are not working, we should change them in the authorizing process, a review which the Health and Education Committee is currently undertaking. We should not set up eligibility rules and then flagrantly ignore them, override them or ''freeze'' in place funds to districts that do not meet the requirements. We should not rewrite the rules in the ''dark of night'' outside the normal legislative process.

Fourth, this provision violates the principle that funds should follow the child. Title I was created for poor, disadvantaged children. That is its fundamental purpose and funding to states is determined largely by the number of poor children, children that all agree have great educational needs. This amendment sends funds to districts merely because they got funds in the previous year, not because the districts have needy children and not in proportion to the number of poor children they have.

Finally, this provision is very unfair to states like mine that have a very high growth rate in the number of poor children. In California, the number of poor children grew by 52 percent from 1990 to 1995. In Arizona, poor children grew 38 percent from 1990 to 1995. In Georgia, 35 percent. In Nevada, 56 percent. That is why Congress included a requirement for a child poverty update. This amendment is very unfair to those children. This amendment takes the funds away from the poor children for which the funds were intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. If I may have 30 seconds to wrap up.

Mr. BYRD. I yield an additional minute.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the distinguished ranking member.

Even though it ''freezes in'' funding to districts—including some in my state—that got funds last year, even though they do not qualify, it makes a mockery of the basic purpose of the Title I program, its eligibility rules and the requirement to use recent poverty data. If Congress continues to override these basic rules of the authorizing law, we are effectively operating with no rules, or at least, constantly changing rules. Districts will not know whether they are eligible or what they can or cannot count on. This is just plain wrong. In my state, even though 39 districts would have their funding ''frozen in'' by this provision, next year, California will have 166 new school districts that will become eligible. If these ''hold harmlesses'' keep appearing in the dark of night, these eligible districts, with concentrations of poor children, could be deprived of funds to which they are entitled.

Because this is a conference report, under our procedures, I am not allowed to offer an amendment to delete this provision.

But let me put my colleagues on notice that I find this provision and this procedure very objectionable.

I hope my colleagues will join me in ending this practice so that our children can get the education Congress intended in creating the Title I program in the first place.

I thank the Chair, and I thank the ranking member.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am authorized to yield myself 5 minutes off of the time of Senator STEVENS.

Eleven billion dollars in this bill are earmarked to pay for the costs of the war in the Balkans and its consequences, direct and indirect. That war was begun in folly and has been conducted since with an almost incredible degree of incompetence. I have opposed the war from the beginning and will not support it now.

The conflict was begun because of Serbia's refusal to sign an agreement granting autonomy to the people of Kosovo and protecting its citizens. Other demands, including the free right of NATO troops to travel through any part of Yugoslavia, were impossible for any sovereign nation to agree to.

Our goals were worthy. But they were not of sufficient importance to vital American interests to warrant the use of our armed forces in combat. This proposition is perhaps best illustrated by the President's refusal to use all of the means necessary to attain his goals, choosing to cause death and destruction to the Serbs, and suffering, dislocation, and death to the very people we purport to protect, than to risk American lives in order to succeed. This is no way to wage a war.

But vital American interests have been seriously and adversely affected by the war itself. We have destabilized Macedonia and Montenegro, and perhaps other nations in the Balkans as well. We have damaged relations with Russia and may have pushed it along the road to reaction. We have put ourselves on the defensive with respect to China when we should have the high ground in many of our differences. We have fueled anti-American sentiment around the world.

If we win, we get to occupy Kosovo for a generation and to spend billions rebuilding it; if we lose, we are humiliated and NATO is weakened.

In addition, this war appropriation comes to the Senate in a form in which it cannot be amended. I, for one, am denied the opportunity to attempt to earmark a modest portion of this money to arm the Kosovo Albanian rebels. It is inconceivable that we should trigger this ethnic cleansing, refuse to intervene on the ground to defend the Kosovo Albanians, fail even to attack their persecutors effectively, and top it off by refusing to aid those who wish to fight for their own liberties.

Finally, of course, this entire emergency appropriation comes straight out of our Social Security surplus. I am not sure that the American people are at all aware of this fact. I cannot believe that they would support it. At my behest, the conference committee added managers' language calling for the restoration of this borrowing to the Social Security Trust Fund out of future general fund surpluses. But the language is not mandatory, and may well be ignored. We should not use Social Security to pay for a war in the Balkans.

For these reasons, and in spite of its many good and important provisions on other issues, I oppose this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the emergency appropriations bill because it is an emergency, it is necessary. I have been reading all of the press reports about the bill and criticisms of the bill because it is too large or perhaps too much money has been spent on one area or another. But the fact is, we have emergencies in our country that are not covered by the budget. We have had more emergencies in our agriculture area than we ever could have foreseen. You can't pick up the paper that you don't read about a terrible tragic tornado, and we are coming into hurricane season. So we are putting more money into FEMA. We have had floods in my home State. We must deal with these as they occur, and clearly on an emergency basis.

A good part of this bill is for agriculture. We are also helping our neighbors in Central America who were ravaged with a terrible hurricane and tornadoes. We are trying to do the things we have promised we would do. But since we started this emergency appropriation, we have also had a new emergency, and that is the situation in Kosovo. We are seeing, every day, what is happening there.

Mr. President, it is no secret that I have spoken out strongly against the way we got into this Kosovo operation. I have spoken out against going into an operation when we didn't have a good contingency plan. I have spoken out against so much of our policy in the Balkans. I just came back from the Balkans, just over the weekend, and I met with our soldiers on the airfield in Albania, the ones who are going to be supporting our humanitarian effort and, hopefully, be part of our defenses there, whatever we may do. I went to Aviano, Italy, and met with the troops who are doing so many of these air operations that we are seeing day after day after day. And, of course, there is no question that our troops are doing a great job. They don't make the policy; they just do the mission they are

given. Nobody can question their sincerity, their great attitude, and their commitment to our country. You will never meet a young man or woman in the military who isn't there because they love our country.

So when I think about this supplemental appropriation—and I know I have spoken against the mission itself, the way it has come about—and I remember looking into the eyes of the young men and women who are on the front line, I think, now, can I vote not to give the money to them to have the equipment they need to do the training they need, to have the incentives that they need to be doing a very tough job in a very tough neighborhood? Well, the answer is no, I can't vote against paying for their security, because they are the security for me and my family and for every one of us who is lucky enough to live in the greatest country on Earth.

So they have volunteered to give their lives so that we may live in freedom. Do you think for one minute I would vote not to give them the equipment they need to do that job? It would be unthinkable. So while we debate how we pay for it or who is responsible, in the end, I am going to vote for this bill, because I am going to support the troops who are in the field.

I am going to continue to argue with the administration that we need to learn the lessons about how this operation has been handled, and I think we will. I think there is a glimmer of hope that perhaps Mr. Milosevic has seen that we are going to win and prolonging it will only hurt his own people. So there is a glimmer of hope, and a glimmer of hope is better than total darkness. I think we need to seize on that glimmer of hope and try to come to the first agreement that we must have from Mr. Milosevic—that he will stop the atrocities against the people of Kosovo.

I just visited with the people of Kosovo. I visited with them in Macedonia. I visited with them in Albania. Those people have been through more than any one of us will ever know or understand. What I want now is the atrocities to stop for the ones who are still there. The ones we met with are in refugee camps. They are not comfortable, but they are safe. I want to try to help the people who are still in Kosovo, and the atrocities on them to stop so that we can then allow the people who have fled their country in terror to be able to go back in and rebuild their homes, rebuild their economy, so that they will be able to have a livelihood, so that they will be able to raise their children in their homeland without fear of a despot who would commit the atrocities that there is no question in my mind have been committed in the last 6 months and, indeed, for many years in this part of the world.

So, Mr. President, while we are debating policy, while we are debating from where the money is going to come all of which is legitimate debate, while we are talking to each other about our principles, which is our right to do, but at the end of the day, it is most important that we have the emergency appropriations which would give our kids who are on the front line and their commanders everything they need so as to know that we are not going to pull the rug out from under them, that they will have the equipment, they will have the airplanes, they will have the helicopters for their own security while they are protecting yours and mine.

So let's talk policy. Let's talk about never going into an operation like this again without a contingency plan. Let's talk about the treasure we have spent in this country to try to solve this problem. And let's not stop with Kosovo, because the money and the troops that we have put in harm's way cannot be lost for us to put a Band-Aid on Kosovo. Let's finish this job now.

But when we have stopped the atrocities and when the Serb troops have started leaving Kosovo, and when an international peacekeeping force moves in, let's take the opportunity, let's seize the moment to do something bigger than putting a Band-Aid on Kosovo. Let's look at the Balkans and do what we can to try to help them form areas of government that have to change so that those people will be able to have jobs, start farming their land, to live in security. That is what I want for the Balkans.

But continuing to say we can amalgamate the Balkans as if they were America is not going to have a long-term chance for success, because we don't understand what they have just been through in the last 5 years. We don't understand what it would be like to force people to live next door to each other when their mothers have been raped, when their fathers have been brutally murdered, when their families have had to flee in terror.

Let's start today by supporting our troops. Let's start today by keeping open the glimmer of hope for peace. And then let's take one step at a time to try to help these people become a contributing part of Europe so that they can do what every one of us wants to do; that is, live in peace and freedom, to have jobs, to support our families, and to give our kids a better chance than we have. That is what the Kosovar Albanians want. It is what the Serbs want. They are the good people of Serbia—not President Milosevic. That is what the Moslems in Bosnia want. That is what the Croats want. It is what the Albanians want. And they should be able to have it. That should be our goal.

I am going to support this bill. I am not going to say there are not legitimate differences about certain parts of it. Sure there are. That is why 100 of us are elected independently to represent the views we have—the views of our States. But we are required to come together. I hope the Senate will do the right thing and come together to do what is right for the farmers who are hurting, for the people in Central America who are hurting, for the people in the Balkans who are hurting, to help promote peace in the Middle East, and to continue to appreciate that we live in the greatest nation on Earth. We need to make sure we keep the security and the freedom of our country on our watch.

It is our responsibility to pass this bill and talk about the policy and talk about our differences, and our Constitution that provided that we do this.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask for 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized to speak for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I rise to offer some comments on the emergency spending bill we have before us. Many of us had hoped that the almost grotesque experience of last year's omnibus appropriations bill might have shamed Congress into refraining from the kind of fiscally irresponsible spending and catering to special interests that characterized that legislation. Apparently, it was a vain hope. We are back at the same disgraceful work barely seven months later.

Mr. President, few would argue the need for many of the core provisions of the legislation, especially the urgently needed humanitarian relief in Central America, our current military and humanitarian operations in the Balkans, and for victims of natural disasters here at home. Regrettably, those legitimate provisions are completely eclipsed by dozens of others that are at best highly questionable and at worst grossly irresponsible.

Mr. President, first and foremost among this latter group are the billions in additional funding for the military that was not requested by the administration.

Mr. President, to say there is a double standard when it comes to fiscal prudence in Congress is to say the ocean is damp. We saw it last year in the omnibus appropriations bill, we saw it again when this body took up and passed an unfunded military pay and retirement increase even before we had passed a budget resolution, we saw it still again during the budget resolution when military spending received a special exemption from the tough new emergency spending rules we adopted, and sadly, we see it now in this bill.

As has been noted by others, including my distinguished colleague from the other House, Wisconsin Representative DAVID OBEY, what we are probably witnessing is an effort to load as

much military spending into this bill under the pretext of an emergency in order to make room for special interest military spending provisions in the Defense appropriations bill later this summer.

Mr. President, put simply, this emergency supplemental measure uses Social Security Trust Fund revenues to help lard up an already corpulent defense budget.

Almost as troubling as this reckless use of Social Security revenues to pay for the military budget is that this technique isn't an exception. It has become the custom.

Mr. President, our budget caps have become a sham. We agree to those tough caps with great acclaim and fanfare, only to circumvent them casually on a regular basis with the emergency provisions of our budget rules.

Mr. President, as much as I oppose raising the budget caps, it would be far better if Congress and the White House were to raise those caps in an honest and open manner, than to continue the pretense that the caps have meaning only to circumvent them through the abuse—I say ''abuse''—of the emergency funding designation.

Mr. President, while the doubling of the military budget request is certainly the dominant flaw in this bill, there are other provisions that deserve notice as well. They represent what is most unseemly about the emergency appropriations process—special interest provisions that relate to no true emergency, but avoid the scrutiny of the normal legislative process and instead capitalize on human suffering or an international crisis, finding their way onto what we have come to call must-pass bills.

Mr. President, let me note that it may be that some of these extraneous provisions have merit. But they should be subject to the same fiscal scrutiny we ask of any proposal. They should be paid for. The standing committees should review and authorize these proposals, and the Appropriations Committee should propose a level of funding for each of them that makes sense in the context of the overall budget.

Mr. President, by circumventing this process, the advocates of these provisions reveal their distrust of Congress and possibly their own apprehension that their provisions may not be able to gain passage on their merits.

One such provision is the so-called Russian Leadership Program, a new program, Mr. President, newly authorized by this legislation which also provides it with $10 million in funding. I understand the program is intended to enable emerging political leaders of Russia to live here in the United States for a while to gain firsthand exposure to our country, our free market system, our democratic institutions, and other aspects of our government and day-to-day lives.

Mr. President, offhand, that doesn't sound like it is necessarily a bad idea. I might be able to support such a program, though I would certainly want to know something more about it before endorsing still another new democracy building effort. But, Mr. President, this proposal has not gone through the normal legislative process. It has not been held up to the scrutiny of a public review by the appropriate committees.

Mr. President, if one were asked where the new Russian Leadership Program were to be housed, one might reasonably guess somewhere in the State Department, perhaps in USAID. Those a bit more familiar with the array of duplicate programs we have might stroke their chin wisely and suggest that it would probably be included in the National Endowment for Democracy, a quasi-governmental agency that many of us believe duplicates services provided elsewhere in government.

But, Mr. President, if you guessed the State Department, or NED, you would be wrong. For the next year, this new Russian Leadership Program is to be housed in the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress, Mr. President.

Mr. President, as some may know, we already have numerous educational and other exchange programs with Russia. Agencies and Departments which have received funding from the Congress for exchange programs with Russia include, but are not limited to: the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Education, Justice, State, and Treasury; the Agency for International Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Federal Trade Commission, the Marine Mammal Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Commission, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for Democracy, the National Science Foundation, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Peace Corps.

Mr. President, I appreciate the tremendous impact that educational cultural exchanges have had on our relationship with Russia. I have to wonder if we really need to create still another exchange program. Even if we determine that the program has great merit, I think serious questions can be raised about whether this ought to be administered by the Library of Congress.

It doesn't end there. According to the authorizing language in this legislation, the Librarian of Congress is given authority to waive any competitive bidding when entering into contracts to carry out this program. In other words, this program is effectively shielded from any expertise or efficiencies that might be brought to bear by existing firms or nongovernmental agencies with experience in this area.

There we have it: In this bill, a brand-new program that has completely avoided the review of the appropriate standing committees established in an agency, that is wholly inappropriate, with virtually no restrictions on its administration. This is a heck of a way to legislate.

Of course, this is just one example, one of dozens of extraneous provisions that have been slipped into this emergency supplemental bill. I am not talking about a lot of different bills; it is just what is going on in this bill.

As others have noted, these unrelated riders have become business as usual. This is especially true with respect to antienvironmental policy. This is not the first time I have expressed concerns regarding legislative riders in appropriations legislation that would have a negative impact on our Nation's environment. I am sorry to say with respect to one of these policies, the delaying of the implementation of new mining regulations, this is not even the first time such a rider has been inserted into an appropriations bill.

The merits of this policy, this very important policy relating to mining, should be debated at length on another occasion. I do want to note that the rules that safeguard our public lands with respect to mining badly need updating, if only to keep pace with the changing mining technology. One such technique, the use of sulfuric acid mining, caused grave concern 2 years ago in my own State when it was appropriated for use in private lands in the neighboring Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Regulations also need to take into account other land uses that would be displaced by mining, and they need to do more to require meaningful cleanup. Currently, there is no requirement to restore mine lands to premining conditions. This leaves taxpayers holding the bag for the mining industry's mistakes.

Obviously, this kind of a change requires a full, careful, and open debate. It just can't get the kind of attention it needs when it is quietly slipped into an emergency supplemental appropriations bill that we are only going to debate for 3 hours. Of course, that is precisely the reason the advocates of the rider have done it this way. They see their opportunity. They don't want a full and careful and open debate—special interests that push this policy know it will do them best and they will get it done best behind closed doors, away from the light of open debate.

In this connection, I think my colleagues should be aware that the PACs associated with the members of the National Mining Association and other mining-related PACs contributed more than $29 million to congressional campaigns from January 1993 to December 1998. Mining soft money contributions totaled $10.6 million during the same 6-year period. Mr. President, that is nearly $40 million in campaign contributions in recent years from an industry that stands to benefit from this rider that has been stuffed in this bill which we are only going to debate for 3 hours.

And so it is with too many of these provisions.

It should come as no surprise that a process characterized by secret negotiations and backroom deals should be

dominated by special interests and produce such questionable policy. These interests have succeeded in presenting Congress with a take-it-or-leave-it deal, and they are betting we will acquiesce for fear of delaying the true emergency assistance that I and everyone else have said is truly urgently needed.

Of course, I realize this measure is likely to pass. I hope it does not. But I cannot endorse this package or the process that brought it to the floor by voting for it. I ask my colleagues to consider calling the bluff of the interests that have succeeded in loading this bill up with extraneous matters that could never command a majority in Congress on their own.

If we can defeat this measure and insist on a clean, true emergency bill, we just might be able to shame those who have participated in crafting it and maybe even prevent this kind of abuse in the future.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 20 minutes to speak against this bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will not object.

Mr. President, Senator STEVENS has left the floor and I am here in his stead. Please enlighten the Senate as to the time situation pursuant to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator STEVENS has 39 minutes, Senator BYRD has 42 minutes, and Senator DORGAN has 15 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask for 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, obviously appropriating money is a very difficult task. I had the privilege for 7 years to serve on the Appropriations Committee. During that time I had the great privilege of serving as chairman of Commerce, State, Justice Appropriations. Probably more than most Members of the Senate who don't currently serve on Appropriations, I think I have some understanding of the difficulty our colleagues have in appropriating money. Let me also say that the funding issues are the most important and the most difficult issues we debate.

I will share with my colleagues and anybody who might be following the debate an experience I had in 1980. I was a second-year Member of the House and I had been an economist prior to coming to Congress. I kept noticing that on the issues that really mattered—the spending issues on amendments—we were consistently losing on virtually every one of those votes. I ran sort of a running total for about 6 months on those votes.

Here is what I concluded, as best I can remember. The average vote on spending that really mattered cost about $50 million. These were little add-on amendments that were voted on in 1980 in the House of Representatives. There were about 100 million taxpayers in 1980. So the average taxpayer was paying about 50 cents. The average appropriation amendment was costing about $50 million; there were 100 million taxpayers; so each taxpayer was having a cost imposed on them of about 50 cents.

As best I could figure, the average beneficiary was getting about $700.

Members don't have to have a degree in mathematics or any fundamental understanding of economics to understand that if you have 100 million people all losing 50 cents each, and then you have beneficiaries who are getting, on average, $700 each, it doesn't take a lot of imagination to understand why in 1980 we were losing on every spending amendment. The reason being, the average taxpayer could benefit only by 50 cents if the amendment were defeated. That wasn't enough to activate them to write a letter in opposition. The average beneficiary was getting about $700, as best I could figure, on these votes on amendments. For $700 they were willing to do quite a bit, especially through groups that represented them where they would have thousands of members, sometimes tens of thousands of members, who were getting $700 each.

So it very quickly became evident to me that we were fighting a losing battle on spending. That ultimately gave rise to our efforts to try to elevate this to a national issue where, rather than voting on all these little amendments that cost taxpayers 50 cents each, we could turn it into a big issue where we were talking fundamentally about the future of America, which is what budgets are about. And, in fact, in 1981 when Ronald Reagan became President, we were able to adopt a budget that dramatically reduced the growth in government spending, that reformed entitlements, and that cut taxes across-the-board by 25 percent. And I would argue, probably more than anything else, that and Ronald Reagan's opposition to regulations and the rolling back of burdensome regulations, and the monetary policy of the Fed, explained why we are in the happy condition we are in today with the current state of the economy.

But what I discovered in 1981 was the only way you can win on these issues is when you are debating the big issue instead of the individual spending program. The budget has become our way of trying to rein in spending. One of the vehicles we have in that budget process is spending caps, where we debate how much money we are going to spend on discretionary programs and we set it in law and then we judge spending based on that number that we have in fact set into law. In order to try to beef up our strength to try to hold the line on spending, we established budget points of order. In order to try to enforce them we established supermajority budget points of order, with 60 votes required in order to violate the budget.

I will, later today, raise a budget point of order against this appropriation bill. Why do I object to this appropriation? First of all, you cannot spend $14 billion beyond the spending caps in actual cash outlays, without doing a lot of things that almost everybody is going to be in favor of. But here is the basic problem. We set out, in 1990, in a budget agreement, a little loophole. I would have to say I was worried about it when it happened. But the loophole was allowing the President and Congress to get together and declare emergency spending, to designate spending as an emergency and therefore get around the binding constraints on spending that we had written into the budget. That provision went into effect in 1990. And in 1991 we declared $900 million of emergency spending. But in 1992, with the Presidential election, with the election of Bill Clinton, and with the fundamental change that occurred since then, here is what has happened to spending that we have annually designated as an emergency, and therefore outside the budget caps, and outside any binding constraint that we all solemnly voted for as part of the budget process. In fact, the spending levels that I will be trying to defend today with my point of order were adopted 98 to 2 on June 27 of 1997. Only two Members of the Senate voted against making the commitment to hold the line on spending. I am today going to be offering a point of order to try to hold the line on that commitment we made.

But here is what happened. Beginning in 1991 we had $900 million designated as an emergency in a government that was spending, in 1991, maybe $1.2 trillion. It was not very much money by comparison. In 1992, we declared $8.3 billion of spending to be such an emergency that it did not even count as part of the budget process; that it was exempt from the cap. By 1994 that number had grown to $12.2 billion that, in 1994, we designated as an emergency.

Because of our action at the end of last year in passing a $21 billion emergency funding bill, we have already violated the budget for fiscal year 1999 above the level that we committed to on June 27 of 1997. We have already violated that budget by $15 billion in budget authority, which is the portion of the $21 billion that the President has already released by concurring in the emergency designation. If we adopt this bill unchanged, as it is written and now is before the Senate, we will declare another $14.8 billion in budget authority as emergency, which will mean that in 1999 alone, we will bust the spending cap by $29.8 billion, all of which will be designated as an emergency, and all of which will be exempt from our budgetary process.

First of all, isn't it amazing that we have seen the level of emergency spending grow in 1991 from $0.9 billion, to $29.8 billion? What this really shows is we have lost control of the budget

process. This loophole is literally destroying our ability to control spending.

What are these items that are declared as emergencies, items that were so critical that we had to pass an emergency supplemental appropriation in order to fund them? Let me just give you some of the ones from last year that have already busted the budget by $15 billion. Then I will give you a few from this year. Army research into caffeinated chewing gum; the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine; grasshopper research; manure handling and disposal; onion research—those are the kind of items that were included in the emergency measure that we passed last year that has caused us to violate this year's budget already by $15 billion.

Let me go over some of the items that make up this supplemental appropriation bill. ''National Public Radio, $48 million to purchase satellite capacity; $1.3 million for the World Trade Organization ministerial meeting in Seattle.'' Would anybody have us believe that we planned that meeting and we suddenly discovered, after years of planning, that we had to pay for it? Would anybody believe that this should suddenly be contained in an emergency bill? No. But what they would believe is we always knew we had to pay for it but we did not put it in the budget, knowing we would put it in an emergency bill and therefore we could get around spending constraints.

''Filling up San Carlos Lake; the purchase of a post office and a Federal court house in Minnesota; modernization at Washington International Airport.'' Modernizing an airport is God's work, but does it belong in an emergency bill? Don't we fund that out of a trust fund? What is it doing in an emergency supplemental bill? ''Renovating the U.S. House page dormitory?'' I do not doubt that is meritorious. If I did a survey among the pages they might think it is a wonderful idea. But is suddenly the world going to come to an end if we did it in this year's regular appropriation? My guess is we will not spend a penny of it until this year's appropriation bill is enacted anyway, so why is it in this emergency appropriation? It's in this emergency appropriation so we do not have to count it toward the spending caps next year. ''$1.5 million for the University of the District of Columbia.'' Then there is funding for the majority whip's office—that is in the House let me make clear—and the House minority leader's office, $333,000 each. Why isn't that in the appropriation bill for the legislative branch of Government? Why are we not funding that through the normal budget process? The answer again is we put these things in emergency funding measures in order, basically, to take them out of the process.

Why does it matter? Why does it matter that we are getting ready to bust our spending caps by $29.8 billion? Why it matters is that every penny of that money is coming out of Social Security. We do not have a surplus today except for the fact that Social Security is collecting more money than it is paying out. In fact, Social Security is collecting $127 billion this year more than it will spend. We have already spent $16 billion of that on something other than Social Security. We are getting ready to spend another $14.8 billion from this bill on something other than Social Security.

The point is, if we had not passed the emergency supplemental bill last year, which ended up taking $17 billion away from Social Security in this year, we would have had in this year the first time ever in American history where we actually had a Social Security surplus available to either lock up in a lockbox so it could not be spent or use it to save Social Security.

We do not have that ability now because of the emergency bill we passed last year, and now we are passing another bill that will take $14.8 billion.

The point I am making is this: We cannot have it both ways. We cannot say we want to lock this money up for Social Security and spend it at the same time. You can say you want to spend it and that this spending is critical and that it is absolutely essential we fill up these lakes and build these dormitories and that we fund reparation payments to Japanese South Americans from World War II, that we repair high schools, which I never knew was a function of the Federal Government.

You can say those are emergencies and they are important enough that we are willing to plunder Social Security in order to fund them. That is a legitimate position. It is not one with which I agree, but it is a legitimate position. What you cannot do is say we are going to lock this money away from Social Security or we are going to use it to save Social Security and then turn around and spend it. It is not legitimate to do both. What we are trying to do in this Congress is say we want to save the money for Social Security and we are trying to spend it at the same time.

I do not hold myself out as being more righteous than anybody else, but that is turning a little more sharply than I can turn. I still remember the press conferences where we stood up and said we want to lock this money away. Here we are today spending it.

What am I trying to do in my point of order and what will it do? First of all, there is not a point of order under the budget resolution against defense spending. There is a point of order against nondefense spending. The tragedy of this bill is that we could have offset all the nondefense spending in this bill. There was a point at which, before we started piling on more and more spending, we could have, with $441 million, offset all of the nondefense spending in this bill, in which case we would not have had an emergency designation to allow us to spend beyond the budget.

A decision was made by the Appropriations Committee not to do that. They could have done it. The level of reductions in other programs would have been minuscule. But the basic response from the Appropriations Committee, with all due respect, has been: We are not going to pay for these programs, we are not going to offset them and, basically, if you don't like it, do something about it.

That has basically been the message, and people have been up front and honest about it. The only thing I know to do about it is to oppose the bill and to use the budget which we adopted and of which I am proud—it is the best budget that has been written since I have been in Congress or certainly the best budget since the Reagan budget.

The problem is, I do not see any willingness on the part of our colleagues to enforce the budget. It is as if somehow writing a good budget was enough. Every day I read in the paper, often from members of the Appropriations Committee, that they do not have any intention of living within these numbers.

Some people are saying: OK, let this $14.8 billion go and then the next time we will resist. If you are going to resist this never-ending spending spree and this plundering of the Social Security trust fund, you have to begin to resist.

We are averaging over $10 billion a year of spending we are not even counting as part of the budget, and I believe that has to end.

I am going to make a point of order which simply makes the point that under the budget we wrote earlier this year, any Member of the Senate can raise a budget point of order identifying emergency designations in nondefense areas that are not offset, and that in order to overcome that point of order, those who want to spend that money, those who want to take that money out of Social Security, will have to get 60 votes to waive that point of order.

I do not deceive myself into thinking we are going to get enough votes to sustain this point of order. I realize how the system works. But I think it is important that we begin to raise questions about what is going on in the Senate. I do not know how we are going to save Social Security if we keep spending the Social Security surplus, nor do I see how we are ever going to give tax relief if we——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 20 minutes have expired.

Mr. GRAMM. I ask unanimous consent that I may take 7½ minutes off my 15 minutes on the point of order I will raise and use that 7½ minutes now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have great problems now. I understand the Senator wants to vote on this point of order,

and there are 30 minutes on that. We then have time left for the debate on the bill itself. This vote then, I take it, will occur sometime around 25 after 2, the way I look at it. I put the Senate on notice that I am going to ask that the Senate stand in recess or stand off this bill from the hour of 3:30 p.m. until 4:15 p.m. I have not done it yet, but I want everyone to know we have to go off this bill. Our committee cannot be on the floor during that period of time because of a very important meeting the committee has that we cannot cancel.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. GRAMM. I will be very happy to have this vote on waiving the point of order at any point that will convenience the Senator. There is nothing magic about doing it now. I had thought at the end of this 7½ minutes that I would raise the point of order, we could go ahead and have this vote and dispose of it, and therefore there will be no trouble being off the bill or potentially finishing the bill before the meeting. If the Senator wants to delay it, I will be happy to do that. The time is not of any importance to me. Whatever will convenience the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. That is 1 hour 6 minutes beyond that. I serve notice to the Senate, as manager, I cannot be here between the hour of 3:30 p.m. and 4:15 p.m. We will go ahead and have the vote when Senator GRAMM's time expires, but then I will ask the leader to give us consent to do something in that period of time so we can keep our meeting as scheduled. The Senator has another 7½ minutes now, as I understand.

Mr. GRAMM. On this. Why don't I go ahead and raise the point of order and take my 15 minutes and explain it, if that is OK with the chairman.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, what has the Senator been doing? I thought we gave him 20 minutes so he can do that.

Mr. GRAMM. The Senator gave me 20 minutes to speak against the bill. I have done that. I am ready to raise the point of order.

Mr. DOMENICI. And speak 15 more minutes?

Mr. GRAMM. I have a right to under the unanimous consent request.

Mr. DOMENICI. I misunderstood when I quickly gave the Senator 20 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. If the Senator wants me to yield the floor so he can speak now——

Mr. DOMENICI. No.

Mr. STEVENS. There are 30 minutes on his motion to waive.

Mr. GRAMM. I get half the time on the motion to waive since I am against waiving.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the conference report contains nondefense emergency designations in violation of section 206 of House Concurrent Resolution 68. I send a list of those designations to the desk. There are 29 nondefense emergency designations in this bill that are in violation and that are subject to a point of order, and I raise the point of order against each of these 29 designations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, pursuant to section 206 of H. Con. Res. 68 and section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive all points of order against this conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 30 minutes equally divided.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me be sure to clarify: There are 29 provisions in the bill that are subject to a point of order because they are not funded.

Let me explain to my colleagues what this point of order does and what it does not do.

This point of order does not kill the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. This point of order does not strike any funding measure in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. What this point of order does, by striking the emergency designation for these 29 unfunded, nondefense provisions, is that it will trigger an across-the-board cut in all nondefense programs to fund these items.

That across-the-board cut will fund $3.4 billion of unfunded programs. It will do it, according to the Office of Management and Budget, with a 1.25-percent across-the-board cut in discretionary nondefense programs.

Obviously, our bill—if this point of order is sustained—will differ from the House bill. Under the procedures of our budget the bill would go back to the House, which could adopt the bill with this point of order made and therefore require the across-the-board cuts to offset this new spending, or the House could amend the bill to throw out the point of order, and the bill would come back and we would vote on the bill again and see if we could sustain it.

So that is basically what we are doing.

This point of order does not kill the supplemental appropriation, it simply pays for it. It simply says, in the $3.4 billion of programs that are not funded, that under the Budget Act you can make a point of order that they are not funded, and insist on that point of order so that 60 Members of the Senate would have to vote to say we do not want to fund these programs, we want to bust the budget, and we are willing to take the money out of the Social Security surplus in order to pay for it—which is what you will be saying if you vote to waive this Budget Act point of order. Have no doubt about that.

If we sustain this point of order, there will be a 1.25-percent across-the-board cut in the same accounts, same section of the budget, nondefense discretionary, to fund these programs. The Appropriations Committee will have a decision at that point as to whether they really want these programs if they have to fund them. My guess is for many of them, they will not. My guess is, if you have to fund these programs, you will decide you do not really want them all.

Why have I made this point of order? And why is it important? Why it is important is that our budget is so different from real budgets in the real world. Every time we want to bust our budget, we say we have an emergency. But American families have emergencies every day. They are not able to bust their budgets. What we basically do here would be equivalent to a family—they have written out their budget, and they decide to buy a new refrigerator this year or they are going to go on vacation this year or they are going to buy a new car this year; and Johnny falls down the steps, breaks his arm.

The way the Government does it, they say: Well, that is an emergency, so we are going to waive our budget. We just won't have to count that as part of what we are spending. But that is not the way families work. Families have to sit back down around their kitchen table, get out an envelope and a pencil, and they have to figure out that if they have spent $400 setting Johnny's arm, they are not going to be able to buy that refrigerator or they are not going to be able to go on that vacation. They do not like it, but that is what they have to do, because that is the real world.

All I am asking here is that on these $3.4 billion worth of programs, if they are so good and they are so important, let's pay for them. It is not as if we are going to do great violence to the budget of the United States if we are required to pay for it. We are talking about a 1.25-percent across the board reduction in order to pay for these programs.

My view is that if you really wanted these programs, you would be willing to pay for them. If you are not willing to pay for them, we ought not to be spending it.

So I want to reserve the remainder of my time and conclude by just saying this. If you meant it when you set those caps on spending, if you meant it when you said you want to lock away this money for Social Security or use it for Social Security reform, we have an opportunity today to save $3.4 billion that belongs to Social Security. It does not belong to general government. It does not belong to all of these projects we are funding here. It belongs to Social Security.

If you want to save that $3.4 billion for Social Security, if you want to lock it away or use it to save Social Security, vote to sustain this point of order. I hope my colleagues will vote to sustain this point of order, because I think it is important. I think if we do not stand up now, we will now be at $29.8 billion by which we have overspent the 1999 budget before we have ever passed a single regular appropriations bill—all in the name of emergencies.

So if we are ever going to stand up and stop this plundering of Social Security and stop this runaway spending train, we have to do it now. I urge my colleagues to vote with me if you want to protect Social Security and if you want to live up to the budget.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for just 2 minutes on this motion to waive. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for making that motion to waive.

My point in addressing the Senate now is to inform the Senators that, basically, this point of order deals with the moneys that are in the bill for PL–480 food aid, for refugee assistance, for farm aid, aid for the Wye River, aid to Jordan, for the Central America and Caribbean emergency due to Hurricane Keith, and for the FEMA disasters that have taken place throughout our country.

All of those are matters that could not have been contemplated in 1947. We controlled $1.8 trillion on a 2-year period. And the Senator from Texas is objecting to the fact that these events, that have taken place totally unexpectedly, are going to cost $29.6 billion.

He is talking about 16 one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total spending that we control. In other words, estimates that were made have been exceeded now because of unforeseen circumstances in Central America, in farm aid, in terms of the assistance to Jordan, in terms of FEMA disasters, and national disasters declared by the President, and have consumed 16 one-hundredths of 1 percent more money than we estimated.

He is wrong in talking about the bill for the year 2000. We have not gotten to the year 2000. This does not have any impact on the year 2000 except in terms of defense. It aids us in defense trying to deal with defense matters.

These are things that the Budget Act rightfully said there is a time when you can have emergencies, when they are unexpected items that have happened.

There are a lot of things in this bill that are not emergencies; they are supplemental; they are supplemental items. We can argue about them, but they are not involved in what the Senator from Texas is doing. An opinion about lumping all those things in the bill is one thing, but to deal with this concept of knocking out the emergency clause is wrong. I hope the Senators will support the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, not too long ago Senator GRAMM and I stood on the floor shoulder to shoulder preparing a budget for the United States. Not too long ago, I came up with the idea of a lockbox for Social Security. Once my friend, Senator GRAMM, saw it, a few words of congratulations and a few thoughts on how to make it perhaps a little better, we stood shoulder to shoulder that we wanted to save the Social Security trust fund. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed.

The Senator from New Mexico is proud of the budget that is going to operate for the year 2000, the new millennium. It is going to be a tough budget, and we are going to try to live with it. But I do not believe we should leave the floor today with a lot of Americans, if they were listening, thinking that the budget of the United States is out of control.

Sometimes my good friend from Texas overstates the case. And by overstating the case, sometimes, instead of being as effective as he could be, he is a little less effective.

Nobody looking at the budget of the United States as it pertains to the accounts we are talking about, defense and appropriated domestic accounts, thinks it is out of control. As a matter of fact, the whole world looks at this budget, the one that the Senator from Texas is saying is out of control, and says, how do you do it? You are doing so well.

As a matter of fact, the defense spending which is in this budget—part of the budget that the Senator is talking about—is at the lowest level and under control, the lowest level since World War II, the end of World War II, in terms of the percent of our gross domestic product that goes to defense. Likewise, the domestic spending that he is alluding to, out of control, says he, well, let me tell you, it is the lowest in history in terms of the percent of GDP. We are doing a great job of controlling this part of the budget.

He and I may come to the floor and discuss another issue where we might agree, but it has nothing to do with this bill, nothing to do with these ideas that he is alluding to today about the budget. They have to do with entitlements and mandatory spending. So for those who think the budget has gotten kind of big, we have to face up to where it is that it is getting its pot belly. It is not getting it from these two accounts, defense and domestic discretionary spending. That is the truth.

The Senator referred to families and their budgets. I noticed some people were listening to him almost enraptured thinking about their own checkbooks. To compare a family checkbook with a great American country that has a war going on in Kosovo that we didn't know about 6 months ago and expect us not to have to spend some money for that is to compare an individual American family in their kitchen with their checkbook to a country that is at war and needs money to fight the war. That is what is principally behind this appropriations bill. The overwhelming percentage of this spending is for the defense of our Nation, if that is why we are in Kosovo, because we have something to defend. And whether you like the war or you don't like the war, it costs money. It isn't predicted in the family checkbook that in the middle of the month you are going to have a war, because families don't have wars. They don't go out and buy more tanks and more airplanes, when they have a disaster.

That is point No. 1—the budget is not out of control.

Point No. 2—the overwhelming percentage of this particular bill is for the defense of our Nation. Many of us are proud that we put more money in than the President had asked us for. We thought the President low-balled the request because he didn't want to be embarrassed about this war, and so he has far too little money. We put in $5 billion more in this bill. Take that to the American people and ask them: Would you do that, or would you not do that? Would you believe Senator GRAMM's reasoning for saying let's cut some other American programs to pay for that?

By the way, the sequester which he is speaking about, the across-the-board cut which will be done by the Office of Management and Budget, the President's people, it will not be 1.25 percent for all the rest of the accounts. Because the year is so far down, it will be almost 4 percent, 3.75 percent, or some $3 billion. Is that what we should do when we have emergencies, cut all of Government across the board 3.75 percent, not when the budget starts, but when the budget year is half over with or more than half over with, just say we are going to cut it? Families do not do that either, if you want to talk about families. They don't come along when they have all their children's bills paid for and everything else and say that we are going to cut 3.75 percent out of it and spend it for something else. They don't have that kind of problem. That is what we are going to be confronted with for American programs in education, in construction, in highways, in everything.

It is just not worth it, in this Senator's opinion. The longer you wait and delay this bill, the more the demands are going to be, not less. They will be more.

Let me just give you one more. If we are out of control, every country in Europe and every industrial democracy in the world has already gone out of this world. They are all spending more than we are as a percentage of their budgets. Their budgets are much higher than ours. And that is why we are doing so well—because our budgets are low, and our taxes must remain low.

To be sure on my comments about how low defense spending is and how low domestic spending is versus other years and other nations, I have that on two pieces of paper. I ask that those two documents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total government—Federal, State, local—spending as a percentage of GDP (1998)

	Percent
United States	31
England	40
France	54
Germany	47
Japan	37
Canada	42

	Percentage of GDP	
	Defense	Nondefense
1980	5.0	5.2
1985	6.2	4.0
1990	5.3	3.5
1995	3.8	3.8
1998 [1]	3.2	3.4

[1] The lowest percentage since WWII, both defense and nondefense.

Mr. DOMENICI. The issue now is not whether you want to vote for this bill or not. The issue is whether you want to support a motion to waive the point of order, a very specific, new point of order; I helped draft it. It is a nice point of order. Whether you want to waive it or not, that is the issue. If you want to vote against the bill, you can still do that but, frankly, you should move to waive this so that when those people who want to vote for this bill vote for it, they are not confronted with having to cut Government 3.75 percent in order to accomplish the purposes suggested here by my good friend from Texas, Senator GRAMM.

How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes 4 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and friend from New Mexico for helping me see that in an effort to derail this point of order that we didn't do something that could undercut the whole budget. I am very grateful for his help on that.

I want to disagree with the points that have been made by my two colleagues and do it in such a way as to not be disagreeable.

First of all, our dear colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, says that the violating expenditures here that are not offset are only sixteen-hundredths of a percent of overall Government spending. Well, my point is, if it is that small an amount of money, why don't we pay for it? In a budget of $1.7 trillion, we are in essence saying that $3.4 billion of nondefense spending is so important we are willing to violate the budget in terms of spending beyond our cap. But it is not important enough that we are willing to cut somewhere else to fund it? It seems to me if it is that important, we ought to be willing to pay for it.

As to whether the budget is out of control relative to much of the world, our budget is not out of control. I agree with our colleagues. I am not making a statement trying to send the stock market down at 2, nor do I think any statement I could make would be capable of doing that. But I am not comparing America to Honduras. I am not comparing America to Japan. I am comparing what America is doing relative to what Congress promised the American people we would do.

I do say that when we are spending, in emergency spending in 1999, three times as much as we have ever spent before, that suggests to me that something is out of control. As we all know, we read every day in the paper where Members are saying there is no way we can live up to these spending caps, and that this is only the beginning of our violation of the budget. My view is this ought to be the beginning of the fight to preserve the budget numbers we adopted.

Let me tell you how the budget is out of control. It is not out of control the way we keep our books, even though we are beginning to lose control by designating all the spending as an emergency. But if we used accrual accounting, like American business has to, with Medicare and Social Security, we would be running huge deficits today.

I agree with our colleague from New Mexico. Many of our worst problems are in areas like Social Security and Medicare. But the point is, we have to have Presidential leadership, we have to put together a program to deal with those problems; and it takes a concerted effort to do that. But the one area that we can control by ourselves is discretionary spending. The point is, if we don't have the will to prevent $3.4 billion of new spending, how are we going to have the will to reform Social Security or Medicare?

In terms of comparing the checkbook of a family to a great nation and a great economy, I think it is a good comparison. In fact, Adam Smith once observed:

> What is wisdom in every household can hardly be folly in the economy of a great nation.

Where can we find a better blueprint for fiscal responsibility than looking at working American families sitting around the kitchen table? The fact that they are dealing with thousands of dollars and we are dealing with billions of dollars doesn't fundamentally change things. They have to set priorities. They have to say no. And they have to say no to their children, the people they love, and to real needs.

All I am saying is that we need to say no more often so that working families can say yes more often. I want to save Social Security so we don't have to double the payroll tax. I want to save Social Security so we don't have to cut benefits for the elderly. But we can't do that if we keep spending the Social Security surplus.

In terms of across-the-board cuts, if it is not worth cutting to pay for, then why is it worth spending? If it is not worth taking it from a lower priority, is Social Security the lowest priority? Is taking this money out of the Social Security surplus of lower significance than funding all the thousands of other programs we fund? I don't think so.

The final point. This is a point of order under the Budget Act against the nondefense portions of this bill. I would have raised a point of order against all the emergency designations in the bill had the point of order existed. I don't want people to think this is somehow nondefense versus defense. I believe in a strong defense. My dad was a sergeant in the Army for 28 years 7 months and 27 days. I have voted for defense. I have helped write budgets that rebuilt defense. But I want to pay for defense.

I think where the difference is, I am willing to cut other programs to fund defense. But I don't understand why we are not willing to take it away from something else to fund defense but we are willing to violate our spending caps to fund defense. And if this war is so vitally important—let me make it clear that I don't see the vital national interest here. I don't see this as a vote on the war. But let me make it very clear, if this war is so vital, we ought to be willing to cut other Government programs to fund it. The idea that we ought to take the money out of Social Security to fund this war, I think, is wrong.

So, again, this is a hard issue. I don't doubt the sincerity of our colleagues who are trying to do a difficult job in writing these appropriations. But there are two reasons I am here making this point of order. No. 1, we busted the budget by $21 billion on the last day of the last Congress. We are already at almost $30 billion of busting it now. We have to stop this from happening at some point. Let's do it now.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask that the Senator yield me 2 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 2 minutes to the chairman.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, let's go back to what we are talking about. If a family had a $16,000-a-year income and had a 16 one-hundredths of 1 percent overage in their expenditures that year, they would have to borrow $20. We are talking about 16 one-hundredths of 1 percent in excess of the budget. And it is for items that are emergencies. What family would not borrow $20 to meet an emergency? Is it disaster relief emergency? Yes. Is the Central America-Caribbean expenditure an emergency? Yes. The Wye River accord for Jordan, was that an emergency? Yes. Is farm country in trouble? Is that an emergency? Yes. All we are saying is we are going to deal with that $20 out of $16,000. That is the comparison for an average family.

Mr. President, the thing that bothers me most about this is, we have to contemplate change. I will make one statement to you. If the New Madrid Fault that runs through the center of this country suffers an earthquake again—the last time it went off, the church bells rang in Boston because of an earthquake that took place going through the area west of the Mississippi. It changed the Mississippi River. It went backwards. It started a new channel which it has today. Can you imagine the amount of money we

would have to have? That is why the Budget Act provides money for emergencies. If the Senator is trying to say you have to have 60 votes to overcome that, now, that is wrong. I hope we have them today, Mr. President. This is an emergency, and this money is needed by the Department of Defense, and the agencies need it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does the Senator from Texas have any time remaining?

Mr. GRAMM. I don't think I have any.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is up.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, in conclusion, Senator GRAMM makes a lot of good points. I believe we make some good points, also. I don't believe we ought to, at this stage of the budget year, adopt a point of order that will send us back to all of the Government programs, some of which many of us don't like, some of which many of us love, most of which are halfway through a year. I don't believe we ought to go back and have them cut 3.7 percent across the board.

One thing about missing our budget targets—the so-called caps, Mr. President—the overwhelming percentage of supplemental appropriations have been for real emergencies, or emergencies that the President of the United States asked us for and in which we concurred. That is what the Budget Act says; caps are binding except for emergencies; emergency money is not subject to caps. That is what we have here.

I hope we pass this appropriations bill today and fund what our military desperately needs to replenish the Kosovo war and replenish the military equipment and the time that was spent in Central America for the disaster that killed 10,000 of our neighbors in Central America. Those are predominant items in this bill. There are a lot of small ones that are difficult to justify, but in a real sense they don't really amount to the essence of this bill, which is emergencies we cannot contemplate.

I yield back whatever time I have.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to offer my support to Senator GRAMM's point of order against the supplemental appropriations conference report. As I have said before, we must provide the offsets for the nonemergency portions of this conference report. There is currently $13.3 billion of nonemergency spending that has not been offset, in violation of the Budget Act. I believe that Congress must protect the Social Security surplus and ensure that the money is there for future generations, not spend it on items that are clearly nonemergency items.

We have been spending the last few years talking about fiscal discipline and the spending caps. Now that we have a surplus, Congress must resist the temptation to circumvent the regular appropriations process. Many of the items contained in the report should have been considered by the appropriations subcommittees and debated on the floor of the Senate. Congress must allow the regular process to take place and not sneak things into appropriations bills.

I tried to offer legislation that would provide those offsets, but an objection was raised. I want to ensure that Congress does the right thing and preserves the Social Security surplus. This is what the lock box legislation would prevent. This is what my legislation would prevent. I ask my colleagues not to waive the Budget Act.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I supported Senator GRAMM's point of order because, while some of the spending programs in this bill may have merit, they should not be funded by Social Security Trust Fund balances. The point of order would not prevent these programs from being funded, but would force Congress to find adequate offsetting spending cuts to pay for those programs, or those spending cuts would be imposed automatically at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to waive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote take place at 15 minutes after 2, in 7 minutes, and I yield that time until the vote to the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER. The vote will take place at 2:15, in 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The vote will be at 2:15.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for yielding me the time.

I support the waiver on the point of order. The conference committee labored extensively and diligently to come up with the bill that is on the floor at the present time. It was a tough, contentious, argumentative conference. While not perfect, we conferees did the very best we could. At some points on Wednesday night of last week, it looked a little like ''Saturday Night Live,'' except it was Wednesday. C-SPAN was in the conference room recording and videocasting across the country to the few who might have been inclined to watch.

Having been a party to that conference and having struggled through the issues of the necessity for military spending and the emergency programs that are involved in Hurricane Mitch and the tragedies in Oklahoma and Kansas—Kansas being my native State—the conference committee did the very best it could.

This bill ought to be enacted in toto. Since that requires a waiver initially, that ought to be undertaken.

We are really looking at broader, complex issues as we face the appropriations process for fiscal year 2000.

We have recently seen the allocations in the House of Representatives. The allocations in the Senate are portending for very, very severe cuts.

I chair the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services. The President's budget is slightly in excess of $90 billion. The allocation preliminarily marked up for my subcommittee is $80 billion. If that is to happen, we are going to have some really drastic, drastic cuts, cuts which the American people are going to have to evaluate as they are making their wishes known in our representative democracy to the Members of the House and Senate.

We have budget caps. I would like to live within those budget caps. But to do that, we are going to be looking at these kinds of reductions in spending:

On Safe and Drug-Free Schools, there would be a cut of $66 million from the Drug and Violence Prevention Program.

Here we are today on a juvenile crime bill where we are trying to deal with the problems of juvenile crime, and at the same time we are looking at a budget which is going to cut funding of $66 million from the guts of that kind of a program—drug and violence prevention.

We are looking at cuts on the Job Corps of $150 million from a $1.3 billion program.

When we talk about the Job Corps, here again we are talking about dealing with juveniles who may have gone astray.

If you have a juvenile offender without a trade or a skill, a functional illiterate who leaves prison, that individual is going to go back to a life of crime, and is going to get the first gun he can put his hands on. And here we are talking about an enormous cut in the JOBS Program, which is designed specifically against that problem.

We have enormous cuts in child care—$131 million in our efforts to whip the welfare program and send welfare mothers to work. Child care is indispensable.

Special education—a favorite of all Senators—would be cut by $480 million.

The National Institutes of Health, the crown jewel of the Federal Government, perhaps the only jewel of the Federal Government—instead of having a $2 billion increase, which the Senate said we ought to have in the sense of the Senate, the National Institutes of Health would be reduced by $1.8 billion, which would result in approximately 6000 fewer grants at a time when medical research is on the verge of solving enormous problems of Parkinson's with the new stem cells estimated within the 5- to 10-year range.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. Some of those who were called to order may be the ones who ought to be listening to what needs to happen in our appropriations process if we are to achieve the goals of our lofty rhetoric.

But interrupting, the juvenile violence bill on the culture of violence-

we have programs which are designed to deal with that. The way we are heading, we are going to be cutting the heart out of the precise programs intended to deal with that culture of violence.

These are issues which I hope the American people will understand so that their views may be felt in our representative democracy.

We would all like to stay within the caps. We would all like to economize. But when we take a look at a $10 billion cut which hits labor, safety programs, and health and education, those are matters which have to be decided by this body reflecting the views of our constituency.

I again thank the chairman for yielding the time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 70, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 135 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Akaka	Durbin	Mack
Baucus	Edwards	McConnell
Bayh	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bennett	Frist	Moynihan
Biden	Gorton	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grassley	Murray
Bond	Harkin	Reed
Boxer	Hatch	Reid
Breaux	Helms	Roberts
Bryan	Hollings	Rockefeller
Byrd	Inouye	Sarbanes
Campbell	Jeffords	Schumer
Chafee	Johnson	Shelby
Cleland	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Kerrey	Snowe
Collins	Kerry	Specter
Conrad	Kohl	Stevens
Coverdell	Landrieu	Thurmond
Craig	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Daschle	Leahy	Warner
DeWine	Levin	Wellstone
Dodd	Lieberman	Wyden
Domenici	Lincoln	
Dorgan	Lott	

NAYS—30

Abraham	Graham	McCain
Allard	Gramm	Nickles
Ashcroft	Grams	Robb
Brownback	Gregg	Roth
Bunning	Hagel	Santorum
Burns	Hutchinson	Sessions
Crapo	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Enzi	Inhofe	Thomas
Feingold	Kyl	Thompson
Fitzgerald	Lugar	Voinovich

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 70, the nays are 30.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if we could, for the orderly presentation of the balance of the argument on this bill, I inquire, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 12 minutes. The Senator from West Virginia has 42 minutes. The Senator from North Dakota has 15 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask the Senator from West Virginia if we can make a list of who is going to be recognized, because almost all the time is allocated, as I understand it. I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER. I reserve 7 minutes of the time. Can the Senator allocate his time?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Let me see how much time I have left. I have 45 minutes promised.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator has 42 minutes, but I will give him 3 of my minutes.

Mr. BYRD. All right.

Mr. STEVENS. Please tell us what they are.

Mr. BYRD. Senator CONRAD, 5 minutes; Senator LANDRIEU, 5 minutes; Senator HARKIN, 8 minutes; Senator GRAHAM, 7½ minutes; Senator DODD, 5 minutes; Senator DURBIN, 5 minutes; Senator WELLSTONE, 5 minutes; Senator BOXER, 5 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Is the Senator reserving some time for himself?

Mr. BYRD. Senator DORGAN has 15 minutes for himself outside this.

Mr. STEVENS. Does that allocate fully the Senator's 42 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). It does.

Mr. STEVENS. I urge the Senators to take their time starting now.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, as I begin, I pay tribute to the Senator from Alaska, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. STEVENS, and the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and other of my colleagues. I see the Senator from Mississippi on the floor, Mr. COCHRAN, and so many others who in that conference spent hour after hour, day after day hammering out a conference agreement. Especially the chairman and the ranking member. I recall one evening sitting there at 1 in the morning, and they were still there exhibiting the kind of patience that is quite extraordinary in order to resolve all of these many issues.

Much of the discussion was about the victims of Hurricane Mitch, the responsibility to respond to our neighbors in this hemisphere who have been hit with such a terrible disaster, the military needs with respect to the airstrikes in Kosovo, and the prosecution of that conflict, the needs for spring planting loans in farm country, and a range of other issues.

I support many of those areas, but I am not going to support the conference report because I believe, as I indicated in the conference committee, that if there are resources above that which was requested for the Defense Department for the prosecution of this conflict in Kosovo, if there were $2 billion or $3 billion or $5 billion or $6 billion more available, then I believe we should have a better debate on the priorities of the use of those funds. I, for one, believe we have an urgent, urgent need in rural America to provide a better safety net to give family farmers a chance to make it through this price depression. I believe that is the priority.

We had a vote in the conference on the Senate side, and we lost 14–14 on a proposal that would have added nearly $5.5 billion for some price supports to build a bridge across those price valleys during these troubled times in rural America. We lost 14–14. I wish we had won.

Nearly $5.5 billion to $6 billion was added to this package for defense spending that was not requested. It is not that the money is not available, it is that a different priority was attached to the spending of this money.

I will tell you why I feel so strongly about this. I come from rural America. I come from a small town. We raised some cattle and horses. Last Thursday, my brother called a florist in a little town called Mott, ND. Mott, ND, is 14 miles from my hometown of Regent. Regent has 300 people and Mott is a bigger town and always was, even when I was growing up. Mott is about 800 people.

My brother called the florist on the Main Street of Mott. There is one little florist shop. He said: My brother and I want to order flowers to be delivered to the cemetery at Regent for our mother and father for their graves on Memorial Day. We do that each year, and we also do so on Mother's Day and Father's Day.

My brother said he told the woman who runs and owns the floral shop: By the way, I forgot to call you this year on Mother's Day. I was going to have you deliver some flowers for Mother's Day.

Incidentally, this floral shop always apologizes when we call because she says: We have to charge you a $2 delivery fee. It is 28 miles.

My brother said: I forgot to call you this year to deliver flowers for our mother's grave on Mother's Day, but I would like you to deliver them on Memorial Day.

The woman who owns the flower shop said: That's all right, we delivered some on Mother's Day because we know you call every year and we thought you just forgot. Later on, we were going to send you a bill, and if you paid it, that was all right, and if you did not, that's all right, too.

That probably does not happen across America, but it happens in my part of the country, in rural America, where family farmers and Main Street merchants work together in a lifestyle that is really quite wonderful. People do things, people help each other, but there is no amount of help in farm country these days that can reach out

and say to family farmers who are struggling to make a living: We will help you with the price of your grain. We know you are trucking that grain to the elevator these days and are told there is no value; we will help you.

That is not what is happening. In fact, they are going to the elevators today to find out the grain market has collapsed and they are getting Depression-era prices, at the same time the current farm program, freedom to farm, is pulling the rug out from under these farmers with respect to the safety net. We need to help.

If we want family farmers in our future, we need to help. If we want to preserve this kind of lifestyle, yes, of family farms and Main Street of our small towns, we need to do something to help.

I want to read a few things from Ted Koppel's program ''Nightline'' on Tuesday, May 18. They did a program on the farm crisis. They pointed out—while all of the good news comes to the Washington Post and the New York Times, just open them up and read all the wonderful news, our economy is growing, unemployment is down, inflation is down, virtually everything else is up, a lot of good news—but the farm belt does not experience that good news. Family farmers are in desperate trouble and small towns are shrinking. The rural economy is in desperate trouble.

Ted Koppel on his program had farmers and others talking. I will share some of that with my colleagues:

> Here's what many farmers see happening, the prices they can sell their crops for falling and predicted to stay low. . . . wheat prices are down 42 percent.

Now, ask yourself, how would you feel or your family feel if you had a 42-percent cut in your income? Would you feel that the economy is doing real well?

> Corn prices are down 38 percent. Oats and barley down 32 percent.

In constant dollars, these are prices that we received in the family farm in the Great Depression.

At the start of the program, Ted Koppel interviewed a fellow. He talks about a guy who works with farm families, tries to help them. Willard Brunell said:

> I think the scariest one was back a few years when I got a phone call from a farm wife [who] said my husband just left with a gun and he's driving away. He said he's going to his tractor. [He said] I was there with him 20 minutes and it was quite a ways away. I got him out of his tractor. He sat in my little car and we spent two hours in that car trying to talk him down and he told me exactly how he was doing, going to do it. He had the gun with him. . . .

They get more than 50 calls a month in this fellow's church talking about that kind of desperation.

In Minnesota and North Dakota, where Ted Koppel's program was taped, is some of the richest farmland in the entire world. Last year, one in every three farmers grew a crop that cost more to produce than they could sell it for. For many, it was the fourth, fifth year that happened.

Lowell Nelson was interviewed on this program. He is one of those farmers.

> He was born, raised and had his own sons on this land, a fertile 400 acres he bought from his brothers 35 years ago after his dad died. But this spring [is the first spring] he's not planting anything.

He cannot. He is ruined. He said:

> Well, I had been putting it off [this decision] for quite [a long] time and I had gotten a lot of urging, you know, from my wife to make a decision and I had just been putting it off. It's a decision I didn't want to make.

His wife said:

> One night he was out in the field and all of a sudden called me on the [shortwave] radio and wanted me to come over just to ride with him [on the tractor] and I knew something was wrong and it was shortly thereafter that he decided he'd better get some medical help.

The interviewer asked Mr. Nelson:

> How badly did you scare yourself?

He said:

> Real bad.

The interviewer asked:

> What do you mean?

He said:

> Thinking that it may be better off not being here.

The reason I mention the ''Nightline'' program, they interviewed these folks. These are real people in desperate trouble—just in desperate trouble. We have a country whose economy is growing and thriving and rising—full of good news. The stock market hits record highs. Everybody says this is a terrific economy. Then you drive out down a country road, and talk to a family who has struggled for 20, 30, 50 years, and you see what is happening.

A big guy stood up at a meeting I had one day. He had a big beard, a tall fellow, a strong fellow. He said: You know, my granddad farmed my farm. My dad farmed it for 40 years. And I have farmed it for 23 years. Then his eyes teared up and his chin began to quiver, and he could not continue anymore. When he finally got the words out, he said: And I can't keep going anymore. I'm broke, so I have to sell the farm.

That may not matter to some, but it matters to me.

A woman wrote me a couple of weeks ago and said: We had our auction sale on our farm, and my 17-year-old son would not get out of bed to come downstairs. He refused to come down and help at the auction sale because he was so heartbroken. He knew he would never be able to do what his dad did. He knew he would never be able to farm that farm. She could not get him out of bed he was so heartbroken.

I tell you all of that because we pass a supplemental bill and we say: All right, on defense, the Defense Department needs $6.1 billion to prosecute this war in Kosovo. We must restore munitions and planes and do other things. And I am for all of that. I support all of that. I support our men and women in uniform and support this mission.

But then we also say there is another $5 or $6 billion we want to add to that. And I say, if there is $5 or $6 billion around that can be used in this discretionary way, then I want the priority to say: We want to continue to invest in America's family farmers.

You think this country is going to be a better, stronger place when we don't have family farmers left? When corporations farm America from California to Maine, you think food prices are not going to go up? And it is more than just farming. These folks contribute in every way to their community. They contribute to a way of life that we are losing in this country. Yet, somehow, when we talk about all of these fancy economic theories, nobody talks about the family as an economic unit—nobody.

The economic unit in this country is the large corporation. They are all getting married, as you know. There is all this corporate romance going on all over America. Every day you wake up and see a new couple of corporations have decided to get hitched and get bigger.

What about the economic unit that really matters in the center of this country in America's farm belt that grows America's food? That makes America's communities strong? That helps build America's churches? That puts life on main streets on Saturday night? What about those economic units? What about family farmers?

Last year, we passed an emergency bill. About half of that money is not yet in the hands of family farmers. It will be there in a matter of weeks, I guess, through the USDA, through this formula. But it is $1.5 billion short of what was promised. We should have at least added that to this piece of legislation. We should have at least added some additional support to say to family farmers, when prices collapse at Depression-level prices, we are going to reach out a helping hand, extend a helping hand to you to say you matter to this country.

We had an opportunity to do that and did not. A 14-to-14 vote, and how I regret losing that vote—but in this business, in this system, you win some and you lose some. My hope is that those who felt it not appropriate, those who felt it was not the time to respond to this need now will, a week from now or a month from now, decide that it is time to respond.

This is not Democrat and Republican. We have had bad farm programs under all kinds of administrations—Democratic administrations, Republican administrations. I want the farmers to get the price from the marketplace as well. That would be my fervent hope. But when the marketplace collapses, we must help.

Let me make a final point. I think it is fascinating that at a time when

somehow the economic unit of the family, with respect to agriculture, does not seem to matter, that which the family farm produces in this country is used by everybody else to make record profits—the railroads make record profits hauling it; the cereal manufacturers make record profits putting air in it and puffing it up and putting it on the grocery store shelves and calling it puffed wheat—the farmers go broke. The manufacturers get rich. Or they sell a steer for a pittance or sell a hog for $20, an entire hog. You can buy a hog for $20 at the bottom of the hog market, and then go to the store and buy a ham that cost you $30 or $40. Buy a small ham at twice the price you bought the entire hog for.

Something is fundamentally wrong, and farmers know it. So everybody who touches these products make record profits and are getting bigger and richer; and the folks who start the tractor and plow the ground and plant the seed, and then hope all summer it does not hail, the insects don't come, that it rains enough and doesn't rain too much, and that they, by the grace of God, might get a crop, wonder whether they will be able to sell it in the fall and make any kind of profit.

So I cannot vote for this conference report. But having said that, I deeply admire the work of the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from West Virginia and others who participated in it. The priorities, in my judgment, needed to include the priorities I have just discussed with respect to helping family farmers, and they do not, regrettably.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this conference report. I say to my good friend from North Dakota, I had oriented myself to one set of remarks, but I listened carefully to his, as I frequently do. He certainly speaks from the heart about his people. I remember the floods that his State experienced years ago. I feel as if I am on the farm, the family farm, with him. And you talked about that family.

So while we may be at odds on this bill, I want to take the same theme and talk about a family. I want to talk about a military family. This bill has in it provisions for a military family.

I want to talk about that wife here in the United States, or in other places of the world, with their children, whose husband is flying an aircraft right at this minute in harm's way. It could be the reverse, because women are flying aircraft in harm's way in this conflict over the Balkan region, over Iraq.

Mr. President, this country is at war. And for that wife at home, war is hell. For that individual in the cockpit, war is hell.

The purpose of this emergency legislation is to provide the dollars necessary to alleviate to some extent the strain on the families and those in the cockpits.

Every Member of the Senate has young men and women involved in the conflict in Kosovo or over the general Balkan region or over Iraq or standing guard, as they are, in other far, remote areas of the world to protect freedom. That is what this bill is all about.

Let me add one other feature, and then I will yield the floor, because many are anxious to speak.

Each year, the Department of Defense plans for the next year and the year following as to how many aviators, for example, they will train to keep the cockpits filled. Last year, the number of pilots we had to keep to maintain the flying status of sufficient men and women fell by 1,641. That number of young men and women trained as aviators decided they no longer could remain on active duty and would return to civilian opportunities. Many of those decisions were dictated by their concern for their families. But stop to think of what it costs every American taxpayer to replace that individual in that airplane, to train the number of new recruits to be pilots or navigators or to take to sea in those combat airplanes.

I ran that calculation. It costs roughly between $2 million to $6 million, depending on the type of aircraft, to train a man or a woman to become an aviator, $2 million to $6 million. If you multiply the average of that times 1,641, it is $9 billion just to replace the aviators. That same drain on trained manpower, womanpower in the military occurs in other branches of the service where perhaps their training is not as costly to the taxpayer but $9 billion just to close the gap for those flying aircraft.

Let us think about the families, as my good friend from North Dakota described, the farm community. Let us talk about the military, what those wives and their children, what those aviators are doing in harm's way today. They are carrying out the orders of the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This Nation is but one of 19 nations locked together in the first combat operation in the 50-year history of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This is a critical moment for families, be they farm families or military families.

Mr. President, as I said, support the emergency supplemental appropriations bill now before the Senate. As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I join with my colleague and close working partner on defense matters, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to urge all our colleagues to support our military forces by voting for this bill.

I support this bill for one simple reason—we are at war. As we speak, we have military forces engaged in combat—going in harm's way—in the skies over the Balkans and Iraq. Whether or not there is agreement on how these risk-taking operations are being prosecuted is not now the question. We must support our military forces who are risking their lives daily to carry out the missions they have been assigned.

Mr. President, the conflict in Kosovo has been ongoing since March 24, when the NATO use of force began. Since that time our pilots and the pilots of our allies have flown thousands of combat missions against Milosevic's military machine. We have already spent billions of dollars—on both aircraft operations and munitions—in support of Operation Allied Force. These funds are now coming out of the readiness accounts of our military services. Without this supplemental, there would be further and unacceptable degradation of the readiness of our forces.

The conference agreement provides $10.9 billion for defense, including $2.2 billion above the President's request for aircraft flying hours, spare parts, depot maintenance and munitions, including sophisticated precision-guided missiles and bombs, which allow our pilots to be more effective at reduced risk—both to them and to innocent civilians on the ground.

Mr. President, I know that some of my colleagues have expressed concern regarding the funds provided in this bill for pay raises, pay table reform and retirement reform. I firmly believe that all my colleagues would agree that we have very serious problems of recruiting and retention in our military services. I believe the problems are of such magnitude—indeed, we have a hemorrhaging of skilled personnel leaving our military—that this situation qualifies as an emergency. As an example, both the Army and the Navy failed to meet their 1998 recruiting goals and the Army, Navy, and the Air Force project that they will not meet their recruiting goals for 1999.

Last year, 1641 more pilots left the service than the Department of Defense projected. It costs about $6 million to train a single pilot. The cost to replace these 1641 pilots is more than $9 billion. We must act to stop this hemmorhage of pilots and other skilled military personnel. We must send a signal now that we in the Congress intend to take care of our military personnel and their families.

I know that there are Senators who are concerned about this process, and there are Senators who disagree with some of the items in this emergency supplemental. I share some of these concerns. But, Mr. President, as I stated earlier, our Nation is at war. We can argue the process and our other concerns at another time.

I believe that now is the time for the Senate to show its support for our men and women in uniform who are, as we speak, carrying out their assigned missions under difficult and dangerous conditions. I will vote for this bill, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I appreciate his work on this very important measure for our country at this time.

I was here in the Chamber and got to hear the remarkable speech of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. He is absolutely correct. There is not enough money in this supplemental appropriations bill to address the devastation that we are experiencing throughout rural America. My State in particular has been hard hit because of weather-related disasters, the worst drought in over a century occurred last year.

It is my hope that in the months ahead we will all, on both sides of this aisle, Democrats and Republicans, be more mindful of the tremendous difficulty that rural America is experiencing and come up with additional and real ways of helping that lead us to a more market-oriented approach but recognize that there are some safety nets and some bridges that need to be put in place that are not there yet, and it is causing great pain throughout America.

However, I want to point out that in this supplemental, partly because of the fine work by the Senator from North Dakota and others, we have added a half billion dollars for much-needed farm relief. It is not enough, but it is better than nothing. Farmers in my State in Louisiana and in many States around the Nation are depending on us today to vote favorably toward this measure and to send them this help. Every day in my office the phone rings with farmers needing their emergency assistance that was promised to them last year but not forthcoming.

It is estimated from our agriculture commissioner that there are over 300 to 400 farmers that are just barely holding on, waiting for these checks and this assistance so that they can make future plans.

It is important. It is not enough money in this bill, but it is better than what it started out to be. Because of the leadership, a half billion dollars has been added. I am happy to say that a great deal of that money will go to help Louisiana and other States in our area.

This package includes much-needed emergency assistance to farmers in Louisiana and other agriculture States still reeling from last year's extreme weather conditions.

Mr. President, I will never forget the faces of farmers in my home State as they showed me acre after acre of scorched row crops, or how shocking it was to see the horrible cracks and craters in what was once fertile soil.

This package, Mr. President, includes additional assistance to replenish the fiscal year 1999 emergency loan account, which has been depleted due to the severity of this crisis.

Hundreds have received help but, right now more than 300 farm families in Louisiana are waiting for their emergency loan applications to come through. And although more assistance may still be needed, those loan payments are crucial to help our farmers stay in business.

Mr. President, hurricane victims in Central America are also waiting on this emergency package. In fact, they've been waiting for more than 6 months.

The winds and rains of Hurricane Mitch claimed the lives of more than 10,000 people, and left an estimated 1 million homeless. It completely wiped out hundreds of schoolhouses, bridges, roadways, and churches. But after visiting Honduras and Nicaragua, I can assure you the numbers fail to convey the full extent of the devastation.

Besides the obvious humanitarian reasons, helping our Central American neighbors recover serves the long-term interests not only of the United States but the entire Western Hemisphere.

Within the past few decades, we have seen Central America move from conflict to peace, from authoritarian governments to democracies, from closed to open economies. Now this progress is at risk.

In the past, the United States has played a strong role in encouraging economic development in Central America.

Nearly four decades ago, President Kennedy traveled to Costa Rica to announce his ''Alliance for Progress'' to promote the expansion of agriculture exports throughout the region.

Since then we have pursued a variety of other measures designed to help these countries diversify their economies and boost exports.

While these policies have not always been successful, the United States has always shown its willingness to help lift these economically depressed nations to a more prosperous standard of living.

The point is—the United States has a long history of helping our Central American friends move further down the path of development. Now—perhaps—that friendship is being tested by the devastation that has decimated their towns and villages and the commerce that flows through them.

But, as we all know, friendships become stronger when they are tested. And I am glad that the United States is responding like good friends should.

I am also particularly pleased that this supplemental package will be used in part to addresses the problem of permanent housing in Central America.

During a historic meeting—hosted by Senators LOTT and COVERDELL—held in the LBJ Room several months ago, four Central American Presidents made it clear that permanent housing is among the highest priorities for their recovery. The numbers say it best: Mitch destroyed 700,000 homes, severely damaged 50,000 and left 35,000 people in temporary housing—tents, schools, churches.

I will be working—along with other colleagues on both sides of the aisle—to see that we do all we can in the area of housing in Central America.

Helping Central America rebuild is of special concern in Louisiana. With one of the largest Honduran communities outside Honduras, New Orleans is sometimes referred to as ''the third largest Honduran city.''

Brought to our State through trade with the port, these enterprising people have been a source of strength to our community for many years now. So this package is of utmost importance to them and so many others back home.

Before yielding the floor, Mr. President, let me also express my support for the increase in military spending in this supplemental.

Over the last decade, we have seen a slow, steady decline in the recruitment and retention of our military men and women. We have allowed the disparities between military and private sector to grow so large that our service men and women are being lured away.

For instance, B–52 pilots at Barksdale Airforce Base in Shreveport, LA, can go right down the street to the Shreveport International Airport and sign on with a commercial airline with better salaries, pensions, and benefits.

It is imperative that we reverse this trend. Mr. President, my hope is that these military spending increases will mark a good step forward in helping us recruit and retain the best and the brightest.

In closing, let me say again how important this Emergency Supplemental Package is to farmers in Louisiana and other rural communities in America. And as we consider the interests of our Nation and this hemisphere—and the future of the fragile democracies in them—on the edge of this new century, let us make sure we honor our ties of friendship with the nations of Central America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from West Virginia and my leader on the Appropriations Committee, and my friend, Senator STEVENS from Alaska, who is not present on the floor; he is also the chairman of this important committee.

You can measure the values of a nation by the way it spends its money. If you take a look at this bill, you will see that the values of America are strong in many areas. We are prepared to spend $6 billion to make sure that the men and women in uniform in Kosovo have the very best. Were it my son or daughter, I would demand nothing less. I am sure we all feel the same.

We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars for humanitarian relief. Isn't it typically American that no matter what our sacrifice, we are willing to help others, whether it is the refugees

in Kosovo or those suffering from the hurricane in Central America.

Many other good things are in this bill. I was happy to be part of an effort to provide financial assistance to those who have been in the pork production industry and have been hard hit during the last year. Senator BOND and I have worked for $145 million to try to help some of these farmers to face the toughest times in their lives. Net farm income in Illinois is down 78 percent. Farmland in Illinois is some of the best in the country, yet farmers have seen this dramatic decline in income. With all these good things in the bill, it would seem fairly obvious to vote for it without reservation. I wish I could. I plan on voting for it, but with serious reservations. Let me tell you what they relate to.

When this bill came from the White House, the President asked for $6 billion for military and humanitarian assistance, and then the House added $5 billion in military spending which the President didn't ask for. Among other things in this bill is $500 million for military construction around the world that is not authorized, not requested. It is put in here.

When I went to the conference with Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS, the Senate side of the aisle said we are going to propose an amendment that I offered—$265 million for American schools. You have heard of all the things I have mentioned. There is not a penny in this bill for American schools—nothing. Are schools on our minds? You bet they are. Cities like Conyers, GA; Littleton, CO; Jonesboro, AR; West Paducah, KY; Pearl, MS; Springfield, OR. The sad roster of schools in America that have been hit by school violence continues to grow.

I produced an amendment for $265 million for two things—not radical new suggestions but tried and true things such as school counselors so that kids who are troubled and have a problem have somebody to turn to, and after-school programs so that kids are supervised in a positive, safe learning environment. The House conferees rejected that. Not a penny for schools, not $265 million. Not a penny for schools, but $5 billion more in military spending than this President requested.

Where are our values? Where are our priorities? If our priorities are not in the schoolrooms and classrooms of America, if they are not with our children, where are our values?

I salute what is in this bill. Much is good. But it pains me greatly to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that in a conference committee only a few days ago the idea of sending money to America's schools for America's schoolchildren was soundly rejected by the House conferees. That makes no sense whatsoever.

We will talk in the juvenile justice bill about how to reduce crime in America, how to reduce violence, and we should. We will talk about gun control, and I support it. But there is more to it. We have to be able to reach out to those kids who show up at school every day with a world of hurt, a world of problems, kids who probably see school as the only shelter, the only nurturing environment, in their lives. These kids need a helping hand, and with this helping hand they can be better students and better Americans.

We missed an opportunity in this bill by denying one penny for those schools. We missed that opportunity. I am sorry to say that this bill does not include it. But I promise you this. As long as I serve in the Senate, I will join with those in the Senate and, I hope, others in the House, who come to the realization that there is no greater priority than our children.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee. Like our other colleagues, I commend him and the distinguished Senator from Alaska for their hard work on this particular proposal we will be voting on today.

I regret that I am not able to support this particular bill because there is so much in it that I do support. I clearly recognize the critical need for additional spending for our military. Indeed, we are not spending enough on our military today, even with the emergency spending that is legitimately included in this bill for the crisis in Kosovo. We are going to have to spend even more if we are going to meet our commitments around the world and provide the national security that we're expected to provide—and indeed that we profess to be able to provide. We are not spending enough money on ships, or planes, or ammunition, or on quality of life improvements for members of our Armed Services. We are going to have to address those needs, even beyond what is provided in this bill.

I am embarrassed by the fact that we're just now getting around to funding the emergencies that occurred as a result of Hurricane Mitch, and the needs of our farmers are acute and critical. There is simply no excuse for the delay in providing the emergency funding in these areas. The concern I have is with the process. We cannot continue to do business this way. If we determine that this is an emergency spending measure, we ought to make sure that what we are funding are true emergencies and take care of our other priorities through the normal authorization and appropriations process.

We have the promise of a surplus. We ought not to abandon the fiscal responsibility that brought us that promise and has given us the chance to make real progress on debt reduction. We should not use the fact that we have our men and women in harm's way overseas as an excuse to go on a spending binge here at home. Many of the projects in this bill have merit. If it is an emergency, it ought to be in this bill. And we ought to take out the nonemergency spending, pass a clean bill, and get the emergency spending where it is needed, especially to our military.

In short, Mr. President, providing substantial emergency funding for our troops in Kosovo is the right thing to do. Providing long-overdue emergency funding for the victims of Hurricane Mitch is the right thing to do. And providing desperately needed emergency funding for our nation's farmers is the right thing to do. But combining these legitimate emergency requests with billions of dollars of nonemergency spending—no matter how meritorious the individual project—is the wrong way to do it.

With that, I yield back any time I may have. With great regret, I announce that I am unable to support the bill, although I fully support many of the priorities the bill includes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 7½ minutes to Mr. GRAHAM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that Colton Campbell be afforded floor privileges during the duration of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will reluctantly support this legislation because it contains important issues. It contains the funding for our troops in the Balkans. It contains the funds to meet our humanitarian responsibilities to our neighbors in Central America and the Caribbean. It also retains a provision—which I know the Presiding Officer has strongly supported—to clearly state that the funds the States secured through their tobacco settlements will be funds to be managed, administered, and prioritized at the State level.

Mr. President, I share many of the concerns of my colleague from Virginia. I share those concerns because what we are doing is to chip away at the financial security of 38 million Americans—38 million Americans who receive Social Security income. Forty percent of those 38 million Americans would have fallen below the poverty line but for Social Security.

Why is this relevant to this debate? It is relevant because we are on the verge of draining an additional $12 billion from the Social Security fund through this legislation. We had three choices when we started this debate. One choice was to do the tough thing, to reprioritize our spending, to say that if it is important that we spend money on our humanitarian needs in

Central America and the Caribbean, then let us reduce spending somewhere else.

I am pleased to say that for that account we in fact have done so.

We had another choice, which was to say let's raise revenue. If we can't find an area where we think it is appropriate to reduce spending, then let's be prepared to pay for this emergency.

Third, we could say let's use the accumulated surplus that we have, which today is a 100-percent surplus generated by the Social Security trust fund. As to the $12 billion in this legislation, we have elected the third course of action.

Mr. President, this is not the first time we have done so. In fact, it is not the first time in the last 8 months that we have done so.

Last October, in the waning hours of the budget negotiations, Congress passed a $532 billion omnibus appropriations bill.

Tucked into that bill was $21.4 billion in so-called emergency spending.

The effect of that designation then—as it is today—was to relieve Congress of the necessity of finding some other reprioritized spending to eliminate in order to pay for this emergency.

But because of the emergency designation, the $21.4 billion in October could be approved without offsets, and because of the emergency designation today, we will approve an additional $12 billion of expenditure without offsets.

Let's look at the numbers.

In 1998, Social Security was $99 billion. The first use of that money was to offset $27 billion in deficit in the rest of the Federal budget. An additional $3 billion was used to pay for emergency outlays, leaving us with a total surplus not of $99 billion but of $69 billion.

This year, 1999, we are projecting a $127 billion surplus.

Again, we have used $3 billion to offset deficits elsewhere in the budget, $13 billion for emergency outlays, and we are about to spend another $14.6 billion for emergencies, reducing our surplus from $127 billion down to $96 billion. And for the year 2000, we have already carried forward some of the emergency spending from 1999.

Again, we will be reducing the Social Security surplus by $10 billion. This is from where we are paying for these emergencies.

Mr. President, the repetitive misuse of the emergency process is continuing to erode the Social Security trust fund. This misuse is done in a manner that precludes most Members of Congress from any meaningful role in what has traditionally been accepted as emergencies. We have been denied the opportunity to participate in a determination as to whether the proposed emergency expenditure met the standards of being sudden, urgent and unforeseen needs, which is the standard that has traditionally been used for emergencies.

The same Congress that claimed to be saving the surplus for Social Security—committed to a ''lockbox'' for Social Security—is again actively participating in raids on the Social Security trust fund through the back door.

Willie Sutton once was asked, ''Why do you rob banks?'' His answer: ''That's where the money is.''

We may manufacture the strongest vault to protect the Social Security surplus from Willie Sutton. But if we let Jesse James continue to steal the money on the train before it gets to the bank, we will have the same result. The money will not be there for our and future generations of Social Security beneficiaries.

Social Security is a federally mandated program. We have a legal obligation to our children and grandchildren to secure the surplus for its intended purpose—Social Security. We must assure that the budget surplus is not squandered on questionable emergency items in the future.

Mr. President, with your support and that of Senator SNOWE of Maine, we have introduced legislation which has as its objective to establish permanent safeguards that will assure that nonemergency items are subject to careful scrutiny and not inserted into emergency spending bills to circumvent the normal legislative process.

I urge our colleagues' support for this legislation.

Mr. President, as we adjust to the welcome reality of budget surpluses—after decades of annual deficits and burgeoning additions to the national debt—we must never forget how easily this valuable asset can be squandered.

For too long, the Federal Government treated the budget like a credit card with an unlimited spending limit.

Private citizens are warned against falsely dialing 911. Congress should exercise the same restraint in using its emergency authority.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 10 minutes be authorized for debate on this measure, and that 8 of those minutes be under the control of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and 2 minutes be under the control of this Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, let me just say that being for or against this bill is basically a tossup, as far as I am concerned. It is one of those 51–49 types of propositions. So that is how I am going to come down on the 51-percent side, and vote for the conference report.

First of all, this is not a time to indicate anything less than full support for our troops in Kosovo and the surrounding areas.

There is also in this conference report some much-needed farm assistance and disaster assistance for the United States and Central America. However, I must say there are parts of the bill to which I register my stiff opposition.

First, this bill forfeits the opportunity to ensure that tobacco settlement money is used to fight smoking and to promote health—that is not in here. In fact, just the opposite.

Second, the bill provides only a fraction of critically and urgently needed farm assistance. Let me just talk for a moment about that subject.

This is an emergency supplemental appropriations bill. We take care of emergencies in Central America and other places. But one of the very biggest emergencies facing us today is the emergency in American agriculture. Export prospects are dismal. Exports for this year are projected to fall to $49 billion, which is a 19-percent decline from 1996. Asia still hasn't recovered. Net farm income for major commodities could drop to $17 billion compared to an average of $23 billion a year for the previous 5 years. Net farm income for major field crops will be 27 percent below what it was for the last 5 years.

It is true that there is some farm assistance in this package, and I was pleased to work with my colleagues to get it in the bill. But it is not enough, and it is too late.

The White House sent up the supplemental appropriations request for additional farm loan funds and Farm Service Agency funding on February 26. Now here we are just getting to it, nearly three months later.

This money was critically and urgently needed for the planting season. Now we are just getting around to it, even though the planting season is well over halfway past. The farm assistance that we have in the bill is good. Sure, an aspirin is good, if you have a major illness and you have some pain. But it doesn't get to the real root cause of it, and neither does the assistance in this bill. It falls far short of what is needed.

I offered an amendment in the conference committee to address the deepening crisis in the farm economy. The amendment addressed a range of farm income problems in the crop, livestock and dairy sectors, and it dealt with agriculture's economic crisis around our nation, not just in one or two regions. Regrettably, that amendment failed on a 14–14 tie vote of Senate conferees.

The amendment lacked just one vote. So we will be back again on whatever measures we can get up on the floor this year to provide critically and urgently needed economic assistance to our farm families and our rural communities.

All I can say is that when it came to the issue of Kosovo, we were willing to meet our obligations and respond to the emergency. In fact, the conferees had no trouble coming up with $5 billion more than what was asked for in

military spending. But we couldn't come up with the money needed to help our beleaguered farmers and the rural economy.

Finally, I also want to say a word about offsets for this bill. For the small portion of the bill that is offset, there was a beeline to go after programs that are vital to the most vulnerable in our society: food stamps and housing. Hunger and poverty remain persistent and pervasive problems in our society. Now we know these rescissions are not genuine offsets, since there are not outlay reductions associated with them. So perhaps there is no harm, but clearly these offsets should not lay the groundwork or create a precedent for future rescissions that actually reduce program benefits.

Again, on the whole, I will vote for the conference report.

I just want to register my objections to two major portions of the conference report, farm assistance and tobacco, which I consider to be totally inadequate.

I yield the floor and yield the remainder of my time.

NEEDED SUPPORT FOR THE PAN AM 103 FAMILIES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a significant provision in the 1999 Kosovo supplemental appropriations bill will enable the Justice Department to pay for the travel expenses of the Pan Am 103 families who wish to attend the upcoming Lockerbie bombing trial in The Netherlands this summer. Existing law prevents the Department from using federal funds to pay for this travel.

Under this provision, the Justice Department's Office of Victims of Crime will be able to use an existing reserve fund to pay for the transportation costs, lodging, and food at government per diem rates for immediate family members of the Pan Am 103 victims. The Department also plans to establish an 800 number and a web site to keep family members informed during the trial. In addition, the Department plans to establish a compassion center, staffed with counselors, at the base in The Netherlands where the trial will be held, in order to help the families cope with the emotional strains of the trial.

The families of the victims of this terrorist atrocity have been waiting for more than ten years for justice. They have suffered the deep pain of losing their loved ones, and that pain has been compounded by the Libyan Government's refusal for many years to surrender the suspects accused of the bombing. Now the suspects are finally in custody and the trial will begin soon. We can never erase the pain of the loss that the families have suffered, but we can enable them to attend the trial and see that justice is finally done. I commend the House and Senate conferees for including this important provision to help these long-suffering families.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, in the past, American presidents have argued that a congressional appropriation for U.S. military action abroad constitutes a congressional authorization for the military action. I will not vote for an authorization of money that may be construed as authorizing, or encouraging the expansion of, the President's military operations in Kosovo. I will oppose the appropriation of almost $11 billion for a war I have consistently spoken out against.

On March 23, I voted against President Clinton's decision to launch the air campaign in Yugoslovia. On May 4, I voted against a resolution that would have given the President blanket authority to expand the operation. To date, I have not been convinced that this war is necessary to protect a vital national security interest, and I have opposed efforts to escalate the conflict.

I have a number of secondary considerations with respect to this legislation. I am concerned, for one, about plundering the Social Security trust funds to pay for a war that involves no vital national security interest. If I believed that vital national security interests were at stake, I would consider the argument to fund the war from the Social Security trust fund surplus. But in the absence of a vital national security interest, I do not believe the Congress should pay for the war out of the Social Security trust funds.

I am also concerned about some of the anti-environmental riders added to the emergency supplemental bill in conference. These provisions should have been fully debated, and should have gone through the normal legislative process, instead of being slipped into the bill in the dead of night.

I am disappointed that I can't support this bill, because it contains funding for farmers hit by low commodity prices. Some of this is funding that I've argued for and, in fact, voted for in earlier instances, including S. 544. But my opposition to funding the military action in Kosovo is firm. I can endorse neither the authorization for the war, nor the appropriations process that is its genesis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD.

Mr. DODD. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I rise to support the Conference Report of H.R. 1141—the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill before us today. I do so reluctantly, however, because of the many special interest riders that have been attached to this emergency legislation. In the final analysis I will support the conference report because it provides critically important funds to assist American farmers, to support ongoing action against Yugoslavia, to relieve the suffering of Kosovar refugees, and to help Central America recover from the devastating effects of Hurricane Mitch.

In light of all the other measures that have been added to this bill, many of dubious merit, I deeply regret, Mr. President, that the Speaker of the House refused to allow House conferees to accept a Senate amendment that would have freed up monies for payment of the United States debt to the United Nations. I find it somewhat puzzling that House Republicans are on record calling for a negotiated settlement of the Kosovo conflict, yet are not prepared to provide overdue payments to the organization that will likely play a central role in implementing any peace agreement. I would like to dwell on two major provisions of this bill which I support, namely the aid to help Central America recover from the damage caused by Hurricane Mitch and the funds to sustain our ongoing efforts in the Balkans.

The funds aimed at helping Central America recover from Hurricane Mitch stem from an emergency request the President made back in February. It is extremely embarrassing that it has taken until May for the Congress to finally get around to passing the necessary legislation to provide relief for a natural disaster that occurred last fall.

I cannot overstate the degree to which the storm ravaged Nicaragua, Honduras and other nearby nations. In less than a week, Hurricane Mitch claimed at least 10,000 lives—possibly as many as 20,000, left more than a million others without adequate food or shelter, and set the economies of Nicaragua and Honduras back as much as a generation. The need for long-term international assistance is great.

In late October and early November 1998, Mitch carved a slow, meandering and deadly path through the Caribbean. At the hurricane's apex, Mitch's storm clouds stretched from Florida to Panama and wind gusts topped 200 miles per hour. Meteorologists labeled Mitch a ''Category 5 Hurricane,'' the highest such designation.

Unlike other hurricanes, Mr. President, it was not Mitch's winds which proved so deadly. By the time the storm crossed the Honduran Coast on October 29, 1998, its winds had slowed to 60 miles per hour and the storm's movement to a mere crawl. The torrential rain, however, did not abate. The storm's slow speed allowed it to continually pound the same area day after day. By the time the skies cleared, Mitch had dropped five feet of rain onto Honduras and Nicaragua.

The massive flooding which followed claimed the lives of at least 10,000 Central Americans. That number, Mr. President, is certainly shocking. Yet, sadly, it is probably an understatement of the actual loss of life. As many as twelve thousand other people in the region are still missing and presumed dead. The Honduran government has declared 5,657 dead and 8,052 officially missing. In Nicaragua, at least 3,800 died. Smaller numbers perished in El Salvador, Guatemala and other countries in the region.

Mr. President, not since the Great Hurricane of 1780, nearly 220 years ago, has a storm claimed so many lives in the eastern Caribbean.

Mitch also destroyed or damaged 338 bridges, 170 in Honduras alone, leaving much of Honduras and Nicaragua accessible only by helicopter. The lack of helicopters in the region and their limited capacity left thousands without adequate food and water for weeks while some of the food provided by international aid organizations rotted at the airport.

Those who survived face the task of piecing the economy and mangled infrastructure back together. Meanwhile, more than a million people throughout the region, including one out of every five Hondurans, had to rebuild their homes and replace their personal possessions.

Honduran and Nicaraguan agriculture—a vital component of both economies—was decimated. Hurricane Mitch destroyed a quarter of Honduras's coffee plantations and 90 percent of the country's banana plants. The entire shrimp farming industry was destroyed. Damage to sugar and citrus crops was similarly heavy. The factories and farms of Honduras's Sula Valley, which normally contribute 60 percent of the country's GDP, were all flooded. While Nicaragua was not as badly damaged, the effects are still staggering: 20 percent of the nation's coffee plantations were destroyed. Newer crops such as citrus were completely annihilated.

The process of rebuilding the shattered lives, infrastructure and economies of Honduras and Nicaragua will be long and expensive. The World Bank and the United Nations Development Program estimate the total damage to the region at more than $5.3 billion. While these numbers are difficult to comprehend, they are even more daunting given that the GDP of Nicaragua is only $9.3 billion and that of Honduras only $12.7 billion.

I commend my colleagues for finding the resources to assist our neighbors to the south who have called upon the international community in their hour of need. It is not only in their interest, it is in our interest to assist them. It deserves our strong backing.

The original intent of the President's request for emergency appropriations from the Congress was to provide our men and women in uniform with the equipment and materiel they need to effectively strike the Yugoslav military. While I am heartened by recent reports of a possible diplomatic solution, we must remain prepared to continue our military efforts in the absence of an enforceable diplomatic solution which meets NATO's conditions.

Mr. President, we must never take the decision to send our service men and women into harm's way lightly. If a situation which is such an anathema to the United States that it calls for military action presents itself to us, however, we must vigorously support our soldiers, sailors and airmen through both word and deed.

As I just mentioned, the decision to send our military into battle is one of the most solemn that this body or this nation ever faces. And so, before I go on, let me reiterate why the situation in Kosovo justifies, in fact demands, American military involvement.

Slobodan Milosevic has carved a place for himself amongst history's most despicable tyrants. Serb forces have murdered least 5,000 ethnic-Albanian civilians and burned six hundred villages. To date, approximately 80 percent of Kosovar Albanians—more than 1.3 million innocent men, women and children—have fled their homes in a desperate attempt to outrun Serb military and police forces. Nearly 750,000 Kosovar Albanians have made it to the relative safety of neighboring countries and are now living under the most difficult of conditions.

These numbers, however horrific, tell only part of the story. They cannot express the pain of a family torn apart by blood-thirsty paramilitary policemen or the pain of a young woman gang-raped by Serb soldiers. They do not express the tears of a young child who spends each day wandering between the tents of a Macedonian refugee camp searching for his or her missing parents. They do not describe the pain, both physical and psychological, the victims of torture feel each day.

Many members of Congress, myself included, have traveled to the region and visited the refugee camps. We have seen the pain in the eyes of the refugees fortunate enough to have made it out of the killing fields of Kosovo. Mr. President, the look in the eyes of these refugees defies description.

The ongoing genocide in Kosovo is antithetical to the most basic principles on which the United States stands. By acting to preserve the fundamental rights of Kosovar Albanians, the United States is reaffirming our belief that all people are endowed with certain inalienable rights, including the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. If, however, the United States chose to stand idly by in the face of such grotesque evil, we would draw into question our dedication to human rights and our resolve to oppose dictators around the globe.

Our military, however, cannot effectively combat this evil if we in the Congress fail to offer them our support. One month ago, President Clinton sent a request to Congress for $6 billion in order to fund our military operations through the end of the fiscal year. That money is included in this bill.

As we debate this issue, people far beyond the walls of this chamber are listening to our words and watching our actions. Our men and women in uniform throughout the region who are putting their lives on the line each day want to know whether we in the Congress will seize this opportunity to support them. They need and they deserve the very finest equipment our nation can muster—the type of equipment the President's original request will pay for.

In capitals across Europe, our allies are listening and looking to the United States for leadership. They want to know whether the United States will maintain its commitment to NATO and to this important operation.

In refugee camps in Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro and elsewhere, hundreds of thousands of Milosevic's innocent victims are listening; hoping that we will reaffirm our commitment to them.

In the hills and forests of Kosovo, men, women and children who are hiding from soldiers and policemen are listening to American radio broadcasts on portable radios. They are looking to the United States for hope and support in their most desperate hour.

And finally, tyrants around the world, but especially in Belgrade, are judging our dedication to human rights and freedom.

Mr. President, we must send the same message to all: The United States will not back down in the face of unspeakable evil.

Just a moment ago, I mentioned that the President requested $6 billion for the ongoing operation in the Balkans. In just one month, however, that $6 billion bill has ballooned into a $14.9 billion monstrosity. The President's original request now represents well under half of the total bill.

Regretfully, the majority of the new spending is for non-emergency programs which fall far outside the original intention of the legislation. Such programs should rightfully be left to the regular appropriations process. The issues this bill was intended to address are simply too important to be embroiled in political spending. Thus, while I continue to support strongly the President's original request, I support the legislation before us with reluctance due to the expensive, non-emergency riders that were added during the House/Senate conference on this measure.

Mr. President, the provisions of this bill relating to Kosovo and Central America deserve our immediate attention and support. The victims of mother nature's fury in our own hemisphere and of Slobodan Milosevic's genocide in Europe, as well as the brave American men and women fighting under the American flag, need and deserve America's support. For that reason I intend to vote to support passage of this conference report despite its imperfections.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS, has a very distinguished guest whom he wishes to present. I therefore yield for that purpose.

I ask unanimous consent that no time be charged to the remaining speakers because of that fact, and I ask unanimous consent following the introduction by Senator HELMS, there be a recess of 3 minutes so Senators may personally greet the distinguished guest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY KING ABDALLAH BIN HUSSEIN

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, as always, is gracious, and I thank him very much. As he indicated, we have today a distinguished son of a distinguished father who has visited many times. His Majesty, King Abdallah bin Hussein of Jordan.

He has been visiting with the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee and I present him to the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess for 3 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:37 p.m., recessed until 3:42 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the very able and eloquent distinguished Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise for the first time since I have been in the Senate to oppose a supplemental appropriation. It hurts my heart because there is so much in this bill that is good. But I have to say there is a lot in this bill that does not belong in it, and there are some things left out of this bill, one or two things, that I thought were real emergencies that should have been in there.

What started out as requests to fund unexpected emergencies has turned into a flurry of spending and riders that simply do not belong in this bill. The one area that I particularly cared about, violence in our schools—which is an emergency by anybody's measure when parents are telling us, 75 percent of them, they are concerned about their children when they go off to school—a very modest proposal by the Senator from Illinois was turned down by the House members of the conference after it was approved by the Senate members of the conference. So all kinds of dollars were found for many things, but they could not find it in their hearts to do something about violence in the schools by providing some counselors, some afterschool money so desperately needed in our country today.

I am happy for the Senator from West Virginia, that he was able to get a commitment for a crisis he is facing in the steel industry in his State. I agreed with him, that particular piece of legislation and those funds should have been placed into this bill, and they were not. So I found this a very strange conference. I miss the Appropriations Committee. I was on it for two beautiful years. So I sat and watched at 1 in the morning as Senators and House Members debated. You may wonder, why would the Senator from California do that? Very simple: It is a very important bill that is before us.

I believe in what NATO is trying to accomplish. I agreed with the President that we needed to find about $6 billion for the military. It turns out it is almost double that, that winds up in this bill. The pay raise is taken care of. I wanted to do an even higher pay raise, but that pay raise—it is not an emergency, it is an obligation. We have to back the pay raise in the regular appropriations bills. This is just another way to push dollars around.

I do not think it is fair to say that is an emergency. I supported the funds in there for America's farmers, for Hurricane Mitch; those things were fine. But some of the riders in this bill really were wrong, not only wrong in substance but wrong to put in this bill. For example, the rider that deals with the tobacco funds from the tobacco lawsuit. It is not that I object that the Federal Government will not get a share of that—because I am willing to say it is fine, the Governors are the ones who put their names out there and they should get these funds. But to say to the Governors who are getting our part of the reimbursement: By the way, spend it any way you like—we are going to see Governors use that money to put a swimming pool in the Governor's mansion; we are going to see Governors use that to build a little street in the neighborhood where maybe some of their donors live.

I do not come from the school of thought that Governors are better than Senators. I think we run on a platform and most of us, most of us from both parties, believe we need to take care of the health care needs of our people. Comes along this bill, comes along a rider that says: Governors, you can spend that any way you want. Build a running track for your friends around the Governor's mansion? Fine, no problem, no strings. I have a problem with that. We should make sure our Governors are taking care of the health needs of their citizens since part of that money rightly comes from a recovery that included Federal programs—Medicaid, as an example.

Then there are three riders that deal with the environment in one way or the other. One has to do with oil royalties. This is about the third time that antienvironmental rider has been placed in this bill, because colleagues know they cannot get the votes here. It is stopping the Interior Department from collecting the rent payments or the royalty payments from oil companies who drill on Federal land, taxpayers' land. That money is being stolen from us. How do I know that? Because there have been lawsuits. And every time the Federal Government wins those lawsuits—I ask for 1 additional minute, if I might.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. So here we have a situation where the Interior Department could use the money to help with our parks and open space, and the oil companies get another special rider on this bill. It is the third time that has happened. Mr. President, I do not think that is the way to legislate.

Then we have an environmental rider placed in the bill by Senator GORTON who now, I understand, is not even going to vote for this bill which has his rider in it that does tremendous damage to the State of Washington by permitting a mine up there.

There are so many things in this bill that do not belong in it. So it is with a heavy heart I say to my friends, for whom I have great respect, I cannot vote for this. I do not think everything in there is truly an emergency. Yet I think those things that were emergencies were left out.

I look forward to working with my friends in the regular order so we can debate some of these important measures outside this so-called emergency designation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I will vote against the pending conference report because I believe it, and the policy and process behind it, represent a shameful failure on behalf of our American servicemen and women now in harm's way in the Balkans.

This legislation before the Senate today displays exactly what's wrong with Washington, including the United States Senate. There is much in the pending conference report on Supplemental Appropriations which is urgently needed and which I support. American farmers need and deserve the disaster assistance included in this legislation. The Kosovar refugees need and deserve massive resettlement and reconstruction assistance, of which the pending measure provides at least a down payment. Our servicemen and women need and deserve the pay raise it provides and above all, those who are on the front lines in the Balkans and elsewhere in the world need supplies and equipment.

However, in spite of these positive features, I will be voting ''no'' because of the bill's funding for an expanded, open-ended war against Yugoslavia, which in my opinion, has not been adequately and appropriately considered by the Congress, and also because this important legislation has been used for petty provincial interests. In effect, our servicemen and women are being held hostage while the bill has been loaded up with narrow amendments to assist special interests, such as a gold mine in Washington state, a dormitory for Congressional pages, and reindeer ranchers.

While I have certainly observed this same game of special interest influence on the legislative process all too often since I have been in the Senate, this current case is particularly egregious

because of the boldness of the special interests and the apparent willingness of too many of our national leaders to allow those interests to be placed above consideration of the interests of our troops in the field.

Our troops deserve better from all of us.

I have spoken before my reservations about NATO's current policy in the Balkans and Congress' abdication of our Constitutional responsibilities with respect to war powers. To say the least, neither of those reservations have been alleviated in this conference report.

Our leadership, including both the Clinton Administration and NATO, have failed to clearly state what our mission is in the Balkans, what specific goals we intend to achieve, and how we will end this mission.

As perhaps the leading military analyst of the Vietnam War, Colonel Harry Summers, wrote in his excellent book ''On Strategy: The Vietnam War in Contest:''

The first principle of war is the principle of ''The Objective.'' It is the first principle because all else flows from it. . . . How to determine military objectives that will achieve or assist in achieving the political objectives of the United States is the primary task of the military strategist, thus the relationship between military and political objectives is critical. Prior to any future commitment of U.S. military forces our military leaders must insist that the civilian leadership provide tangible, obtainable political goals. The political objective cannot merely be a platitude but must be stated in concrete terms. While such objectives may very well change during the course of the war, it is essential that we begin with an understanding of where we intend to go. As Clausewitz said, we should not ''take the first step without considering the last.'' In other words, we (and perhaps, more important, the American people) need to have a definition of ''victory.''

Colonel Summers continues:

There is an inherent contradiction between the military and its civilian leaders on this issue. For both domestic and international political purposes the civilian leaders want maximum flexibility and maneuverability and are hesitant to fix on firm objectives. The military on the other hand need just such a firm objective as early as possible in order to plan and conduct military operations.

Mr. President, we've been here before, and speaking personally, I know all too well the kind of price that is paid by our men and women in uniform when our political leaders fail to lay out clear and specific objectives. More than thirty years ago, in Vietnam we also lacked clear and specific objectives. We attempted to use our military to impose our will in a region far from our shores and far from our vital national interests, and without ever fully engaging the Congress or the American people in the process. The result was a conflict where the politicians failed to provide clear political objectives, but intruded in determining military strategy, and where our policy was never fully understood or fully supported by the American people.

Too many Americans never came home from that war, and others came home unalterably changed in mind or body. I cannot in good conscience sit here and watch it all appear to be happening again. I will not support putting American ground troops into Kosovo, and I cannot vote for this conference report which, in my opinion, moves us further in that direction.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report before us. It uses funds for undeniably urgent needs—our operations in Kosovo, our rescue of struggling family farmers, our efforts to dig out from the hurricanes of last year and the tornados of this month—to mask spending on unnecessary and unbudgeted urges. That is more than dishonest; it is disgraceful. It is like agreeing to let your neighbors use your car to take their sick child to the hospital—if they also agree to pick up and pay for your groceries, your dry cleaning, a set of new tires for the car, and a pizza.

It is no surprise that people are cynical about talk that comes out of Washington. By adopting this conference report, we prove our work means very little. We prove that the budget we endorsed just two months ago was not a promise—it was posturing. We prove that we are more interested in sound bites than sound accounting.

Mr. President, I understand that there are genuine emergencies that require us to spend beyond what we had anticipated for a given fiscal year. I will vote to fund such emergencies immediately and work out the budget details later. I also understand that there are supplemental spending requirements that can come up during the year. And I will also support passing supplemental appropriations bills and paying for them within the budget limits we have set for ourselves. What I find unconscionable is what we are doing here today: attempting to get around the draconian budget resolution we passed in March by stuffing as much supplemental spending as possible in this bill and then treating it as an emergency.

Given my strong feelings on this, I would like to clarify my vote to waive the Gramm point of order. Senator GRAMM, rightly I believe, raised many of the same issues that concern me. His point of order, however, did a surgeon's job with a hatchet. His point of order would have brought down spending that was truly emergency, and therefore was not offset—spending for humanitarian aid for the Kosovar refugees, for infusions of cash into the struggling farm credit system, for helping areas hit by natural disaster. The point or order would also have brought down domestic spending that was not an emergency, but that the Appropriations Committee went to great pains to offset. There are over $2 billion in offsets in this bill, and the great majority come from cuts in nondefense programs.

So, while I understand Senator GRAMM's desire to make this bill fiscally honest and responsible, I cannot support his methods. Instead, we should defeat this bill and start again—passing only what the Department of Defense says they need to continue their operations in Kosovo, only what is truly a domestic emergency, only what is non-emergency and offset.

I have voted in support of the use of air power in Kosovo, a decision I made solemnly, and I am willing to vote to support funding the mission. This conference report, however, contains money the Pentagon never asked for and that will never have an impact on the situation in Kosovo. Almost five billion dollars in non-emergency defense spending has been attached to the President's request without even allowing the Senate an opportunity to vote or debate these additions. Calling some of these new military construction projects an ''emergency'' is shameful. Those projects cannot compare with the urgency in hurricane ravaged Central America, the economic hardship faced by our family farms, or the plight of refugees on the desolate hillsides of Albania.

Obviously a great deal of munitions, fuel, and material have been expended in our mission over Yugoslavia. The need to fund these operations, however, should not be an excuse to fund other special-interest projects that were never high enough priorities to be placed in the tight military budget. Suddenly these projects are so important they are given emergency designation, when a few months ago they hardly deserved mentioning, and were certainly not worth including in the budget resolution Congress adopted in March.

It is wrong for those who want a much larger defense budget to hold hostage the emergency funds needed for the Kosovo operation, Central America, and the devastated rural America—and it is wrong to go to the American taxpayers to pay their ransom.

Thus, it is with some regret that I must vote against this conference report. Regret, because there are a number of very good things in this bill, including funding that I worked hard to ensure would be there to help respond to the desperate situation of our family farmer.

This bill provides $43 million for Farm Service Agency personnel and $110 million and for the farm credit program requested by the Administration in response to the tremendous credit crunch facing our Nation's farmers. The Farm Service Agency funds are needed to provide the support staff so USDA can deliver disaster assistance promised to farmers last fall. The additional $110 million for USDA's farm credit program will provide essential loan guarantees to farmers as they struggle through historically low prices.

The conference report also includes $63 million for FY 1999 and FY 2000 to

allow the USDA to provide technical assistance to landowners as they enroll in USDA's Natural Resource Conservation Service environmental programs. Because of funding shortfalls, Wisconsin's NRCS has already stopped providing technical assistance. That means thousands of acres of land, ready to be returned to their pristine state through the joint efforts of farmers and the USDA, are lying fallow.

Finally, I want to highlight another provision I worked on in this conference report: food assistance to the Kosovar refugees. We have all seen the news accounts, the pictures, and have heard the terrible stories of tragedy that the people in the Balkans are facing daily. Reports from that region include hunger as another major problem that is hitting hardest among the children, the elderly, and the most vulnerable. Humanitarian food assistance, or PL–480 funds, have been diverted to Kosovo from other regions of the world where serious needs exist. Funding for Kosovo food assistance was not included in initial versions of this bill, but without it, people in Africa, Bangladesh, and other troubled regions will continue to suffer from hunger and deprivation. It is never good policy or sense to rob Peter to pay Paul, but it is disgraceful when Peter and Paul are innocent, starving children on opposite sides of the world.

However, even with all these good things, this conference report is the harbinger of terrible things to come. By trying to slip so much non-emergency spending into this bill, the conference committee has acknowledged that we cannot meet the genuine needs of our citizens within the budget that was laid out in March.

Mr. President, the American people deserve an honest budget, and they deserve to know that we will meet their emergencies in a forthright manner. I regret that we could not do that today. If we pass this conference report, we will further and deservedly lose the trust of those who send us their hard earned tax dollars. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will reluctantly vote for this supplemental appropriations bill for three primary reasons: to provide our agricultural producers at least a portion of the support they need; to support our troops in Kosovo; and to assist the desperate Kosovar refugees and Hurricane Mitch victims. I strongly oppose the mining rider added in the middle of the night to this emergency spending bill and am saddened this Congress will not require States to spend of the tobacco settlement funds on actually preventing teen smoking or protecting public health.

I very enthusiastically support the $109 million in this bill for direct and guaranteed loans to provide credit for American agricultural producers. This and the other agriculture-related provisions in this bill are vitally important to our growers, providing more than $700 million for important agricultural programs. Every single dollar of this aid is all the more critical because Congress failed to support a funding level that would help producers weather these difficult economic times. I support the Harkin-Dorgan amendment to add $5 billion to this agricultural aid package during the conference committee's consideration of this bill. Unfortunately, the amendment was rejected. Meanwhile, our growers are left waiting for more meaningful assistance as they struggle under the so-called Freedom to Farm Act.

This bill also contains vital funding for our military forces in the Balkans. I strongly support the Administration's original request for monies to support the Kosovo effort. I am fully prepared to meet our responsibilities to our troops and personnel involved in this important NATO effort. It is unfortunate the House insisted on adding billions of additional, unrequested funding for defense projects, many of which are unrelated to the NATO action in the Balkans. I also endorse our commitment to assist the millions of refugees, who are victims of this unfortunate conflict.

I, too, am pleased this bill provide critical assistance to the victims of Hurricane Mitch. This deadly and destructive hurricane decimated several Central American countries, and has been particularly difficult on families already surviving on subsistence levels. The U.S. should have long ago signaled our commitment to lead the international effort to aid the victims of Hurricane Mitch.

These important issues aside, I strongly oppose the rider on mining included in this bill. I do not accept the argument put forth by several of my colleagues on the conference committee that the supplemental appropriations bill was the proper place to address an administrative interpretation of the 1872 Mining Law. Within this bill are two provisions that simply are not emergencies and do not belong. One is the further blockage of the Department of Interior's implementing regulations on hard-rock mining.

The other provision is particularly troubling to me for it affects a proposed mine in my State of Washington. Included in this bill is a provision that blocks the Department of Interior from enforcing a recent solicitor's opinion interpreting allowable mill site acerage. That opinion reinterpreted the 1872 mining law and limited the amount of mining waste companies could dump on public lands. For many years, my constituents and people across the nation have been calling for true reform of the 1872 mining law. This late-night change is not what they have been asking us to do. The industry knows these provisions would not win approval in the normal legislative process, so they sought riders on a military and disaster relief appropriations bill. These are issues that deserve to be debated in full and in public, not in a mere 10 minutes, late at night among conferees without the necessary expertise to determine whether this is the correct policy.

I want to add that I have spoken with officials at the White House who have shared their concern about these mining provisions. I told them we must not allow this action to be a precedent for how we authorize new open pit mines on our public lands. We should debate reform of the 1872 mining law fully and in the bright spotlight of public review. Protecting the public's interest in their federal lands must be a top priority. They agree.

I am also extremely disappointed this bill will allow the states to allocate the federal share of the multi-state agreement (MSA) with the tobacco companies to any program or project they desire. I strongly believe we have missed an historic opportunity to reverse the destruction caused by smoking. It is tragic to think that every day we delay reducing underage smoking, 3,000 children will try this deadly habit. Five million children today will face illness and premature death due to smoking. Yet we are allowing the states to spend the federal share on any program they may chose.

I am proud that in Washington state, the state legislature and Governor Locke chose to do the right thing and spend the settlement money working to eliminate the plague of tobacco. However, Washington state is only one of three states using the MSA settlement funds to support public health efforts and smoking cessation.

There is some irony in this debate about the role of the federal government in spending so-called settlement monies. The tobacco companies win immunity from future prosecution or liability from the states of federal government and because of states' inaction, the companies will be guaranteed a whole new generation of smokers. By not standing firm and using these monies to eliminate underage smoking and reduce adult rates, the cost of care for these individuals will be the burden of the federal government and federal taxpayers. As members of the Senate, we will have to find the additional funding to pay for increases in Medicare, FEHBP, CHAMPUS, and VA health care costs.

I am disappointed that we could not reach an acceptable compromise that would have protected our children, allowed states' reasonable spending discretion, and shielded the federal budget. I am hopeful we can continue to work at the federal level to enact tough, anti-tobacco restrictions, including FDA regulation of tobacco and increased efforts by CDC to help the states reduce the burden of tobacco.

Let me address one more topic. This bill transfers the Disaster Recovery Initiative (DRI) program, commonly known as the unmet needs program, from HUD to FEMA. While I do not oppose this transfer, my concerns about

it grew as Congress delayed its consideration of this supplemental bill. President Clinton declared two disasters in Washington state during calendar year 1998, including a slow-moving, on-going landslide in the Aldercrest community in Kelso. For a variety of reasons, FEMA public assistance dollars will not reach Aldercrest victims for some time. That makes the unmet needs money—now administered by FEMA—all the more critical. While I am frustrated with the delay in this process, I am pleased we are moving forward once again. This conference report highlights the conferees interest in ensuring Aldercrest victims get this disaster assistance as quickly as is possible.

Mr. President, this is a very difficult vote for me. I chose not to sign the conference report, but I support the bill to help our ailing agricultural producers, support our troops, and provide assistance to refugees and disaster victims.

EFFECTIVE HUMAN RIGHTS RESPONSE TO KOSOVO

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, an important provision in the Statement of the Managers on the 1999 Kosovo Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act recommends $13 million above the administration's request for the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. It also recommends $10 million more than the administration requested for the State Department's Human Rights and Democracy Fund.

The conferees on this legislation have recommended these additional resources to help support a more effective human rights response to the Kosovo crisis. Many of us are deeply concerned over the escalation of human rights abuses in Kosovo since the breakdown of the Rambouillet negotiations. The additional funding for the War Crimes Tribunal will enable it to expand its investigative efforts to see that justice is done.

Justice Arbour has made a strong case that this funding is needed immediately for forensic investigative teams, mass grave exhumations, investigations, Albanian translators, equipment, and other associated costs. America is the strongest support of the War Crimes Tribunal, and it is essential for us to provide provide the additional resources the tribunal needs without delay to ensure that those responsible for the gross violations of international law in Kosovo are brought to justice.

I also strongly support the work of the State Department's Human Rights and Democracy Fund. The HRDF's ability to respond quickly to emergencies has enabled the Department to begin documenting mass executions, rape, deportations, and torture. Unfortunately, its resources are stretched thin as a result of the large scale of these atrocities.

the additional funds recommended by Congress for the HRDF will enable the State Department to enhance its ability to obtain information promptly and methodically from fleeing refugee victims and witnesses and provide the information to the U.S. Government, the War Crimes Tribunal, and the public to ensure that those responsible for these atrocities will be held accountable.

The funds will also enable the State Department to provide documents to refugees whose passports, identity papers, and property titles were stripped from them when Serb forces compelled them to leave Kosovo. Doing so will help counter President Milosevic's cynical policy of ''identity cleansing'' and facilitate the return of the refugees to their homes. The funds are also intended to enhance our government's efforts to ensure that victims receive proper counseling for the unconscionable trauma they have suffered.

I commend the conferees for making these additional resources available to achieve an effective human rights response on Kosovo.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in 1996, I authored the Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act to provide assistance to victims of terrorism and mass violence, wherever it occurred. This assistance is limited to victims who are citizens or employees of the United States who are injured or killed as a result of a terrorist act.

Unfortunately, that legislation is not doing the job as we intended. There are still too many victims of terrorism who are not getting the help they need and deserve—the help that Congress meant to give them in 1996. Among those left out in the cold are the families of those killed in the downing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie in 1988, and the victims of last year's embassy bombings in West Africa.

Section 3024 of the emergency appropriations bill will provide a limited but immediate response by providing much-needed assistance to the families of the Americans who were killed in the bombing of Pan Am 103. I am proud to have worked to get this emergency provision included in the conference report.

Currently, in cases involving terrorist acts occurring outside the United States, the Office of Victims of Crime (OVC) may only give supplemental grants to the States, for compensation of state residents. This formulation has not provided the intended help to victims of terrorism who reside overseas and do not have a clear State residence, even though they are U.S. citizens. It is of little assistance to the non-citizen victims employed by our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, who also deserve our support and assistance. And due to an overly restrictive interpretation of the 1996 law by the Department of Justice, it has not provided help to the victims of the Lockerbie bombing and other victims of terrorist acts that occurred before the Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act went into effect.

The current law has led to slower implementation than I intended when emergency aid is desperately needed, and has not enabled OVC to provide emergency relief, crisis response or training and technical assistance for victim service providers, as I intended.

Accordingly, this week I offered an amendment to the juvenile justice bill, S. 254—which was accepted in the mangers' amendment—which would improve the law even further. It would ensure that OVC can provide efficient and effective assistance—and really make a difference—for Americans whose lives are torn apart by acts of terrorism and mass violence occurring outside the United States.

In the meantime, the trial in the Pan Am 103 case is getting under way, and the families of those victims need our help *now*. This is an urgent matter, and I am glad that we are addressing it in this emergency bill.

OUTSTANDING CLAIMS

Mr. INOUYE. I have a few questions for my colleague from Alaska on Section 3021 of the bill which authorizes the Attorney General to transfer funds available to the Department of Justice to pay outstanding claims of Japanese Americans under the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 and outstanding claims of Japanese Latin Americans under the settlement agreement in the case of *Carmen Mochizuki et al* .v. *United States* (Case No. 97–294C, United States Court of Federal Claims).

Am I correct that this provision would allow the Attorney General to pay redress of $20,000 to Japanese Americans who were interned by the United States during World War II and who filed a timely claim for redress under the Civil Liberties Act of 1988?

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct. Under the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, the United States has paid redress to more than 82,000 eligible individuals over the 10 year life of the program. Eligible individuals under this Act had to file a claim for redress by August 10, 1998. There were a number of individuals, however, who did not complete the documentation necessary for the Department of Justice to determine, prior to the termination of the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund and the expiration of the redress program six months later, whether they were eligible for redress under the Act. This provision would allow those individuals, if they filed timely claims, to provide any necessary information to the Department of Justice, and allow the Department to complete its review of their files. If the Department determines that they are eligible, this provision allows the Attorney General to pay the claimants restitution under the Act.

Mr. INOUYE. In the case of Carmen Mochizuki et al versus United States, plaintiffs brought a class action against the United States seeking redress for Japanese Latin Americans who were interned by the United States during World War II. The United States settled this case. The settlement provides that each eligible class

member would receive a $5,000 restitution payment, to the extent there were funds available in the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. Even though this Fund has now terminated, does this provision also allow the Attorney General to pay restitution to Japanese Latin American individuals who are found eligible under the Mochizuki settlement agreement and who filed timely claims covered by the agreement?

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct. Some of the class members in this lawsuit were paid $5,000 restitution before the funds in the Civil Liberties Education Fund were exhausted. However, there are a number of class members who filed timely claims under the Mochizuki settlement who were not provided with restitution because there were no funds remaining. In addition, some class members were not able to complete the documentation necessary for the Department of Justice to determine, prior to the termination of the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund and the expiration of the redress program six months later, whether they were eligible for redress under the settlement agreement. This provision would allow those individuals, if they filed timely claims, to provide any necessary information to the Department of Justice, and allow the Department to complete its review of their files. If the Department determines that they are eligible, or has already done so, this provision allows the Attorney General to pay them restitution under the settlement agreement.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank my colleague from Alaska for the clarification on this provision in the bill.

CLEANUP FROM SPRING TORNADOES

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleagues, Senator COCHRAN and Senator KOHL, the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies, for their help regarding clean up needs in my state following the devastating tornadoes that struck on January 21, 1999. On that day, an estimated 38 tornadoes touched down in at least 16 counties in Arkansas, a one-day record for the number of tornadoes in a single state in one day. Eight deaths and scores of injuries resulted. The storms damaged or destroyed two thousand homes, at least 126 businesses, and various utilities in eleven counties. As you might imagine, a tremendous amount of debris is scattered throughout the damage area.

When the Senate considered S. 544, the supplemental appropriations bill which is now before us as the conference report to H.R. 1141, an amendment of mine was adopted that would direct the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to assist in the removal of debris left from those storms. It is extremely important that we provide assistance necessary to remove this debris in order to help restore lands to a more productive state, but even more importantly, to prevent more serious emergencies that will result if this debris is allowed to obstruct stream flows and cause flooding, erosion, and other economic and environmental problems. Could the Senators please explain how his conference report addresses this situation.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator for her comments and I understand her concern about the need to provide debris removal assistance following the violent storms in her state and other states. The amendment of the Senator, to which she refers, would have expanded the statutory authority of NRCS to exercise debris removal activities on lands not covered by current law. This would not only have included the lands of which the Senator speaks, but could be interpreted to cover a wide array of other lands. It is our understanding that statutory authority does exist for the debris removal activities about which the Senator speaks, making bill language unnecessary. However, certain administrative actions by the Department will be necessary before these activities can be carried out.

From time to time, we are asked to provide emergency funds in response to natural disasters. Too often, there is a human cost to these disasters that we have no power to compensate. In other instances, the level of our assistance is appropriate and necessary for the task. There are times, however, when the sums required could have been reduced had a little prevention been in place before the crisis struck.

Obviously, the force of a tornado is such that mankind may never be able to control or overcome. The devastation we all have witnessed this Spring in several states including Arkansas, and more recently Oklahoma and Kansas, was of such a magnitude in economic and human costs that calls for our assistance must not go unheard. Now, however, we are faced with choices about actions that might, at this point, prevent future damage and future costs.

The debris of which the Senator describes is not only that which currently is obstructing stream flows or causing flooding or erosion, but it also includes debris located in the immediate vicinity of those streams and waterways. It takes little imagination to envision another, far less intensive storm in the region that would cause that debris to be removed directly into the steambed with substantial damage and cost as a result, costs for which we and the American taxpayers might very well be asked to compensate in the near future. in this case, a little prevention today may save substantial sums tomorrow. That is why the Senator is precisely correct and why we must ensure these needs are met.

The conference report now before the Senate does not include the bill language the Senator offered earlier due to the fact that, as mentioned above, the statutory authority for those activities of concern to her and to others currently exists. The Statement of Managers makes that point. However, the purpose of her amendment is well taken in bringing to the attention of the Department that necessary administrative actions must be taken immediately to address the emergency situation that remains. We do not here suggest that the Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations authorities be broadened to include ''any'' lands. Instead, it is important for us all to recognize that reasonable steps by the Department should be taken to remove the debris in question before it becomes the cause of more substantial losses in the future.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for raising this issue and I appreciate the comments of my other colleagues on this subject. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that the Department should exercise any preventive measures practicable as the best way to avoid more costly restoration and rehabilitation in the future.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank my colleagues for this explanation.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the 1999 Supplemental Appropriations legislation. Let me make a few brief remarks explaining why I will vote against it. I do so reluctantly because some of this funding is necessary, such as the agriculture spending, and some is offset. I co-sponsored and strongly supported the Enzi amendment to fully offset spending in this bill. Since our colleagues on the other side of the aisle blocked this effort to be fiscally responsible, thereby giving their support to this spending of Social Security surplus funds, I cannot endorse this irresponsible spending.

The Concord Coalition, a bipartisan watchdog of fiscal policy, calls this bill a ''SAYGO'' bill, and SAYGO stands for spend-as-you-go. According to the Concord Coalition, ''Congress is using the emergency spending loophole to create a new budgetary concept—spend as you go (SAYGO). I fully agree with the Concord Coalition. Sadly, the term ''SAYGO'' has captured the essence of this legislation.

However, there is nothing new about this practice. Congress has repeatedly used this old trick on the American taxpayers as a way to expand government programs and escape budget disciplines.

Let me remind my colleagues about what happened last year.

As you recall, Mr. President, despite the rhetoric of President Clinton and Congress to use every penny of the budget surplus to save Social Security, last year, we spent nearly $30 billion of the Social Security surplus for alleged ''emergency spending.'' This was more than one third of the entire Social Security surplus for 1998. In last year's omnibus spending legislation alone, Congress spent $22 billion, and nearly $9.3 billion in regular appropriations was shifted into future budgets, a new

smoke-and-mirrors gimmick, since we are now hearing how impossible it will be to live within budget caps for FY 2000. No wonder!

In addition, few of these ''emergency spending'' items were true emergencies. Many of these dollars could have been included in the annual appropriations process.

Last year's irresponsible spending used up the Social Security surplus we were supposed to save, broke the statutory spending caps we promised to keep, and as a result made the caps even tighter for this year.

Clearly, that was a big mistake. That's why many of us believe we should end this practice before it becomes automatic and even more egregious in the future. In fact, that's why we passed this year's Budget Resolution with a new enforcement mechanism which allows any Senator to raise a point of order against non-defense emergency designations in an appropriations conference report. In my judgment, this should include defense as well.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, we are repeating the same mistake in the 1999 Supplemental Appropriations bill. It includes $15 billion of spending with an estimate of only $2.5 billion actually outlayed this fiscal year. So it is quite obvious this spending is a way to relieve some of the pressure on the FY 2000 spending caps. If the spending caps need to be lifted, let's vote on that up front, not this way. I would not vote to lift the caps anyway, but it is a more responsible way of handling what some believe is a budget crisis.

The legislation was originally intended to provide disaster relief to Central America and was later expanded to cover our military action in Kosovo, which are necessary and important spending. Even the agriculture spending is necessary. But conferees also added significant funding that is not emergency-related and was not requested by the President in the conference report.

The conference report for this year's emergency spending bill includes $15 billion with only $1.9 billion offset. This means Congress is spending $13 billion of the Social Security surplus, which is over 10 percent of this year's Social Security surplus.

The President requested $5.5 billion for military operations in Kosovo and Southwest Asia. But the conferees have doubled that amount. As a result, American taxpayers now have to pay $10.9 billion additional for defense, much of which should be considered in FY 2000 appropriations and was not an emergency. These add-ons include $1.84 billion for military pay and pension increases and $2.25 billion for spare parts, depot maintenance and readiness training.

I believe we must allocate sufficient resources to ensure our national security and I am concerned about readiness. We must provide adequate funding to maintain our military operations and support our troops in Kosovo and elsewhere. However, I don't believe we can use our immediate needs as a vehicle for non-emergency defense spending. General defense readiness needs, such as a military pay raise and a pension benefits increase, is not an emergency and should be handled through the normal budget, authorization and appropriations process. Again, if the spending cap is a problem, we should deal with that problem head on, not by this back-door approach.

Further, this conference report is a Christmas tree that's loaded not with ornaments, but with plenty of non-emergency spending items under the guise of an emergency, totaling over $200 million. Even some emergency related funding is far above what is needed and requested. For example, the President requested $370 million funding for FEMA, but the conference report has almost tripled that amount. This is not right. Attached is a copy of Senator MCCAIN's list on the objectionable provisions contained in this conference report.

My biggest concern is that we have promised the American people we will save every penny of the Social Security surplus exclusively for Social Security. In the recently-passed budget resolution we included a provision to lock in $1.8 trillion of the Social Security surplus to save and strengthen Social Security. We are continuing to pursue Social Security lockbox legislation to prohibit Washington from continuing to loot the Social Security surplus for unrelated government spending. Now we are backing off from that promise, claiming we will make it up next year. I've heard that before. I believe this will damage our credibility and accountability with the American people, as well as further endanger our already damaged Social Security system.

As I mentioned earlier, there are some good provisions I strongly support in this bill. Frankly, some of the provisions and funding will help my own state of Minnesota. But the non-emergency spending which is not offset overshadows these good provisions. I cannot in good conscience vote for this legislation.

Finally, the Concord Coalition challenges us, I quote: ''Fiscally responsible Members of both parties should put an end to SAY–GO by rejecting this emergency supplemental.'' They are right. Above all we must maintain the fiscal discipline and responsibility we promised the American people. We must keep our commitment to protect Social Security. I hope my colleagues will reject this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent this list of objectionable provisions in H.R. 1141 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN H.R. 1141, THE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1999

BILL LANGUAGE

Bill language directing that funds made last year for maple producers be made available for stream bank restorations. Report language later states that the conferees are aware of a recent fire in Nebraska which these funds may be used. (Emergency)

Language directing the Secretary of the Interior to provide $26,000,000 to compensate Dungeness crab fisherman, and U.S. fish processors, fishing crew members, communities, and others negatively affected by restrictions on fishing in Glacier Bay National Park, in Alaska. (Emergency)

A $900,000,000 earmark for ''Disaster Relief'' for tornado-related damage in Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, and Tennessee. This earmark is a $528,000,000 increase over the Administration's request and is earmarked for ''any disaster events which occur in the remaining months of the fiscal year.'' (Emergency)

Report language providing FEMA with essentially unbridled flexibility to spend $230,000,000 in New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, to address damage resulting from the 1998 Northeast ice storm. Of this amount, there is report language acknowledging the damage, and the $66,000,000 for buy-outs, resulting from damage, caused by Hurricane George to Mississippi, and report language strongly urging FEMA to provide sufficient funds for an estimated $20,000,000 for buy-out assistance and appropriate compensation for home owners and businesses in Butler, Cowley, and Sedgwick counties in Kansas resulting from the 1998 Halloween flood. (Unrequested)

$1,500,000 to purchase water from the Central Arizona project to maintain an appropriate pool of stored water for fish and wildlife purposes at the San Carlos Lake in Arizona. (Added in Conference)

An earmark of an unspecified amount for Forest Service construction of a new forestry research facility at Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. (Unrequested)

Language directing that the $1,000,000 provided in FY 99 for construction of the Pike's Peak Summit House in Alaska be paid in a lump sum immediately. (Unrequested)

Language directing that the $2,000,000 provided in FY 99 for the Borough of Ketchikan to participate in a study of the feasibility and dynamics of manufacturing veneer products in Southeast Alaska be immediately paid in a lump sum. (Unrequested)

Language directing the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture to remove restrictions on the number or acreage of millsites with respect to the Crown Jewel Project, Okanogan County, Washington for any fiscal year. (Added in Conference)

Language which prohibits the Departments of Interior and Agriculture from denying mining patent applications or plans on the basis of using too much federal land to dispose of millings or mine waste, based on restrictions outlined in the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Interior dated November 7, 1997. The limitation on the Solicitor's opinion is extended until September 30, 1999. (Added in Conference)

Specific bill language providing $239,000 to the White River School District #47–1, White River, South Dakota, to be used to repair damage caused by water infiltration at the White River High School. (Unrequested)

A $3,760,000 earmark for a House Page Dormitory. (Added in Conference)

A $180,000,000 earmark for life safety renovations to the O'Neill House Office Building. (Added in Conference)

An earmark of $25,000,000 to provide for the construction and renovation of family housing units at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico. (Unrequested)

Bill language, added by the conferees, directing that $2,300,000 be made available only for costs associated with rental of facilities in Calverton, NY, for the TW 800 wreckage. (Added in Conference)

$750,000 to expand the Southwest Border High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area for the state of New Mexico to include Rio Arriba County, Santa Fe County, and San Juan County. (Unrequested)

Bill language directing $750,000 to be used for the Southwest Border High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area for the state of Arizona to fund the U.S. Border Patrol anti-drug assistance to border communities in Cochise County, AZ. (Added in Conference)

A $500,000 earmark for the Baltimore-Washington High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area to support the Cross-Border Initiative. (Added in Conference)

Earmarks $250,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Los Angeles Civic Center Public Partnership. (Unrequested)

Earmarks $100,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Southeast Rio Vista Family YMCA, for the development of a child care center in the city of Huntington Park, California. (Unrequested)

Earmarks $1,000,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development for work associated with the building of Caritas House and for expansion of the St. Ann Adult Medical Day Care Center. (Added in Conference)

Bill language permitting the Township of North Union, Fayette County, Pennsylvania to retain any land disposition proceeds or urban renewal grant funds remaining from Industrial Park Number 1 Renewal Project. (Added in Conference)

$2,200,000 earmark from previously appropriated funds to meet sewer infrastructure needs associated with the 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Wasatch County, UT, for both water and sewer. (Unrequested)

$3,045,000 earmarked for water infrastructure needs for Grand Isle, Louisiana. (Added in Conference)

The conference report language includes a provision which makes permanent the moratorium on the new entry of factory trawlers into the Atlantic herring and mackerel fishery until certain actions are taken by the appropriate fishery management councils. (Added in Conference)

Additional bill language indicating that the above-mentioned limitation on registered length shall not apply to a vessel used solely in any menhaden fishery which is located in the Gulf of Mexico or along the Atlantic coast south of the area under the authority of the New England Fishery management Council for so long as such vessel is used in such fishery. (Added in Conference)

Bill language directing Administrator of General Services to utilize resources in the Federal Buildings Fund to purchase, at fair market value, not to exceed $700,000, the United States Post Office and Federal Courthouse Building located on Mill Street in Fergus Falls, Minnesota. (Added in Conference)

REPORT LANGUAGE

A $28,000,000 earmark in FY 99, and a $35,000,000 earmark in fiscal year 2000 to the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve program. (Emergency)

The conference agreement provides $70,000,000 for the livestock assistance program as proposed by the Senate, and adds language providing that the definition of livestock shall include reindeer. (Emergency)

$12,612,000 for funds for emergency repairs associated with disasters in the Pacific Northwest and for the full cost of emergency replacement of generating equipment at Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge. (Emergency)

Report language acknowledging the damage caused by Hurricane George to Kansas. (Unrequested)

Report language urging FEMA to respond promptly to the appropriate disaster needs of the City of Kelso, Washington. (Unrequested)

Language where the Conferees support the use of the emergency supplemental funds to assist organizations such as the National Technology Alliance for on-site computer network development, hardware and software integration, and to assess the urgent on-site computer needs of organizations assisting refugees. (Unrequested)

$200,000,000 earmarked for the Coast Guard's ''Operating Expenses'' to address ongoing readiness requirements. (Emergency)

Report language detailing partial site and planning for three facilities, one which shall be located in the mid-Atlantic region, to house non-returnable criminal aliens being transferred from the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). (Unrequested)

A $1,300,000 earmark, for the cost of the World Trade Organization Ministerial Meeting to be held in Seattle, WA. (Added in Conference)

$1,000,000 earmarked for the management of lands and resources for the processing of permits in the Powder River Basin for coal-bed methane activities. (Unrequested)

$1,136,000 earmarked for spruce bark beetle control in Washington State. (Unrequested)

A $1,500,000 earmark to fund the University of the District of Columbia. (Added in Conference)

$6,400,000 earmarked for the Army National Guard, in Jackson, Tennessee, for storm related damage to facilities and family housing improvements. (Unrequested)

A $1,300,000 earmark of funds appropriated under P.L. 105–276 under the EPA's Programs and Management for Project SEARCH water and wastewater infrastructure needs in the state of Idaho. (Unrequested)

Report language clarifying that funds appropriated under P.L. 105–276 under the EPA's Programs and Management for Project SEARCH water and wastewater infrastructure needs for Grande Isle, Lousiana, may also be used for drinking water supply needs. (Added in Conference)

Report language which authorizes the use of funds received pursuant to housing claims for construction of an access road and for real property maintenance projects at Ellsworth Air Force Base. (Unrequested)

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate directing a statutory reprogramming of $800,000 for preliminary work associated with a transfer of Federal lands to certain tribes and the State of South Dakota and for cultural resource protection activities. (Unrequested)

The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the Senate that clarifies the scope of certain bus and bus facilities projects contained in the Federal Transit Administration's capital investment grants program in fiscal year 1999. The conferees direct that funds provided for the Canton-Akron-Cleveland commuter rail project in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 shall be available for the purchase of rights-of-way in addition to conducting a major investment study to examine the feasibility of establishing commuter rail service. (Unrequested)

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, this marks the third time I have been to the floor to discuss the emergency supplemental bill. For months now I have been trying to get my colleagues' attention about the extreme urgency of the items included in this bill. There are provisions included in this bill that were deemed an ''emergency'' back in March of this year. In addition to the tornado-related funding we just referenced, I have received call after call from farmers who have been anxiously awaiting the loan money that is tied up in this supplemental appropriations bill. Mother Nature does not wait for Congress to act. The ideal planting window has already come and gone for several commodities in the South, and yet, many producers have not been able to put a crop in the ground because they do not have adequate funds for operating expenses. The money is included in this bill and it is critical that we act on this matter as quickly as possible.

While I am pleased that these funds are included, I am disappointed that more assistance is not provided to the agriculture community. If ever there was an emergency in this country, we are seeing one now in rural America. I commend the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator HARKIN, on his efforts to provide additional assistance to farmers. I hope that my colleagues will be ever mindful of the potential consequences this country will face if we allow our producers to simply die on the vine, and I strongly urge this body to revisit the agricultural crisis as soon as possible.

Some of my colleagues have chosen to use this bill, which is designed specifically for emergency needs, to fund projects that would have a hard time passing the laugh test of emergency spending. In spite of this, I will be casting a vote in favor of this bill on behalf of the brave servicemen and women representing our nation in the conflict in Kosovo, and on behalf of our nation's family farmers.

I thank the President, and I yield the floor.

EMERGENCY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDING

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise regarding the conference report language in the supplemental bill regarding the transfer of emergency Community Development Block Grant funding from HUD to FEMA.

January 1998 will long be remembered in the State of Maine because of the extraordinary and historic Ice Storm that crippled the State. The combination of heavy rains and freezing temperatures left much of the State under a thick coat of ice which downed wires, toppled transformers and snapped utility poles in two. At the peak of the storm more than 80 percent of the entire State was literally in the dark. Vice President GORE best summed up the situation during his visit on January 15, 1998, when he said,

''We've never seen anything like this. This is like a neutron bomb aimed at the power system.''

The response from the federal government to our plight was for the most part remarkable. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Small Business Administration, and the Department of Defense all answered Maine's call for immediate help. In addition, utility workers from up and down the East Coast came to work in freezing temperatures and hazardous situations to kill live wires and free remaining wires from downed trees and poles. These men and women worked side by side with Maine's utility companies around the clock until the lights were back on in every house in the State.

I am here today, however, because while the storm brought out the best in people across the State and in many federal agencies, we still have not received the assistance we need from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In fact the lack of help from HUD has surpassed the storm in many people's minds as the truly extraordinary event.

To understand fully, one has to know the history. The Stafford Act which provides FEMA's guidelines for assistance covers public power companies. It will reimburse 75 percent of the costs related to a disaster. Because Maine and much of the Northeast have utilities that are investor-owned rather than government-owned, we were ineligible to receive assistance from FEMA for this purpose, despite the fact that, FEMA's own Ice Storm ''Blueprint for Action'' noted that the greatest unmet need from the storm is the cost of utility infrastructure. The ''Blueprint'' also noted that ''(The) HUD Community Development Block Grant Program can supplement other federal assistance in repairing and reconstructing infrastructure, including privately-owned utilities . . .''

Utility reimbursement is of great concern to Maine as it was not only the largest unmet need from the Ice Storm, but ratepayers in our State already pay the fourth highest utility costs in the country. Without some federal help, ratepayers would have been called on to cover utility infrastructure repair costs through increased rates.

So the Maine Congressional Delegation joined with the delegations from Vermont, New Hampshire and New York to obtain funding in the 1998 Supplemental Appropriations Act to provide money for the CDBG program to help our States complete their recovery from the Ice Storm. Working with Senator BOND, Chairman of the VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator MIKULSKI the Ranking Member; and Appropriations Chairman STEVENS, we secured $260 million in the Senate's 1998 Supplemental.

When the Senate considered this legislation, members from the Northeast spoke of the need for, and reasons behind, this additional funding and in a colloquy between Senators BOND and D'AMATO, it was noted that $60 million of this funding was meant specifically for the Northeast to help with the recovery costs from the Ice Storm. During the subsequent conference, that amount was dropped to $130 million, as the House version of the bill only contained $20 million for this purpose.

The Supplemental was signed into law on May 1, 1998. On November 6, 1998, 11 months after the disaster and six months after the bill had been signed into law, HUD announced that it was allocating approximately half of the $130 million, including $2.2 million for Maine. With an unmet need of more than $70 million, this funding was simply unacceptable and made all the more so because HUD would not or could not explain the rationale behind the numbers. Phone calls were made, meetings were held, letters were sent and still we received no explanation.

In the 1999 Omnibus Appropriations bill adopted by Congress at the end of the 105th Congress, $250 million was provided for emergency CDBG money to cover disasters occurring in both FY98 and FY99. Secretary Cuomo told me in a phone conversation on March 2, 1999 that he would use some of this money to allow States dissatisfied with their original allocation to reapply. This discussion occurred a few days before the Senate Appropriations Committee marked up the 1999 Supplemental that included language to transfer the remaining CDBG emergency funding from HUD to FEMA because, according to the Senate Appropriations Committee report,

> The Committee is concerned over HUD's continuing failure to implement an effective emergency disaster relief program for the ''unmet needs'' of states with Presidentially-declared natural disasters. Instead, the Committee believes that FEMA is the appropriate Federal agency for addressing these unmet disaster needs since FEMA has primary responsibility for assessing and responding to all natural disasters and for administering most primary programs of disaster assistance.
>
> In particular, FEMA is urged to review and respond appropriately to the needs of the Northeast for damage resulting from the ice storms of last winter. HUD failed to respond properly to these needs despite congressional concern over the ice damage.

On March 5, 1999 I spoke again with Secretary Cuomo when he called to express his concern that he could not publish the notice as OMB said that the Senate Appropriations Committee's actions on March 4 to transfer the money from HUD to FEMA prevented him from doing so. After conversations with OMB, I sent a letter to the Secretary detailing OMB'S response that it was permissible to publish the notice as long as funding was not allocated.

On March 10, the Federal Register (p. 11943 to p. 11945) contained a notice from HUD that provided a review for states unhappy with their original funding allocation. Maine began work at once on an application for this funding.

On March 23, we learned that HUD had allocated the rest of the money from the 1998 supplemental and that Maine was slated to receive another $2.158 million. HUD took this action despite the fact that they had been informed by the VA/HUD Subcommittee Chair and Ranking member, Senators BOND and MIKULSKI respectively, that they ''wait for final action by the Congress on the program structure for the award of emergency funding for ''unmet'' disaster needs'' and that ''because of a number of outstanding program issues, we believe that HUD should ''hold'' all final award allocations pending final congressional action on S. 544.'' So HUD's allocation announcement was somewhat confusing as they did not have the authority to release the money. I request unanimous consent that a copy of the HUD notice be included in the RECORD.

Secretary Cuomo told me on March 24 that the State should get their application in response to the March 10 Federal Register in as soon as possible, and the State delivered it to HUD on March 25.

On May 4, as conferees were working on the Supplemental, I received a letter from Cardell Cooper, Assistant HUD Secretary for Community Planning and Development, announcing that Maine would receive an additional $17,088,475 based on the State's March 25 application under the March 10 Federal Register notice. This letter also noted that Maine's money was subject to Congressional action.

Mr. President, mere words cannot explain the frustration that Mainers have experienced with HUD throughout this process. I am deeply grateful for the leadership that Senator BOND, Senator MIKULSKI, Chairman STEVENS and the entire Senate Appropriations Committee have demonstrated in their willingness to work with us and to help us address Maine's unmet needs.

The conference report language on this bill states that:

> The Department is directed to award the remaining funds in accordance with announcements made heretofore by the Secretary, including allocations made pursuant to the March 10, 1999 notice published in the Federal Register, as expeditiously as possible.

This language directs HUD to live up to its March and May promises of funding for Maine to help pay for the unmet needs of the Ice Storm.

Mr President, with passage of the Supplemental, Maine's fifteen month journey for equity will hopefully end. We can now complete the recovery that began in January, 1998 and has dragged on far too long.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I would like to comment today on the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program which my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, worked so hard to have included in the Senate-passed Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill. Despite his tireless efforts, the measure was stripped from the bill at the eleventh hour for reasons which are beyond me.

I take umbrage with the misleading moniker that some Members of the House Leadership have shamelessly placed upon this vital program for partisan political purposes.

This program, far from being a handout for any one company in my state of West Virginia or anywhere else, would provide emergency relief for more than a dozen American steel producers who have been stricken by the effects of the unprecedented surge in steel imports into the U.S. over the last year. This crisis, which has caused as many as 10,000 layoffs at steel factories across the nation and threatens as many as 100,000 more jobs, has unfairly injured the credit ratings of America's steel manufacturers by forcing them to compete with dirt cheap foreign steel, which is often being sold in the U.S. at costs below that of production.

If you ask me, this important crisis, without question, is appropriately classified as an ''emergency''. If you ask the steelworkers who've either been laid off or who are the next to go, I bet they say the same thing. Ask their families and communities if this is an emergency, and you'll get the same answer. The emergency is that our American steel industry is being pummeled by illegal foreign competition, and that the imports are taking a very real and devastating toll on the people who depend on steel for their livelihood.

The program that Senator BYRD proposed in the Senate-passed version of the Supplemental Appropriations bill would have made it possible for many of the most financially-unstable steel producers in this country to persevere until we in the Senate can take decisive and comprehensive action to address the underlying cause of our domestic steel industry's current predicament—imports. The Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program would have made much-needed capital available to those companies who have been the hardest hit by the import surge, and it would have done so at minimal expense to the American taxpayer. The program just made good sense, and I was extremely disappointed to hear that Members of the House Leadership insisted that it be eliminated.

The argument was, from what I hear, that Senator BYRD's provision was too expensive and of benefit only to Weirton Steel Corporation in West Virginia. The fact is, Mr. President, that Weirton was just one of more than a dozen companies which the Department of Commerce determined would be eligible for loans under this program. All of these distressed companies have been doing everything in their power to survive the current crisis. I know first hand the great lengths to which Weirton Steel has gone through simply to keep its head above water. In my state alone we've had nearly 1,000 layoffs as a direct result of the import surge. The Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program would have made it possible for companies across the nation to make upcoming debt payments which many steel producers are in jeopardy of defaulting on because of the current crisis. Moreover, the cost of the program was $140 million to leverage $1 billion in loans—that's a good investment. I deeply regret that the unwillingness of some Members of Congress to open their eyes to the plight of America's steelworkers has resulted in the loan program being removed from this vehicle. That is very bad news for the many steel companies who stood to benefit from the program. Some of them are now that much closer to joining the other four major American steel producers who have already been forced into bankruptcy by this crisis.

However, there remains time to reverse this mistake. I hope that the Members of Congress, who did not understand the details of how this loan program functions or the benefits that it would bestow upon a large number of steel companies across the nation, will reassess their position. We still have an opportunity to support this important program. I intend to work with Senator BYRD in moving this program on another legislative vehicle.

Each of my colleagues knows how strongly I believe that this body must act to address the import surge in a comprehensive way. However, I also know how vital the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program is to many U.S. steel producers. It is a critically important stop-gap measure which would allow companies like Weirton steel to remain in business long enough for the United States Senate to take the tough and comprehensive action which is necessary to protect our domestic industry from unfair foreign competition.

Mr. President, I truly hope that we seize the opportunity to take up this measure again. Without it, steel companies in a number of different states may soon find themselves the next victims of our failure to aggressively enforce our unfair trade laws.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I do not support the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 1141, the fiscal year 1999 emergency appropriations act.

My decision to oppose this bill was not an easy one, Mr. President. This legislation contains funding for our U.S. military forces in Kosovo, Iraq, Bosnia, and elsewhere around the world. Regardless of my deep concerns about NATO's Kosovo operations, I realize that our military, already stretched to the limit by numerous foreign deployments, needs the resources provided by this legislation. Further, this bill contains funding to help farmers in Oklahoma who are finding it hard to get credit, and it will make sure disaster assistance for Oklahoma tornadoes does not deplete FEMA's funding reserves.

Unfortunately, it is also fiscally irresponsible.

H.R. 1141 provides $15 billion in new spending authority, $13 billion of which is provided for fiscal year 1999 and $2 billion of which is provided for fiscal year 2000.

The outlays flowing from this budget authority will reduce our budget surplus by $14.6 billion over the next five years. In fiscal year 1999 and 2000, when the entire budget surplus is attributable to the Social Security trust fund, this bill spends $11 billion of the surplus.

Additionally, $14.7 billion of the bill's total spending is designated as emergency spending, so that it is outside of the spending caps. $10.9 billion of the emergency spending is attributable to defense.

Unfortunately, the efforts of my colleague Senator GRAMM to remove the nondefense emergency designations failed earlier today. I supported him in that effort, and I am disappointed that more of my colleagues did not join us.

This legislation makes a mockery of our budget process. I believe Congress cannot continue to squander the economy's good fortune on a bigger, more invasive government. I believe the fiscal restraints we all agreed to in 1997 should be enforced, and I believe the budget we passed just a few weeks ago must be complied with.

A soaring economy and the 1997 budget agreement combined last year to produce the first budget surplus since 1969. What was Congress' reaction?

We abandoned all fiscal restraint and passed a monstrous Omnibus spending bill which included a record $22 billion in emergency spending.

With CBO predicting an even bigger budget surplus this year, $111 billion, we are rushing to enact a $15 billion emergency spending bill.

Since spending caps were instituted in the 1990 budget deal, Congress has appropriated $132 billion in emergency spending; $70 billion since the end of the Gulf War. The average annual emergency appropriation from 1993 to 1997 was $8 billion.

I believe that Senators must decide if they truly intend to abide by the budgets we pass, or simply ignore them.

As I have already mentioned, this bill includes $1.13 billion in new spending for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, partially offset by a $230 million transfer from the Community Development Block Grant program. This $1.13 billion is in addition to the $1.2 billion Congress has already appropriated to FEMA for fiscal year 1999.

While I support the work FEMA is doing to help my state recover from massive tornado damage, I believe the funding in this supplemental is far more than the agency needs. In fact, after touring Oklahoma tornado damage two weeks ago, the President asked for an additional $372 million for FEMA. I have been assured by FEMA that they do not require resources beyond this request to accommodate the Oklahoma disasters.

Unfortunately, the conferees on the supplemental decided to pile on $758 million more than the President requested. This extra funding has nothing to do with FEMA's current needs.

It has everything to do with the appropriations committee's desire to ''prefund'' the agency in an attempt to avoid the fiscal year 2000 spending caps.

Mr. President, I commend the majority leader for his efforts to keep the cost of this bill down and remove some of its objectionable provisions. However, I deeply regret that I cannot support this emergency supplemental spending bill. I believe we are losing our grip on fiscal sanity, and I fear that worse is coming later this year. I plan to work aggressively throughout this year to make sure we comply with the budget we enacted last month.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise in support of the supplemental appropriations conference report.

Mr. President, this bill is not perfect, and I realize that some of my colleagues do not believe it is worthy of support. I disagree. This legislation meets several pressing demands that we have a responsibility to meet. First, this compromise provides essential funding for our military operations in Yugoslavia as well as humanitarian aid for Kosovo refugees. Without this funding our fighting men and women will face equipment and material shortfalls and view a ''no'' vote as a lack of support for them and their mission. Second, this legislation follows through on a commitment we made to provide a long-overdue pay raise for our troops. Third, this legislation provides disaster assistance to help our Latin American neighbors recover from the hurricane which struck that region so viciously earlier this year, and it contains funds to aid recovery from the recent spate of tornadoes here at home. Lastly, it extends the Airport Improvement Program which helps our nation's airports reduce aircraft noise and ensure aviation safety.

However, I am disappointed that the Conference Committee decided to retain the Hutchison-Graham tobacco settlement recoupment provision in this year's Supplemental Appropriations bill. This amendment clearly does not deal with an ''emergency'' situation and should, therefore, not be included in this legislation. I am also deeply concerned that we have not thoroughly considered the potential impact this provision will have on the federal budget in years to come.

In essence, this provision usurps the ability of the Congress to engage in a healthy debate about the use of the federal share of the tobacco settlement. While many argue that the federal government has absolutely no claim to this money, those assertions simply are not true. Current law dictates that the federal government rightly has a say over the percentage it contributes to the Medicaid program. Yet, instead of bringing this matter to the floor and considering it in an honest fashion, we are allowing an unprecedented opportunity to make a real difference in the lives of millions of Americans completely slip away from us. It is unfortunate that proponents of turning over the federal share of the tobacco settlement to the states without any guidelines have taken this backdoor approach.

In essence, we have allowed our hands to be tied by the states, who wish to use this money to cut taxes, fix roads and build new buildings, among other things. According to a recent survey conducted by the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, the majority of states, as of today, have no definite plans to spend a portion of the settlement on programs to prevent children from starting to smoke or to help current smokers quit the habit. This action is in direct contrast with the desires of the majority of Americans who would like to see a major portion of this money set aside for tobacco prevention and cessation programs and health care to cover the cost of tobacco related illness. In my state, Rhode Islanders have resoundingly supported dedicating a significant amount of the settlement for tobacco related activities.

I am saddened that we appear to have lost sight of the fact that the process of suing the tobacco companies was not so states could get more money for roads or schools, but because for decades these companies purposefully deceived the American public about the dangers of smoking. As a result, generations of Americans have suffered the adverse health effects of this campaign of deceit, and the federal government spent billions addressing the health care needs of these folks. While states were triumphant in reaching this monumental agreement, what will the effort have been for if there is no change in teen smoking rates in this country?

Lastly, I am concerned that the conference report contains a number of dubious environmental riders that should be more fully debated as well as several budgetary off-sets that raise a number of questions. In particular, as a Senator who serves on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, I believe that the rescission of $350 million worth of Section 8 funds could jeopardize the renewal of affordable housing contracts for thousands of elderly and low-income Americans, which would be a step backwards in our effort to increase the amount of affordable housing in our nation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I regret that I have to come to the floor to cast my vote against the emergency supplemental appropriations bill before the Senate today. When we face crises in this country, when you have American men and women serving courageously in Kosovo, when you have the borders in Macedonia and Montenegro overflowing with refugees, and when you have hundreds of thousands of hurricane victims in Central America, you would expect that the U.S. Senate would be capable of coming together—unanimously—to address these challenges. It used to be that way in the Senate. It's not that way anymore. Now we fund our operations in Kosovo, and we help the refugees, and we aid the hurricane victims, but at the same time we practice legislative extortion—we say to every Senator, ''You want to vote for Kosovo? You want to vote for aid for hurricane victims? Go ahead—but you have to vote to cut vital housing programs for working Americans across this country. And you need to vote to eliminate environmental regulations.'' That's not the way we ought to do business in the U.S. Senate, and I think it's time we start to talk about changing that course before it contaminates public life any further. That is why I will cast my vote against this emergency supplemental appropriations bill: to register my frustration and my sadness with the way we now do business in the U.S. Senate.

Before I say more about the damage this bill does to so many of the vital areas of public policy in the United States, I must tell you that in many respects I only have the liberty of voting against this bill—of casting a symbolic stone against legislative blackmail—because I know this bill will pass the Senate overwhelmingly. Critical investments for our troops in Kosovo—which, as a veteran, as a citizen, and as a senator, I have aggressively supported—will be made in spite of my vote against this bill. The truth is, if this were not the case, if my vote would have undermined in any respects our efforts in Kosovo, I would have had to vote for this bill, in spite of the damage it does. I would have had to—regrettably—support this bill because we have a responsibility to support the American troops we have committed overseas, and I would never stand by and allow the Senate to send what I believe is the wrong message to our troops, and the wrong message to Slobodan Milosevic about American resolve . I believe the United States, and NATO as a whole, must remain united against the systematic killing, raping and pillaging of innocent Kosovar Albanian men, women, and children at the hands of Serb forces. The funding included in this supplemental appropriations conference report will provide support for the U.S. service men and women who are putting their lives in jeopardy and will, I believe, give them a greater capacity to achieve our military objectives in Kosovo. It will also provide the desperately needed relief for humanitarian efforts already underway to assist the refugees in that region. And these investments will be made by the U.S. Senate, reflected in our final tally.

I believe this Nation must have a bipartisan foreign policy, and that we can not afford to allow politics to endanger our troops. But I wish that more of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, those who included provisions which cut directly against the interests of low income working Americans and our environment, would

also have a commitment to bipartisanship on domestic issues of tremendous importance to so many working Americans struggling to keep their heads above water even in this great economy we celebrate on the floor of the U.S. Senate. The rescissions and changes in policy included in this Conference Report will eventually hurt the poorest Americans and will immediately hurt our environment. That should not be acceptable in a Senate which prides itself on its ability to do what is right for all Americans. I can not in good conscience support these measures.

I question what it says about our commitment to helping those who are being left behind in this new economy, that we could find the resources to provide $983 million in disaster relief for those whose lives were disrupted when Hurricane Mitch struck the Central American nations of Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala and when Hurricane Georges struck in the Caribbean last year—but we are cutting critical investments in housing for working Americans. Hurricanes in Central America have left almost 10,000 dead and have driven millions from their homes. The cost of damages to businesses, hospitals, schools and individual homes have been enormous. We are right to provide assistance to the victims of these hurricanes. But we ought to be able to do it without abandoning thousands of our neediest citizens here at home.

Today there are more than five million low-income Americans facing severe housing needs, receiving federal housing assistance. At least another 15 million Americans qualify for help but do not receive it because of limited budget appropriations. They suffer from homelessness—600,000 Americans homeless each night; 5.3 million Americans pay rents that are more than 50 percent of their household income, or live in severely substandard conditions—these are the severe housing problems we once hoped to address. These families are one misfortune away from homelessness. A child gets sick, a parent gets laid off—even for a week or two, the car breaks down, and that family ends up on the streets. So what are we doing in this supplemental appropriations bill? We're rescinding $350 million from the Section 8 program that helps these families who are working through the tough times—and we're rescinding this money in spite of the fact that the HUD budget in FY1999 will already be almost $1 billion less than it was in FY1994. This rescission will result in a shortfall that will cause the loss of subsidy and the displacement of approximately 60,000 families. 60,000 families. It will make the current waiting list crisis, where families must sometimes wait years to find some relief, even more difficult to solve.

This isn't the first time this has happened. Year after year, HUD's budget is raided—targeted for cuts in 1995, in 1997, in 1998, and again this year—to pay for emergencies which, by their nature and by law, are not required to be offset with budget cuts. Only a very small portion of this $15 billion bill is offset with spending cuts. I am disturbed, really, that some of my colleagues have chosen to make cuts to this program because they believe it is politically vulnerable. HUD's budget should not fall victim to this type of spending cut—and families struggling to stay off the streets shouldn't fall victim to this kind of politics.

I am not new to this game. I have fought year in and year out against substantial cuts that have been made to the HUD budget. These cuts have jeopardized the existing public housing services and have undermined HUD's capacity to continue the Secretary's ambitious program of reform or even just to make up for previous underfunding of capital needs to meet our Nation's demand for affordable housing. Last year, the Congress passed the first new section 8 vouchers in 5 years. This rescission would reverse in large part the down payment Congress made in addressing unmet housing needs. At least 100,000 new vouchers are needed to begin to address the outstanding needs. This rescission moves us in the wrong direction.

As the ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee, as someone who sees first hand in Massachusetts the struggles of so many families working their fingers to the bone and trying to stay off the streets, I can not support these draconian cuts in housing.

But this bill doesn't stop there. Some of my colleagues have included dangerous environmental riders in this bill—in a practice that is becoming all too common in this Senate. It wasn't this way 15 years ago when I came here, it wasn't that way 30 years ago when Democrats and Republicans worked together to write our first environmental laws, but it's that way now—even basic environmental protections have become a partisan fight—and the riders in this bill do serious damage to our environment. Specifically, the conference report includes three environmental riders that I believe will set back environmental progress, unnecessarily limit federal revenues and undermine the legislative process—and I oppose all of them.

The conference report extends the moratorium on issuing a final rulemaking on crude oil valuation until October 1, 1999. It restricts the implementation of the Department of the Interior Solicitor's opinion on mining that limits the number of millsites to one five-acre millsite per patent.

The environmental rider that I find most egregious prevents the Department of Interior from issuing new rules for hardrock mining on public lands. This is the third time the Senate has attached such a provision to an appropriations bill. As a result, the hardrock mining industry continues to cause environmental damage and costs the taxpayer.

The extraction of hardrock minerals like gold, silver and copper usually includes the excavation of enormous pits and the use of toxic chemicals like cyanide, and its results have been destructive. According to the General Accounting Office, there are almost 300,000 acres of federal land that have been mined and left unreclaimed. Abandoned mines account for 59 Superfund sites and there are more than 2,000 abandoned mines in our national parks.

The Mineral Policy Center estimates that the cleanup costs for abandoned mines on public and private lands may reach $72 billion. Rather than reform the industry through comprehensive legislation or proper execution of existing executive branch authority, we will once again block reform through a rider.

It is time that we put an end to this policy of undermining the environment, of gutting environmental protections, by slipping riders through the back door of every spending bill. We ought to be a better Senate than that. We ought to have our debates on the floor, in public, and if you want to promote a vision of an America where we turn the environment over to polluters, over to those who would destroy our natural resources, if that's your vision, then let's debate it—and let's end the practice of environmental degradation through appropriations bills.

Before I yield the floor, I do want to draw our attention to something in this supplemental bill which I believe is an important victory for Massachusetts, and for our fishermen. I am pleased that $1.88 million was included for NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service, NMFS, to promote cooperative management and research activities in the Northeast multispecies fishery. These funds will complement the $5 million in emergency assistance that was appropriated for Gulf of Maine fishermen last November.

Many in this Chamber know that too many fishermen in New England are experiencing economic hardship due to new groundfish regulations recently imposed in the Gulf of Maine. In order to help alleviate the negative effects of these new regulations, fishermen have joined with NMFS in developing a spending plan for the $5 million in emergency assistance. The plan proposes to compensate fishermen for lost fishing opportunities that have resulted from inshore groundfish closures. Fishermen, in return, will make their vessels available to take part in cooperative research projects. A portion of the $1.88 million will be used to fund the cooperative scientific projects that will be conducted by NMFS and other institutions. In addition, some of the new funding will be used to employ fishermen as scientific observers. This new partnership will have a twofold benefit. Cooperative research activities will keep fishermen employed on the water while groundfish stocks recover,

and this plan will promote a more constructive relationship between fishermen and NMFS with the goal of improving management activities in the Gulf of Maine groundfish fishery. I express my very real appreciation for the support of Senate Appropriations chairman, Senator TED STEVENS and the Democratic ranking member, Senator BYRD, for including this provision in the conference report and for their continued steadfast support of the New England fishermen.

In conclusion, let me just say that I fully support the American men and women who are putting their lives in jeopardy in the Kosovo region for a mission which I believe in very deeply—as a veteran, I support their interests very personally in fact. I would have liked to have seen the Senate produce an Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill that we could all vote for, unanimously. But this bill is a far cry from that kind of legislation, a far cry from the kind of bipartisan foreign policy we demand from our leaders in the United States. I am entirely disappointed that some members of the Senate have used this bill as a vehicle to hurt low-income working families and damage the environment we all share.

Mr. President, we are a great country of Americans who care about each other, who believe that we have a national purpose and that part of the reason we are a special nation is that we help each other make it through the times and make the most of our own lives. We're a great nation. We ought to be a great Senate that reflects that sense of commitment to one another, and I look forward to the day when those values return to this Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have three additional speakers. I sent word to them. Does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi have any suggestions at the moment?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I intend to reserve our time until just before the vote, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if it is agreeable with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, I ask unanimous consent there be a recess for 3 minutes and it not be charged against the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. We would just suggest the absence of a quorum for that time.

Mr. BYRD. We can't call off a quorum in 3 minutes if anybody objects.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not intend to object and I hope no one would.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time will not be charged.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have no more requests for time. I yield my time back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, there has been some conversation about disaster assistance for farmers and complaints that this bill does not go far enough to address the needs in the agriculture community for disaster assistance.

I point out to Senators that there are funds in here that will provide guaranteed loans for those farmers who are having difficulty getting financing for this year's crop so that the Government will guarantee the repayment of that loan. That will allow them to get loans they otherwise would not be able to get because of the inability to show that this year's crop will produce a profit.

This is a real problem, and we are sensitive to that. We have had hearings on that subject, and we are aware of it. In this conference report, we spell out, in addition to the funds I have talked about already in the bill, the following:

> The conferees recognize the problems facing agricultural producers today and understand that the actual needs for disaster assistance funds provided last year likely will exceed the projections of the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture has projected that net farm income will decline $3 billion below last year. The conferees expect the administration to monitor the situation closely and if necessary, submit requests for additional funds to the Congress for consideration.

This acknowledges that the problems are real. We know they are real. Last year was a big disaster in agriculture, and the Congress and the administration agreed to respond with a multibillion-dollar disaster assistance program. Some of the farmers have not gotten the benefits of that program yet. We provide funds to accelerate the availability of those benefits from the Department of Agriculture, and we are meeting every request that has been submitted by this administration for additional funds for that purpose.

The conference is sensitive to those needs. We did reject an amendment that was offered to increase the funding, and we hope the administration will let us know if additional funds are truly needed.

In many cases, it is impossible to determine what the assistance needs will be until after the crop year has begun. In many places, we have not even seen planting, but we do think this is responsive to that problem.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1141, the fiscal year 1999 emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

The pending bill includes emergency funding to finance the United States participation in NATO military operations in Kosovo and Yugoslavia. This supplemental makes available $11.0 billion in emergency, and contingency emergency, defense appropriations based on the crisis in Kosovo and the closely related readiness crisis in our armed forces.

Of these funds, $10.8 billion are appropriated to the Department of Defense:

The supplemental provides the $5.5 billion the President requested for military operations in Kosovo and Department of Defense refugee assistance.

It also provides some very needed readiness funding, specifically: $1.0 billion for procurement of depleted munitions stocks; $1.1 billion for spare parts, stocks of which have reached crisis proportions for some weapon systems; $700 million for overdue maintenance of these same weapons systems; $100 million for recruiting to address DoD's retention crisis; $200 million to improve the declining training of military personnel in high priority military specialties, and $200 million to repair aging bases.

These are important additions that clearly merit this additional funding and an ''emergency'' designation. Some will argue that these adds for defense are too much; others will argue, correctly I believe, that these readiness increases are overdue. I have received both official and unofficial reports of extremely serious readiness problems in our armed forces. This additional funding will just begin to address these problems correctly.

The legislation also makes $475 million available to the Secretary of Defense for Military Construction for him to use, under proper controls, as he sees fit. Another $1.8 billion is provided for military pay and pensions, subject to authorization legislation that Congress may choose to enact.

Both of these latter additions are deemed ''contingent emergencies.'' The money will only be expended if the President agrees that the needs constitute an emergency and the funds should be spent for the stated purpose. The President need not spend these funds if he so selects. This, I believe, is an appropriate way to make these funds available.

I strongly support these funds for our troops in the Balkans and for those in other parts of the world who may soon find themselves also involved in this troubling conflict. Regardless of our views regarding the conflict in the Balkans, we must fully support our armed forces being employed there and ensure that their equipment and training is fully and completely supported. It would be dangerous and foolish to do anything less.

The conferees also provide $1.1 billion for humanitarian assistance to refugees from Kosovo. Congress provided an additional $548 million above the President's request to aid refugees that have fled Kosovo and the 20,000 that are temporarily resettling in the United States. This is a significant infusion of

resources to address an increasingly desperate situation in the nations bordering Kosovo.

I commend the managers of the conference report for including the emergency aid to Central American countries who suffered form the ravages of Hurricane Mitch. This aid is for our neighbors who faced devastation of Biblical proportions last fall. The final aid package totals $814 million for the region.

I remind my colleagues that the United States has worked for more than a quarter of a century to help develop democratic movements in this region. The need to move quickly and pass this funding cannot be overstated. When I visited the region in December, I was gratified to hear government agencies and relief groups emphasize over and over again, ''We want your help, not forever, but so we can begin to help ourselves and continue building stable and democratic societies.''

In addition to these critical items, the final bill addresses the President's request for a $100 million appropriation for Jordan under the Wye Peace Accord. The Congress also provides an additional $574 million for aid to America's farmers following the $5.9 billion in emergency aid approved by Congress last October. It is also important to note that the conferees have taken swift action to ensure that sufficient disaster aid through the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, is available for Oklahoma, Kansas, and other Midwestern states that have been severely damaged by recent tornadoes.

Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a table by the Congressional Budget Office that summarizes the spending in the pending bill.

Mr. President, including offsets to some of the nondefense emergency and non-emergency spending in the bill, the net total of the final bill is $11.35 billion in BA and $3.7 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1999. An estimated $2.0 billion in BA and $7.4 billion in outlays will be expended in fiscal year 2000 according to CBO estimates of the bill.

Finally, I address an issue raised by the inclusion of a provision in the conference report concerning the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, OPIC. Because this language in the conference report attempts to change the way we treat an OPIC program under title V of the Budget Act (The Federal Credit Reform Act), it violates section 306 of the Budget Act.

We have consulted with CBO and OMB, and both agencies say they will not change their treatment of OPIC programs from past practices because of this provision. Therefore I will not challenge this language, because I do not think the conference report will have any practical effect on credit reform or our budgetary treatment of OPIC programs.

I support this bill. It is largely an emergency spending package that responds to serious natural disasters at home and abroad, and to the NATO military campaign in the Balkans and the resulting tragedy of thousands of Kosovar refugees displaced during this conflict. I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF FY 1999 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, H.R. 1141

[Conference agreement, by fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Beyond	Total
Discretionary:										
Emergencies:										
Defense	BA	9,049	1,838	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,887
	O	2,509	6,168	1,437	438	174	18	10	4	10,758
Nondefense	BA	3,733	43	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,776
	O	1,073	1,090	741	497	346	226	24	10	4,007
Total emergencies	BA	12,782	1,881	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14,663
	O	3,582	7,258	2,178	935	520	244	34	14	14,765
Non-emergencies:										
Defense	BA	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1
	O	19	17	−13	−13	−4	−1	−1	3	7
Nondefense	BA	−300	74	8	8	8	8	8	8	−178
	O	76	85	18	−4	−5	−4	−4	−351	−189
Total non-emergencies	BA	−299	74	8	8	8	8	8	8	−177
	O	95	102	5	−17	−9	−5	−5	−348	−182
Total discretionary:										
Defense	BA	9,050	1,838	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,888
	O	2,528	6,185	1,424	425	170	17	9	7	10,765
Nondefense	BA	3,433	117	8	8	8	8	8	8	3,598
	O	1,149	1,175	759	493	341	222	20	−341	3,818
Total	BA	12,483	1,955	8	8	8	8	8	8	14,486
	O	3,677	7,360	2,183	918	511	239	29	−334	14,583
Mandatory [1]	BA	−1,135	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	−1,135
	O	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total Bill	BA	11,348	1,955	8	8	8	8	8	8	13,351
	O	3,677	7,360	2,183	918	511	239	29	−334	14,583

[1] Includes Food stamp rescissions of −$1,250 million (assigned to appropriations committee) and grants-in-aid for airports supplemental of $115 million (assigned to authorizing committee).

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

KOSOVO: A LONG ROAD TO NOWHERE?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we will soon vote on a $15 billion spending bill that will, among other things, further fund the war against Yugoslavia. Although the Administration requested some $6 billion for military and humanitarian needs for the Kosovo operation, this amount has almost doubled, and is well over $11 billion. Sadly, this higher figure will not get our readiness back where it needs to be—where we could, at the drop of the hat, successfully wage two full scale wars at the same time—as directed in the ''Quadrennial Defense Review.''

It also illustrates something seriously gone wrong here in Washington, D.C. Only a small amount of these funds are subject to offsets—its as if there is this notion, both in the Administration and in Congress, that this is ''free money.'' Well it's not, Mr. President. For every dollar spent, another priority loses out. And I can think of a whole host of areas where this money would be better spent than in fighting a war in a part of the world where most Americans can't clearly identify on a map. Tax cuts, Social Security, Education, to name just a few.

I will vote against this bill for two reasons: (1) our Kosovo policy is seriously flawed and the only way we in Congress can truly voice our opposition is voting where it hurts the most—the pocketbook; and (2) this is a spending bill gone mad—there is no fiscal accountability here, nor is there any notion of fiscal responsibility.

This vote, at least for me, will be one of the toughest I have had to cast in my tenure in the United States Senate. I strongly support our military, and am proud of our men and women in uniform. I certainly do not want to jeopardize our people who are charged with carrying out this war. But even so, this is not a vote against our military—rather, it is a vote in opposition

to the Administration's seriously flawed, if not inept Kosovo policy.

No one disputes that Milosevic is a bad person and that he should be stopped. His brutal, persistent attacks on the Albanian Kosovar people is akin to Germany in the Second World War. But air strikes alone are not going to do it—they will level Yugoslavia, destroy most of its infrastructure, terrorize its civilian population, and most likely, not be successful stopping Milosevic.

I do not believe that our war fighters' are being given sufficient latitude to make this mission a success. Their decisions are subject to dual-review: (1) the ''political'' review of the White House; and (2) the ''consensus'' of our NATO allies through every step of the war.

A few examples. General Clark's request to deploy gunships continues to be denied by ''senior military advisors in Washington, D.C.'' Who are these people? The Joint-Chiefs of Staff? Or Sandy Berger and Madeleine Albright?

It took over a month to get Apache helicopters to the region; and they sit grounded because the ''polls'' show no support for a ground campaign.

It seems to me that one of the first priorities in waging a war is to cut off the supply lines of the other side—and oil, in particular, so that they cannot fuel their tanks and planes.

Unbelievably, the NATO alliance refused to cut off the flow of fuel that fires Milosevic's war machine. Although the U.S. proposed a blockade to stop the oil, it was defeated by France which opposed implementing a blockade without a formal declaration of war.

We are executing massive, full scale air bombings every day; people are being killed; but the French believe a declaration of war must be a precondition for a blockade.

Our bombs have gone off course several times, hitting refugee convoys, the country of Bulgaria, and the Chinese embassy in Belgrade—which is technically Chinese soil in Yugoslavia.

At least in the case of the Chinese embassy, it wasn't the bombs at fault, it was our intelligence. Although the tourist maps in Belgrade accurately place the Chinese embassy in that locale, our intelligence was using an outdated map that led them to believe it was a procurement center for the Serbian military.

The Chinese people are outraged, and well they should be. But the American people should be just as outraged—not just by this bombing, but by the continued incompetence which has come to typify this policy.

I fail to understand how waging this war by NATO consensus is getting us anywhere except more deeply involved militarily, and less likely to find a diplomatic solution to this crisis. Mr. President, wars should not be waged by consensus, and diplomacy should not be directed by polls.

Internationally, the world is a much less stable place than it was even two months before. There was a sense of optimism that Russia might help broker a diplomatic solution to Kosovo. The possibility remains, but Russia is far less stable than previously thought: President Yeltsin survived an impeachment proceeding, but he has again disbanded his government to the degree that it is unclear who in Russia has the power to help negotiate an end to this crisis.

The Chinese are no longer just a sideline observer. While China has opposed the NATO bombings from the outset, it didn't have a dog in this fight until we bombed their embassy in Belgrade. If a deal on Kosovo is reached, it will have to pass muster with the Chinese who hold veto authority on the U.N. Security Council.

We continue to bomb Iraq daily—stretching our Air Force readiness even further. Saddam Hussein shows no signs of letting up, and will most likely use this as an opportunity to push us even further.

And last, but not least, the Korean Peninsula continues to be a crisis in waiting. Starvation in North Korea is rampant, food supplies are gone, and the country is undergoing one of the worst droughts in history. If the North Koreans decide to engage us militarily, we will be fighting three wars at the same time—beyond that envisioned by our military strategists in the Quadrennial Defense Review, and perhaps much more than we are currently prepared to do.

Again, we will soon vote on this supplemental funding package. Over $15 billion. And when the war is over, we will be asked to vote on additional funding to rebuild Yugoslavia. We will probably vote to rebuild the Chinese embassy in Belgrade. And if we approve additional funds for the military campaign, the end costs of rebuilding Yugoslavia will only continue to mount.

My vote does not undermine my support, concern or pride for our military. But I do believe that a diplomatic solution to this problem should have been found, can still be found, and must be found if we are to avoid the further escalation of this war. Failure to do so will cost us precipitously—not just in dollars, but in American lives.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the $15 billion supplemental appropriations conference report before us. The supplemental spends far more than is necessary to support our effort in Kosovo and, worse, will take vitally needed money out of the Social Security surplus, thereby raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

Protecting the Social Security trust fund is one of my highest priorities. The Social Security system is expected to go into deficit in 2014 and we will need every dollar of that surplus today in order to be prepared for the tomorrows ahead of us.

Until this point, the Senate has been headed in the right direction on Social Security. The Budget Resolution, which I strongly supported, called for reduced debt and taxes, increased funding for education and national defense, and maintaining the spending caps so necessary to control spending.

Perhaps most importantly, the budget resolution built in on-budget surpluses from the year 2001 and beyond. This is significant because surpluses that are accumulating in the Social Security Trust Funds will no longer be used to finance on-budget operations of government. Social Security surpluses should not be used to finance deficits in the rest of government.

The Budget Resolution stood in stark contrast to President Clinton's budget, which, over the next five years, proposed spending $158 billion of the Social Security surpluses on non-Social Security programs.

The Budget Resolution, in addition to preserving every penny of Social Security surpluses, also contained procedural hurdles blocking future budgets from spending Social Security surpluses.

These procedures included a point of order against on-budget deficits and an amendment calling for reducing the debt ceiling by the amount of the Social Security surplus—the lockbox provision.

The Senate voted in favor of both the point of order and the lockbox by unanimous votes during the budget resolution.

In addition, the Abraham-Domenici-Ashcroft lockbox legislation, which is still pending in the Senate, would put these procedures into law, and ensure that Congress could not spend the Social Security surpluses on non-Social Security purposes.

Unfortunately, the supplemental appropriations package before us would undo some of the good work that we have already done this session.

By not offsetting $13 billion of the spending, the supplemental takes money from the Social Security surpluses, money that is necessary to protect the Social Security trust funds.

Thus far, Congress has been committed to stopping the raid on Social Security. This Congress has passed a budget that is balanced without using Social Security funds.

This conference report, however, not only spends Social Security funds, but also contains $1.2 billion in traditional pork spending.

I refer to such spending as $45 million for Census funding, $3.76 million for the House page dormitory, and $1.8 million for the O'Neill House building.

If this bill were just for Kosovo and true emergency spending, I would vote for it. If this bill were fully offset, I would vote for it. But this bill is neither all emergency nor all offset. This bill, like the $21 billion omnibus appropriation last fall, is an abrogation of our responsibility to protect the Social Security surplus.

Mr. President, this is not the way that we should handle Congress' responsibility over the federal purse

strings. If we face real emergencies, we should fund those emergencies.

But funding those emergencies is not free. We need to pay for all spending, emergency or not. This is why I support Senator ENZI's attempt to make sure that this entire appropriation is offset.

If we do not offset our spending, the money comes out of the Social Security surplus. There is no getting around this fact. We must pay for any new funding. If we do not pay for it, it comes out of the Social Security surplus.

The Social Security program is too important to be raided. While I recognize the importance of emergency funding, particularly for Kosovo, I also recognize that spending needs to be paid for.

Mr. President, this request is not unreasonable. All across this great land, when families face unexpected expenses, they must offset their spending by readjusting their priorities. No family in America would react to an unexpected crisis by going out and spending more money on other discretionary, non-budgeted items. All I am asking is that the Congress do the same.

This supplemental spends too much money and offsets too little of it. If we are to keep our financial house in order, and to protect the Social Security trust funds, it is time that we in Congress started to change our behavior.

If we are to maintain our Social Security obligations, we need to learn how to spend less money, and offset more. It is with regret that I feel obligated to oppose this conference report.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I support this supplemental emergency appropriations bill. It is far from perfect, and I have serious reservations about some provisions. At the same time, the legislation would provide vitally important funding for our operations in Kosovo, as well as several other important provisions. So, on balance, I have concluded that the bill deserves my support.

Mr. President, of the $15 billion in new spending this bill contains, $12 billion is to support our important mission in Kosovo, to punish Slobodan Milosevic for his brutal policy of ethnic cleansing, compel a political settlement, and facilitate the return of the Kosovar Albanian refugees to their homeland. The tragedy in Kosovo represents a turning point for NATO, European security, and American leadership in the 21st century. I am glad that Congress has shown its support for the President with the funding contained in this bill for the military operation and the humanitarian assistance.

The bill also contains funds to ensure that the International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia can effectively investigate and prosecute the perpetrators of the atrocities committed in Kosovo and those in Belgrade who ordered them to carry out this campaign of terror. They must be brought to justice.

I am also glad that after a long delay we have provided the necessary assistance for Central American countries to recover from the devastation imposed last fall by Hurricanes Mitch and Georges.

Mr. President, this bill also contains a provision that helps family members of the victims of the terrible Pan Am 103 bombing to attend the trial of the charged criminals before the Scottish court in the Netherlands. As you know, Mr. President, many New Jersey natives were on that flight. These families have waited too long for justice to be brought, and I am glad that they will be able to see it rendered firsthand.

The bill also provides $100 million for Jordan, to help support its role in advancing the Middle East peace process. The region stands at a critical juncture after the death of King Hussein and the election of Ehud Barak as Israeli Prime Minister. I am glad we provided this down-payment for Jordan. Now we must follow through on our commitment for Israel and the Palestinian Authority per the Wye River Memorandum the U.S. helped broker.

Mr. President, despite these positive elements, the bill before us has many flaws.

It contains more than $6 billion in unrequested defense spending, far in excess of what it will take to prosecute the air war against Milosevic. It stretches the definition of what constitutes an ''emergency'' to such an extent that it mocks the notion of fiscal discipline.

This year's concurrent resolution on the budget established five explicit criteria to guide the use of the emergency designation, which allows funding beyond the discretionary caps. These criteria relate to whether an item is (i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial); (ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time; (iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action; (iv) unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and (v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to see how some of this defense spending constitutes an emergency. For example, while increasing military compensation may be a laudable goal, it hardly represents an emergency under these criteria.

I also am disturbed by the apparent disparate treatment of offsets. As my colleagues know, under the Budget Act, funding for emergency spending does not count against the discretionary caps and therefore does not have to be offset. For some reason, however, the Majority feels that offsets are necessary—but for only for the agriculture and humanitarian emergencies, not the military portion. This double standard defies logic. If something is an emergency, no offsets should be required. If it is not an emergency, then we should not use the emergency designation and we should pay for it with spending reductions.

However, of all the problems with this bill, I am most disappointed in the provisions related to the recent multistate tobacco settlement. These provisions waive the Federal government's right to recoup its share of recovered tobacco Medicaid costs without any guarantees that State governments will spend even a penny of these settlement funds on tobacco control programs.

Mr. President, these provisions—stuck into this large emergency supplemental appropriations bill—hand the tobacco industry a big victory. The tobacco lobby wanted to avoid an effective, nationwide anti-youth smoking effort. And unfortunately, it looks like their wish was granted.

Mr. President, some have characterized this recoupment of Federal Medicaid dollars as a Federal ''money grab'' of State dollars. Nothing could be further from the truth.

It is without question that a large portion of the state settlements with the tobacco industry represents a recovery of Federal funds. I should know, because I have been working with the state attorneys general on these cases since they were filed.

In fact, I introduced the first ''Tobacco Medicaid Waiver'' bill back in 1996. At that time, I was joined by Mississippi Attorney General Mike Moore and Minnesota Attorney General Skip Humphrey at the introduction of a bill that would allow States to keep part of the Federal share of Medicaid. At the time, there were only ten states suing, and my bill was aimed at urging more States to bring claims.

Mr. President, back then, none of these pioneering state officials ever said that the Federal Government had no right to Medicaid recoupment. It is a preposterous argument. The states sued under the Federal Medicaid statute—they knew that then and they know that now.

Mr. President, there is no question under current law that a portion of these settlements are Federal funds. It is also important to note that the tobacco settlement signed by the States blocks the Federal government from seeking reimbursement for Federal Medicaid costs caused by tobacco company misconduct in the future. So, in other words, the States waived our rights too.

Let me be clear: I think we should ultimately give this money back to the States—but we must have guarantees that a portion of this tobacco recoupment will be used to reduce youth smoking, assist children and promote public health.

Mr. President, the provisions stuck into this bill are bad policy and primarily benefit one party: the tobacco industry. The losers will be America's children. Because of this provision, more young people will begin to smoke. And many of them, ultimately, will die as a result.

Mr. President, that's not right. And I hope Congress will reconsider this decision in the future.

Still, Mr. President, this conference report does contain several other important provisions, including funding for our operations in Kosovo. So, while I do so with some reluctance, I will support it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes 12 seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair, and I thank my good friend from Mississippi for managing the bill for us as we had a distinguished visitor in the Appropriations Committee room.

Mr. President, there is a lot of controversy about this bill, but I think this bill represents the best of America. We have reacted to crises abroad and crises in this country.

There are items in this bill that are not emergencies. While many people are saying they should not be here because they are not emergencies, they are here because this is a supplemental and an emergency bill. It is a bill that we can all vote for in good conscience, and I hope there will be an overwhelming vote for this.

Again, I point out for the Senate that the men and women of the armed services are aware of this bill. It means a great deal to them. It is a symbol of our commitment to the pay raise for which we have already gone on record.

It is a symbol that we are going to step forward to modernize the armed services. It is a symbol that we are going to provide the money to assure these people when they are sent overseas, whether it is Kosovo or in the area of Iraq or in South Korea, or in Bosnia—wherever it may be in those 93 countries of the world that the American service men and women are now serving—we are going to stand behind them and give them all the support they need not only for their safety but for their comfort.

The passage of this bill will mean that we can now go ahead with the balance of our necessary actions in the Appropriations Committee. We have 13 full bills that come forward. I hope this will be the last supplemental of this year. I join the majority leader in not welcoming supplemental bills. But I know there are times when it is necessary; and this one is necessary.

Anyone who looks at our involvement in the world knows that we cannot calculate in advance the costs of events, such as the Kosovo operation, both militarily and in regard to refugees. These were things that came up after we planned expenditures for 1999 in the fall of last year.

I urge the Members of the Senate to vote for this bill. I urge that we, as quickly as possible, get it to the President so he can sign it today.

I yield back any time I have and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the conference report to accompany H.R. 1141. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 136 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Abraham	Feinstein	Mikulski
Akaka	Frist	Moynihan
Baucus	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Harkin	Reed
Biden	Hatch	Reid
Bingaman	Hollings	Roberts
Bond	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Breaux	Hutchison	Roth
Brownback	Inouye	Sarbanes
Bunning	Johnson	Schumer
Byrd	Kennedy	Shelby
Campbell	Kyl	Smith (OR)
Chafee	Landrieu	Snowe
Cochran	Lautenberg	Specter
Collins	Leahy	Stevens
Conrad	Levin	Thompson
Coverdell	Lieberman	Thurmond
Daschle	Lincoln	Voinovich
DeWine	Lott	Warner
Dodd	Lugar	Wellstone
Domenici	Mack	
Durbin	McConnell	

NAYS—36

Allard	Feingold	Kerry
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Kohl
Bayh	Gorton	McCain
Boxer	Gramm	Murkowski
Bryan	Grams	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Robb
Cleland	Gregg	Santorum
Craig	Hagel	Sessions
Crapo	Helms	Smith (NH)
Dorgan	Inhofe	Thomas
Edwards	Jeffords	Torricelli
Enzi	Kerrey	Wyden

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATCH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

OFFSET OF EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL SPENDING LEGISLATION

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, as the supplemental appropriations conference report stands, it is currently $13.3 billion out of balance. Only $2 billion of the spending in this bill is offset and my bill will ensure that Congress follows the rules and not dip into the Social Security surplus to fund all the truly non-emergency items in the supplemental appropriations bill.

The legislation that I have introduced imposes much needed fiscal discipline. I have been working for a balanced budget since I was first elected to the Senate and the supplemental begins the process of undoing that work. Congress must not go back to the old spending rules—just because we have a surplus that does not mean that the battle has been won. It means that we must continue to be watchful and ensure that the surplus continues to grow.

Some of the items in this bill are true emergencies such as disaster relief in Oklahoma, livestock assistance and Hurricane Mitch relief. However, there are many items that are not emergencies, like $48 million for a new satellite for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and $3.75 million for renovations to the House page dormitory. There is $45 million for unanticipated costs associated with the census, to an accountant it seems that there needs to be better cost control to prevent such things. There are millions of dollars in examples of items that are not emergencies but have been designated as such. Many of these items should have been debated in the fiscal year 2000 appropriations process.

Even while the economy is strong, I remain concerned about the debt that we are in danger of passing on to our children and our grandchildren. In the past, it seemed we were so tied to the immediate gratification we receive from spending money that we didn't see the danger that looms in the not too distant future—the risk associated with spending ''on credit'' with reckless abandon. We still don't acknowledge that danger.

The genesis of this bill was to pay for the current military conflict in Kosovo. I fully support the troops and I was prepared to vote to pay for the costs of supporting our men an women in uniform, but the supplemental goes far beyond what I was prepared to support. Many of these items are best left to the Department of Defense authorization bill or the Soldier's, Sailor's and Airman's Bill of Rights, which passed the Senate and contained a much needed pay raise for the armed services. The pay raise contained in the supplemental jumps the gun. The House should have the opportunity to consider the authorizing legislation before the money is appropriated.

Just passing a balanced budget resolution is not enough. Congress must continue to be on watch for attempts to violate not just the letter of resolution, but the spirit through spending bills that are not offset. This Legislation will ensure that the bill fits under the spending caps and that the surplus is protected.

As a body, we have been seriously debating locking up the Social Security surplus to ensure that the money will be there to honor America' contract with our senior citizens. Now we have a bill that dips into the surplus to pay for a Christmas tree of items under the false pretenses of an emergency. This is exactly what the lock box was designed to prevent. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1097

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

SECTION 1. OFFSET OF EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL SPENDING.

Not later than 15 days after Congress adjourns to end the first session of the 106th Congress and on the same day as a sequestration (if any) under sections 251 and 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall cause, in the same manner prescribed for section 251 of that Act, a sequestration for fiscal year 2000 of all non-exempt accounts within the discretionary spending category (excluding function 050 (national defense)) to achieve a reduction in budget authority equal to $13,303,000,000 minus the dollar amount of reimbursements identified in the report required by section 2005 (efforts to increase burden-sharing) of the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of Senator ENZI's bill to offset all of the nonemergency funding in the supplemental with an across the board cut in non-defense discretionary accounts.

As one who vigorously opposed the omnibus appropriations bill of last year which resulted in spending far above our commitments, I was surprised that here we have yet another attempt to circumvent our budget principles—and to spend part of the Social Security surplus nearly all of us pledged to devote only to Social Security.

While there are true emergencies in the supplemental I support, such as the agriculture spending and funds directly related to our Kosovo operation, I strongly oppose inclusion of other defense spending that clearly should be considered in the normal appropriations process. And I oppose beefing up the FEMA budget three times over the President's request as well. What all of this is about is just a gimmick to claim we are not breaking the caps as we proceed into the fiscal year 2000 appropriations process by providing some funding now. The last estimate I saw indicated only $2.5 billion of this funding will be outlayed in this fiscal year. So—why are we appropriating $15 billion?

Mr. President, I have no objection to this additional spending—if we pay for it. Senator ENZI's legislation, which I have cosponsored does pay for it. This is the responsible thing to do, since most of this bill—over $13 billion is not emergency spending.

Those who believe in integrity of our budget process and in the need to preserve Social Security will vote for this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator ENZI's bill to offset the supplemental appropriations bill.

Senator ENSZI's bill is consistent with my belief that we must pay for this emergency supplemental bill with offsets.

Mr. President, under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, Congress, the President, and the American people agreed to cap the growth of our Government's spending programs. In doing this we were able to balance the budget and head down the path of fiscal responsibility. We have agreed under the law to these spending caps. We should not now turn our backs on the commitment we made to the American people, by going back on our word and breaking this agreement with them.

Because of this commitment to the American people, Congress must not bust these spending caps.

In that same vein, at the zenith of our success to have finally balanced the Federal Government's budget for the first time in 29 years, we ought not look to spend $13 billion we don't have. We can ill afford to use our first wave of surpluses, especially the surpluses garnered from the Social Security trust fund to pay for this supplemental. We can ill afford at this critical juncture to break our pledge to our seniors over social security, not to the public over keeping our budgets balanced.

In closing Mr. President, I believe Senator ENZI's bill, of which I am an original cosponsor, is right on the mark. We need to use common sense in budgeting in our Nation's Capitol.

Granted we have several emergencies confronting us, from the disasters that have hit our constituents across the land, the need to increase FEMA's funding to meet these needs, desperately needed funds for our farmers—including my provision to the bill that will help our farmers to qualify for disaster funds, up to the need to support our troops in Kosovo. But—we must pay the bill. I support Senator ENZI and our other cosponsors, by calling for reduced spending in other federal programs in order to fund these necessary emergencies. This is truly the only way this Congress can justify spending money we don't have.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to make a couple of unanimous consent requests.

First, I want to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his work on the supplemental appropriations. It is never easy for him, but it is easy for us to second-guess and be judgmental. In his unique way he does a magnificent job.

VIOLENT AND REPEAT JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LOTT. I believe the procedure is that Senator HARKIN would be entitled to the floor, but this unanimous consent agreement will take care of that problem and we will be able to move forward.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the Ashcroft-Frist amendment, No. 355, after 20 minutes of debate to be equally divided in the usual form; following that vote, if agreed to, the Senate immediately agree to an amendment to be offered by Senator HARKIN. I further ask that following the disposition of the above two mentioned amendments, if the Ashcroft-Frist amendment is agreed to, the following be the only amendments remaining in order and under a time agreement equally divided, and all other provisions of the previous consent of May 14 still be in place.

The amendments are as follows: The Bond amendment regarding the film industry, 30 minutes; the Biden amendment, 45 minutes, with 30 minutes under the control of Senator BIDEN and 15 minutes under the control of Senator HATCH.

I further ask that following the disposition of the above-listed amendments, the bill be advanced to third reading and passage occur, all without any intervening action or debate.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not because I think we need to move quickly here, I want to thank all those who are responsible for getting us to this point. This has taken some cooperation on the part of both sides. I especially want to thank Senators HARKIN, ASHCROFT, FRIST, BIDEN, WELLSTONE and others who have been very helpful.

I have no objection.

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving the right to object, I am sorry that I did not hear the entire request, but the situation, as I understand it, prior to right now, was that after the supplemental, we were coming back to the Frist-Ashcroft amendment and I was to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. What does this do to that?

Mr. LOTT. This would obviate that and we would move forward with the procedure that is outlined. We would proceed to vote on or in relation to the Ashcroft amendment with time equally divided for 20 minutes, and then the Senate would immediately agree to the amendment offered by Senator HARKIN.

Mr. HARKIN. As I understand it, what you are saying is right now we would have 20 minutes?

Mr. LOTT. Right. Equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. HARKIN. Then you would vote up or down on the Frist-Ashcroft amendment, and then there would be—then what?

Mr. LOTT. Then we would go directly to the agreement to accept the Harkin amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. OK. I am OK with that.

I must be very honest with you. I have been waiting some time to be able to at least make my case on the floor. I have been more than willing to set everything aside and to let the process go ahead since yesterday. But I must tell you that since yesterday I have been waiting to get at least 15 to 20 minutes where I could just lay out my

case on the Frist-Ashcroft amendment on IDEA, the background of it. I just believe I have to. I want to be able to fully make my case against the amendment. I do not want to take a lot of time, I do not want to filibuster it, but I would like to have 15 or 20 minutes just to lay out my case. That is all.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, perhaps I could amend the unanimous consent request to this effect, that we have 30 minutes on the Ashcroft and the Harkin amendments, with each side getting 15 minutes. The Senator would have 15 minutes, Senators ASHCROFT and FRIST would have 15 minutes, and they would split it up between themselves. I modify my request to that effect.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, I support that request. Just for clarification purposes, Senator BIDEN wants to be sure that the other part of the arrangement we had, which was an up-or-down vote on his amendment, would occur. I just would clarify that for the record. I understand that to be the case.

Mr. LOTT. That will be the way the vote will occur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, the unanimous consent agreement is agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. I thank all involved. I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. If I could just ask the majority leader, we had one Member's request; Senator KERRY asked if he could have a period of time—I suggest 10 minutes—prior to final passage, for him to be recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Would it be possible he could do that after final passage? The reason why, and I understand—I would like any Senator to be able to do that—we do have a number of Senators who would like to be able to leave by 6. You are talking about airplanes. You are talking about a son's athletic event. It is the usual thing. To admit we have these sorts of requests is not always easy.

Mr. DASCHLE. Perhaps we can consult with Senator KERRY.

Mr. LOTT. Perhaps we will not use all the time and we could stick it in there, but if he would be willing to at least consider it after final passage it would help a number of his colleagues. We will work on that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 355

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, we are now back on the Frist-Ashcroft amendment. I am not going to proceed until we have order. I cannot even hear myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Will the conversations in the aisles be taken somewhere else.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I know the recent school tragedies—again, even another this very morning—are a call to action to us as families and churches and schools, as communities, as leaders in government, to take positive, constructive steps to make our schools places of learning and not of fear. But let's not use these tragedies of Littleton and other schools to take emotional, unfounded—although well-intentioned-actions which actually will make our schools and communities more unsafe and less secure.

I want to make this point very, very clear. The Frist-Ashcroft amendment is a dangerous, dangerous, dangerous amendment. The Frist-Ashcroft amendment guts IDEA. It actually will make our communities and our schools more unsafe.

The purpose of this bill is to help make our schools and communities safer. That is the purpose of the bill in front of us. I must ask, is putting a child with a disability on the street and cutting off all services to that child something that will make our communities more safe? Frankly, it will have the opposite effect.

This amendment, would, for example, lead to a child with an emotional disturbance being put on the street and end the counseling and behavioral modification services they had been receiving—end, them, cold turkey. No more counseling or behavioral modification services. And this kid is now on the street. Tell me, is that community safer? Obviously not, but that is just what this amendment would lead to. Troubled children out on the street with no supervision, no tracking, no education, no mental health services.

This amendment targets a group of students who are more likely to be victims of school violence than perpetrators. Again I want to point out: Not any of the nine—now nine school shootings—in the last 39 months was done by a child in special education. Not one. Yet we have this amendment that targets kids with disabilities. This amendment is scapegoating—and I use that word, ''scapegoating''—scapegoating kids with disability. And it is destroying an important safety feature of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

The supporters of the amendment say they need it because the law erected barriers that kept them from taking students who had guns in their possession out of schools. We showed yesterday—and the authors of this amendment agreed with me on this point—that a child with a disability who brings a gun to a school can be removed from that school immediately, just like any other child. We settled that yesterday. For a kid with a disability who brings a gun or firearm to school, right now, the principal can call up the sheriff or the police. They can come haul him away, book him, put him in jail, whatever the law is.

So I hope no Senator votes on this amendment thinking that under the law as it exists today, a kid with a disability who comes to school with a gun can't be kicked out immediately. That is simply not true. Nothing in Federal law limits them from immediately removing him and keeping him out as long as that child is a threat to himself or others. Let me repeat that, the school can remove that child immediately and keep them in an alternative setting indefinitely as long as that child is a threat to himself or others. It couldn't be more clear than that.

We worked long and hard, 3 years of hearings, hammering out the IDEA bill in 1997. And we passed it here in the Senate by a vote of 98 to 1, 98 to 1. We have had no hearings on this amendment, none whatsoever. But we had plenty of hearings to set up a framework in IDEA to make sure our schools and communities were safe. First, we wanted to make sure the schools were safe. Second, we wanted to make sure the communities were safe. Third, we wanted to make sure students with disabilities were held accountable for their actions and that schools have the flexibility to take appropriate and timely actions. Last, we wanted to make sure that decisions were based on facts relevant to the child, not just on emotions.

Right now under the law, school authorities can unilaterally remove a child with a disability, first of all, for the first 10 days, and provide no services whatsoever. Second, if it is found that their actions were not a manifestation of their disability, then of course he is treated in the same manner as nondisabled children, and can be kept out in an alternative setting forever.

If it is found by that the child's action was a manifestation of their disability, that child then is put into an alternative setting for up to 45 days. That alternative setting is determined by the local school districts.

Now we heard yesterday that after 45 days the kid will be put back in school. That is just not so—only if he or she is no longer a danger. If that kid continues to pose a danger to himself or others, the school can repeat that 45 days again and again and again—for as long as it deems necessary.

Finally, as I said, there is no way the law prohibits anyone from calling the police to come take any student out who has a gun. I also want to point out, IDEA specifically provides that school officials may obtain a court order anytime to remove a child with a disability from school or to change a child's current educational placement if they believe that maintaining the child in the current educational placement is substantially likely to result in injury to the child or others. So it is clear, current law addresses the issue. Frankly, we have a commonsense structure now. And, again, it was carefully designed to make schools and communities safer.

The Senator from Missouri yesterday put up a chart showing the manifestation determination process, how you

have to go through all these processes. Why do we do that? He made it seem like it was some bureaucratic maze, or jungle. The reason that we have this manifestation determination is so we can address the behavior of the child with the disability, to determine why that child acted the way the child did, and then to have the proper interventions so that child does not behave that way in the future. That's just common sense and it should not be eliminated as this amendment would do.

Who does that process help, and who does that protect? Does it not protect the school? Does it not protect the local community? Of course, it does. If we can intervene and provide the proper kind of psychological help, maybe even medical help, educational help so that the child with a disability modifies his or her behavior, it seems to me that is what we want.

Or are we saying under the Frist-Ashcroft amendment: We do not care; if a kid with a disability brings a gun to school, we do not care about that behavior; kick him out, put him out on the street, cut off all his services?

Is that going to make our community safer? Is that going to make our schools safer? Is that going to protect students? If there is a question about that in anyone's mind, I point to the fact that the shooting in Oregon where students were tragically killed was committed by a kid who had been suspended without services from school. He went home, got a gun, and came back to school. I ask, what if a child in that circumstance was put in an alternative setting with supervision, with appropriate psychological help, behavior modification, supporting services? Would that kid have gone home to get the gun and come back to school? I think the odds would have been great that that kid would not. But instead he was put on the street unsupervised—just as this amendment allows for. That is the ''level playing field'' the supporters of this amendment advocate.

Mr. President, that is why over 500 police leaders from this country are opposed to the Frist-Ashcroft amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from Fight Crime, Invest in Kids. The board of directors includes the president of the Fraternal Order of Police. It encompasses 500 police leaders—many of them the police chiefs in major cities from around the country. It says in part:

> . . . we urge you to oppose the Frist-Ashcroft amendment, and support the [amendment] to be offered by Senator Harkin.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHT CRIME,
INVEST IN KIDS,
Washington, DC, May 17, 1999.

DEAR SENATOR: should we really give kids who bring firearms to school more unsupervised time? Senators Frist and Ashcroft's amendments to S. 254 would have precisely that impact.

As an organization of more than 500 victims of violence, sheriffs, district attorneys, police chiefs, leaders of police organizations and violence prevention scholars, we urge you to oppose the Frist-Ashcroft amendment, and support the substitute to be offered by Senator Harkin.

Regardless of whether students have disabilities or not, schools already can suspend or expel students who bring weapons to school. Nothing in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) prohibits schools from removing immediately a child who brings a gun to school. At the same time, the law recognizes sending the child home or out on the street without educational services is not the answer. That's why IDEA simply requires states to continue education services. The Frist-Ashcroft amendment would eliminate this requirement for any child who brings a gun to school.

We should have tough sanctions for kids who bring a weapon to school. The safety of other students in the school must be paramount. The Frist-Ashcroft Amendment may sound tough to those who think all kids love school. But giving a gun-toting kid an extended vacation from school and from all responsibility is soft on offenders and dangerous for everyone else. Please don't give those kids who most need adult supervision the unsupervised time to rob, become addicted to drugs, and get their hands on other guns to threaten students when the school bell rings.

Anti-truancy programs are often an important part of successful efforts to reduce juvenile violence. The Frist-Ashcroft amendment encourages mandatory truancy.

To minimize the threat these youngsters pose, we should require continued adult supervision as well as participation in mental health and behavioral modification programs, and continued school attendance in an appropriate setting, to learn the skills needed to make an honest living. The Harkin Amendment is consistent with this approach. Otherwise expulsion often becomes a graduation to a life of crime that threatens the public immediately and for many years to come.

Please let me know if we can be of help in advising on what really works to keep kids from becoming criminals.

Sincerely,

SANFORD A. NEWMAN,
President.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, these are the policemen talking. Do you know why they are saying this? Because they know if Frist-Ashcroft is adopted, they are going to dump these kids on the streets—kids with problems, emotional problems, kids with mental problems and behavioral problems, kids who are mentally retarded and may have other problems. They are going to dump them out on the street. That is safe? That is going to make our schools and our communities safe? Please, someone tell me how that is so. That is why the police are opposed to this amendment.

I will read a portion of another statement:

> As police chiefs in America's largest cities, we know that investments today to help kids get the right start are among America's most powerful weapons against crime. Quality child care, parenting, coaching, and afterschool programs can help kids learn the values and skills they need to become good neighbors instead of criminals. We, therefore, call on all our public officials to adopt the policies described in Fight Crime, Invest in Kids. Help schools identify troubled and disruptive children and provide children and their parents with the counseling and training that can help get the kids back on track.

These are not social scientists; these are policemen from around the country.

Let me also read from the testimony of the Police Executive Research Forum—a leading national organization of police chiefs and senior law enforcement officials. Gil Kerlikowski, who at the time was president of this group and the police chief in Buffalo, New York testified at a recent congressional hearing on this topic. He said:

> Students who are expelled or suspended from school and left at home or on the street become my problem, and the problem of police across this country. They have greater opportunity to commit crimes, abuse drugs, or engage in disorderly behavior that affects the quality of life in any given neighborhood. They are also vulnerable to gangs and predators who can victimize and exploit them in ways that will impede any later efforts to put them on the right track. Today's police forces are ill-prepared to deal with these individuals—the rest of the criminal justice system even less so.

I also have a letter from the Correctional Educational Association again stating that the Frist-Ashcroft amendment is more dangerous to our schools and our communities.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Lanham, MD, May 17, 1999.

Hon. BILL FRIST,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FRIST. On behalf of the teachers who labor in the nation's prisons, jails and juvenile facilities, let me implore you to withdraw your amendment and support the Harkin amendment to S. 254. There are enough provisions in the current IDEA to deal with problems related to violent behaviors, such as carrying or threatening to carry weapons into the school environment. In fact, your bill offers no remedy, whatsoever, for changing the behavior which it seeks to punish. It removes the procedural safeguards designed to assist the offending child to find the necessary help he or she needs. Finally, it punishes the child for his or her disability, not for the offending behavior. It is akin to taking medicine from a sick person because he or she has an obnoxious personality.

One of the strengths of IDEA is the procedure for dealing with behavior problems. Carrying a weapon to school is a terrible behavior problem needing immediate action by the whole school community. Dismissal from school services denies a solution to the problem. Why not require the IDEA procedure for any student with a behavior problem, whether or not the student is in special education or not? We need strong procedure to deal with potential and real violence. Doing nothing solves nothing.

Those of us in criminal justice realize that providing special education students with appropriate instructional services is one of the keys to change their negative behaviors. Punishing a student without positive and appropriate assistance changes nothing. In

fact, it just makes things worse. In attempting to help avoid future tragic situations like Littleton, we must be careful to find ways to locate, calm and help potentially violent kids change. Please rescind your amendment.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. STEURER,
Executive Director.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Council for Exceptional Children saying:

While we . . . strongly support the removal of a student who endangers the safety or well-being of themselves or other students, we strongly oppose the cessation of services for any student.

The Frist-Ashcroft amendment ceases those services. What they say is that the school districts may provide the services—may. We already heard one Senator yesterday say how much this costs. It may cost too much, and schools will say: It costs too much money; we are not going to do it; let somebody else provide the services. And the kid falls through the cracks. That is what happens.

If you do not think the police know what they are talking about or the Council for Exceptional Children or the Correctional Education Association, how about the Parent Teacher Association? Do you honestly believe that the National PTA wants more dangerous schools? Here is a letter from the National PTA strongly—strongly—opposing the Frist-Ashcroft amendment:

The National PTA supports Sens. Ashcroft's and Frist's goal of keeping children safe in school. Their amendment, however, would allow for the expulsion of special education students who possess a handgun in school, without ensuring alternative education services are provided. National PTA supports removing students who bring guns to school, but believes students should receive education services in an alternative setting.

National PTA supports Senator Harkin's amendment, which clarifies that schools have the authority to remove any child who brings a gun to school [and continues to provide them services].

I ask unanimous consent the National PTA letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL PTA,
Chicago, IL, May 17, 1999.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: National PTA opposes amending the Individuals with Disability Education Act (IDEA) as proposed by Sens. Ashcroft and Frist. The amendment will be offered to S. 254, the juvenile justice bill currently being debated in the Senate. National PTA asks that you vote NO on Ashcroft/Frist amendment and vote YES to support an alternative amendment sponsored by Senator Harkin.

The National PTA supports Sens. Ashcroft's and Frist's goal of keeping children safe in school. Their amendment, would allow for the expulsion of special education students who possess a handgun on school, without ensuring alternative education services are provided. National PTA supports removing students who bring guns to school, but believes students should receive education services in an alternative setting.

National PTA supports Senator Harkin's amendment, which clarifies that schools have the authority to remove *any* child who brings a gun to school. The amendment also states that all students should be provided education services in an alternative setting. Further, students would receive immediate and appropriate intervention services, and thereby minimize the possibility of future violations by the student.

The National PTA asks that you oppose the Ashcroft/Frist amendment and vote for the Harkin alternative.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY IGO,
Vice President for Legislation.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have a number of other organizations whose letters in opposition to this amendment I want to print in the RECORD: the United Cerebral Palsy Association, Learning Disabilities Association of America, the ARC of the United States, the American Association of Mental Retardation, the Easter Seals of Missouri, the Easter Seals of Tennessee, and a number of others. I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNCIL FOR
EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN,
Reston VA, May 17, 1999.

Hon. JOHN ASCROFT,
U.S. Senate, Washington DC.

DEAR SENATOR ASHCROFT, On behalf of all students in special education and general education, we ask you to withdraw your amendment to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 (IDEA 1997). Amendment No. 348 would seriously jeopardize the integrity of this historic piece of legislation.

While we at the Council for Exceptional Children strongly support the removal of a student who endangers the safety or well-being of themselves or other students, we strongly oppose the cessation of services for any student. Past incidents, such as the tragic story of Kip Kinkle from Springfield, Oregon, prove that when a student is immediately suspended without any type of service, further tragedy is imminent.

The final IDEA regulations, released March 12, 1999, offer schools substantial opportunities and strategies for addressing problem behavior of students with disabilities including behavior that is dangerous or involves drugs or weapons. When it is stated that children with disabilities cannot be disciplined, that is absolutely not the case. The statute and the regulations clearly state that when the behavior is not a manifestation of their disability, those children can be disciplined in the same manner as children without disabilities. Furthermore, the statute and regulations state that a child who commits an offense involving drugs or weapons that is a manifestation of their disability, the child can be removed from the classroom and/or building for up to 45 days. There is nothing in the statute or regulations that prohibit another 45 day removal if that is appropriate. The only difference is that child will receive educational services.

This amendment will not result in safer schools or communities. In fact, every major law enforcement agency reports that expelling or suspending troubled children without education services only increases juvenile crime. Drop out rates, incarceration rates and drug use rates also increase when children are expelled or suspended without education services.

On the other hand, we support Senator Harkin's amendment to the juvenile justice legislation which is presently being debated. The Harkin amendment, not an amendment to IDEA, clarifies that schools can and should remove children who bring guns to school and that schools should provide them with immediate appropriate intervention and services, including mental health services in order to maximize the likelihood that such child does not engage in such behavior or such behavior does not reoccur. The Harkin Amendment also reaffirms that nothing prohibits a school from reporting a crime to appropriate authorities.

Please reconsider your amendment and the negative effect it will have to the carefully constructed IDEA Amendments of 1997. We need to implement IDEA, not amend it. Your amendment will seriously undermine the benefits and protections of IDEA. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

B. JOSEPH BALLARD,
Associate Executive Director.

MISSOURI PLANNING COUNCIL
FOR DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES,
Jefferson City, MO, May 17, 1999.

Hon. JOHN ASHCROFT,
Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR ASHCROFT: On behalf of the Missouri Planning Council for Developmental Disabilities, I am writing this letter to support the Harkin Amendment to the Juvenile Justice Bill. We believe this bill will result in safer schools since it clarifies the schools' roles in removing children who bring guns to school. We also support the provision of intervention and services, including mental health services, to reduce the possibility of such behaviors reoccurring.

We have supported IDEA, formerly the Education for All Handicapped Children's Act of 1975, since it was introduced and believe that because of this strong legislation many children are now receiving the education to which they are entitled. Because of this we cannot support legislation that would weaken this most important special education law.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. Please call our office if you have questions.

Sincerely,

DON JACKSON,
Chairman.

EASTER SEALS,
May 17, 1999.

Hon. JOHN ASHCROFT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR ASHCROFT: On behalf of Easter Seals Missouri, I write to you today to inform you of our opposition to your legislation, the School Safety Act.

While proposed as a solution to the rising problem of violence in our schools, this legislation will only contribute to juvenile crime in our communities. Simply removing a child from school does little to address long-term behavioral problems. In fact, suspensions and expulsions without education services only transfer the problem from the school setting to the community setting.

Parents of children with disabilities want safe schools. They know that their children are too often the victims of inappropriate conduct. Under the 1997 amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, any truly dangerous child can and should be readily removed by school authorities. Moreover, the 1997 amendments add numerous

new discipline provisions that strengthen the ability of school personnel to maintain a safe and orderly environment, conducive to learning.

Easter Seals Missouri urges you to withdraw the Safe Schools Act. Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA JONES,
President and CEO.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION,
Alexandria, VA, May 19, 1999.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) is a private nonprofit association representing state and territorial boards of education. Our principal objectives are to strengthen state leadership in education policymaking, promote excellence in the education of all students, advocate equality of access to educational opportunity, and assure responsible governance of public education.

NASBE would like to express its opposition to an amendment proposed by Senators Ashcroft and Frist that will significantly alter the discipline provisions within the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which will be considered by the Senate during debate on the Juvenile Justice bill S. 254 this morning. Currently, students with disabilities who bring a weapon to school can be shifted to an alternative setting for up to 45 days. The Ashcroft/Frist amendment would change this policy so that students with disabilities could be expelled for an entire year. While we certainly support strict disciplinary measures for all students, we must oppose this proposal on the following grounds:

Cessation of educational services, particularly to those most in need of intervention, is not an appropriate response. Simply removing the offending student from school merely shifts the problem to the neighborhood and streets surrounding the school.

A weapons offense is best handled by law enforcement and the judicial system. The current IDEA law does not preclude school personnel from referring student violations to the police where state and local laws would apply.

The amendment undermines the comprehensive compromise reached on IDEA in 1997, of which the current disciplinary policies were a major consideration. During the final Senate vote on IDEA, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott warned that any attempt to modify the legislation would cause the agreement to collapse. Changes made now would only encourage others to attempt to revise other sections of the carefully crafted IDEA law in the future.

Again, we urge you to oppose changing the IDEA disciplinary provisions under the Ashcroft/Frist amendment to the Juvenile Justice bill. If you have any questions, please have your staff contact David Griffith, Director of Governmental Affairs, at 703/684–4000, ext. 107. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

BRENDA LILIENTHAL WELBURN,
Executive Director.

THE ARC,
Arlington, TX, May 20, 1999.

ANNE L. BRYANT,
Executive Director, National School Boards Association, Alexandria, VA.

DEAR MS. BRYANT: The Arc of the United States is very concerned with your May 17 letter to Members of the U.S. Senate, in which you state that the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (P.L. 105–17) prevents schools from removing students who bring firearms to school. This statement is totally incorrect and very misleading. The newly-reauthorized I.D.E.A. allows school authorities to immediately remove all children, including children with disabilities, from the school setting for *any* violation of school discipline codes for up to ten days. In cases when a child has brought a weapon to school or school function, school authorities can unilaterally remove a child with a disability from the child's regular placement for up to 45 days at a time. In addition, if school officials believe that it would be dangerous to return the child after the 45 day period, they can ask an impartial hearing officer to order that the child remain in the interim alternative setting for an additional 45 days and can request subsequent extensions.

It is incomprehensible to The Arc why the National School Boards Association would want to mislead the Senate about this important civil rights law. As a result of these misperceptions, the Senate is considering an amendment to I.D.E.A. that would make communities more dangerous, not safer. The Frist/Ashcroft Amendment currently being debated as part of the Juvenile Justice legislation (S. 254) would allow schools to cease educational services to children with disabilities. Every major law enforcement agency reports that expelling or suspending troubled children without educational services only increases juvenile crime. Drop out rates, incarceration rates and drug use rates also increase when children are expelled or suspended without educational services.

The current I.D.E.A. law and the final regulations, just released by the Department of Education in March of this year, already provide adequate protections to schools. The new law, which your organization agreed to, should be given a chance to work. I.D.E.A. has provided millions of students with disabilities the opportunity for a free and appropriate public education enabling them to become independent and productive citizens. The Arc is extremely disturbed that your organization would use children with disabilities as the scapegoat for recent school shootings.

Sincerely,

BRENDA DOSS,
President.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF BLACK LAW ENFORCEMENT EXECUTIVES,
Alexandria, VA, May 18, 1999.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: On behalf of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), this letter is to support your substitute amendment to S. 254. NOBLE represents more than 3000 minority law enforcement managers, executives, and practitioners at the local, state and federal levels. We believe that students who are suspended from school for carrying weapons must be placed in a supervised alternative to school and be required to participate in an appropriate mental health and behavioral modification program. Suspending these students from school and putting them out onto the streets would only serve to magnify the crime problem that currently exists. Your efforts to ensure that this does not happen are strongly supported by NOBLE.

Our organization urges you to continue your efforts to ensure that your substitute amendment is incorporated into S. 254.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. STEWART,
Executive Director.

THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, May 17, 1999.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: I am writing to express my strong opposition to an amendment that Senator Frist has offered to S. 254, the juvenile crime bill that the Senate is now considering. This amendment, which is similar to S. 969, Senator Ashcroft's bill to which I expressed my opposition last week, would allow school personnel to suspend or expel children with disabilities from their schools for unlimited periods of time, without any educational services, including behavioral intervention services, and without the impartial hearing now required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), for carrying or possessing a gun or other firearm to, or at, a school function.

The Congress need not address the particular issue that is the subject of the Frist amendment, because it amended the IDEA just two years ago to give school officials new tools to address the precise issue of children with disabilities bringing weapons to school or otherwise threatening teachers and other students. For example, school officials may remove, for up to 45 days, a child with a disability who takes a weapon to school, and may request a hearing officer to similarly remove a child who is substantially likely to injure himself or others, if the child's parents object to a change in the child's placement. Furthermore, the IDEA allows hearing officers to keep these students out of the regular educational environment beyond 45 days if they continue to pose a threat to the rest of the student body. I am convinced that these new tools will be effective if given a chance to work.

I am firmly committed to ensuring that all our schools are safe and disciplined environments where all our children, including children with disabilities, can learn without fear of violence. But we should not let the tragic school shootings in Littleton, Colorado, and other communities lead us to responses, such as the Frist amendment, that will harm children with disabilities.

First, the Frist amendment would deny vital educational services to children with disabilities who are removed from school, including behavioral interventions that are designed to prevent dangerous behavior from recurring. Continued provision of educational services, including these behavioral interventions, offers the best chance for improving the long-term prospects for these children. Discontinuing educational services is the wrong decision in the short run and, in the long run, will result in significant costs in terms of increased crime, dependency on public assistance, unemployment, and alienation from society. We cannot afford to throw away a single child.

Second, the Frist amendment would undo vital protections in the IDEA that were included to protect children with disabilities from widespread abuses of their civil rights. Under this amendment, for example, the IDEA would no longer require schools to determine, when suspending or expelling a child with a disability, whether the behavior of the child in carrying or possessing a firearm is related to the child's disability. Such a determination, which can currently be made while the child has been removed from school, is needed to ensure that children are not unjustly denied educational services during their removal without considering the effects of the child's disability on their behavior. The manifestation determination required by the IDEA is an important tool schools use to appropriately understand the relationship between a child's behavior and their disability in order to best implement behavior intervention strategies.

We should be making every effort to appropriately reach out to our children and help prevent them from endangering themselves and others. It is equally important that we appropriately address the needs of children who have gone astray, violated the rules, and put others at risk. The exclusion of children with disabilities from school—without the impartial due-process hearing and the continued services that the IDEA now requires—is the wrong response.

I urge you to vote against the Frist amendment.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD W. RILEY.

STATE OF TENNESSEE, DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION, DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES COUNCIL,

Nashville, TN, May 17, 1999.

Senator BILL FRIST,
Dirksen Building
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FRIST: The recent path of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has been an arduous one, as you well know. We at the Tennessee Developmental Disabilities Council and many others, especially parents of students with disabilities and the students themselves, remember your outstanding efforts to achieve a fair compromise around complex issues during the recent IDEA reauthorization process. Because of your interest and attention, IDEA still ensures children with disabilities access to a free appropriate public education.

The procedural safeguards contained in IDEA are critical in protecting the right of children with disabilities to receive a free appropriate public education. Therefore, we are distressed about your recent effort to amend IDEA concerning the suspension or expulsion of students with disabilities who carries or possesses a gun or firearm to or at a school, on school premises, or to or at a school function. This is not to say that we believe that any student who carries or possesses a gun or firearm should not be disciplined. Just as the positive principles of the IDEA should work for all students as schools are encouraged to include students with disabilities in regular classrooms and to afford them every opportunity for education, so should such egregious behavior by any student have consequences.

However, we do not believe that the consequences enumerated by your amendment to IDEA will have the desired outcome. They will not result in safer schools or communities. In fact, every major law enforcement agency reports that expelling or suspending troubled children without education services only increases juvenile crime. Drop out rates, incarceration rates and drug use rates also increase when children are expelled or suspended without educational services.

We believe that a better approach, for all students, is articulated in Senator Harkin's amendment to the juvenile justice bill. It will assist schools to maintain safe environments conducive to learning. It clarifies that schools can and should remove children who bring guns to school and that schools should provide them with immediate appropriate intervention and services including mental health services to maximize the likelihood that such child does not engage in such behavior or such behavior does not reoccur. The Harkin amendment also reaffirms that nothing prohibits a school from reporting a crime to appropriate authorities.

Senator Harkin's amendment seems very consistent with the aim of IDEA and with the very compromise that you worked so hard to achieve in 1997. Therefore, we ask that you support Senator Harkin's amendment.

Sincerely,

LANA KILE,
Chair.
WANDA WILLIS,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION ON MENTAL RETARDATION,

To: Senator THOMAS HARKIN.
From: M. Doreen Croser, Executive Director.
Re: Opposition to IDEA Amendments.
Date: May 17, 1999.

Thank you for all your hard work to maintain the integrity of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Your efforts are greatly appreciated by the members of the American Association on Mental Retardation!

We also want you to know that we oppose the Ashcroft/Frist Amendment because we do not believe it will result in safer schools or communities. Drop out rates, crime, incarceration and drug use increases when children are expelled or suspended from school without education services. Clearly, such suspensions or expulsions are not in our society's best interest.

Your proposed amendment to the juvenile justice legislation rather than to IDEA seems to be a sensible approach and we support it.

Please share our support with your colleagues and, again, thank you for all work on behalf of children with disabilities.

LEARNING DISABILITIES ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,

Pittsburgh, PA, May 17, 1999.

DEAR SENATOR: As President of LOA, the Learning Disabilities Association of America, a national non-profit volunteer organization dedicated to a world in which all individuals with learning disabilities thrive and participate fully in society, I ask you on behalf of all children with disabilities to:

Oppose the Ashcroft/Frist Amendment to the Mental Health Juvenile Justice Act (S254) now being debated on the Senate floor. This amendment, which would allow local schools to deny educational services, including special education, to a child with a disability who carries to or possesses a gun or firearm in school or a school function, would not reduce violence in schools and society. Testimony of law enforcement agencies during the IDEA reauthorization process pointed out that expelling or suspending troubled children without educational services results in increased juvenile crime in the short term and increased drop out rates, incarceration rates, and drug use in the long term.

Support the Harkin Amendment to the Mental Health Juvenile Justice Act (S254) which clarifies that, under IDEA 97, school can and should remove students with disabilities who bring guns to school. Moreover after being in an alternative educational placement for up to 45 days, the IEP team may decide to move the child to a placement other than the school in which the infraction occurred. The Harkin Amendment also reaffirms that nothing in IDEA prohibits a school from reporting a crime to appropriate authorities.

I would like to point out that none of the children responsible for the eight school tragedies in the past two years was a special education student being served under IDEA. However, it is also apparent that appropriate mental health interventions might have prevented some of these tragedies.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

HARRY SYLVESTER,
President.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 7 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. I have used up 14 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FRIST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I yield myself 8 minutes.

This will be the last few minutes that I have to speak on the Frist-Ashcroft amendment and, thus, I want to, for the sake of my colleagues and others who are listening, explain what the amendment is about.

This amendment is very simple. It is about two things: No. 1, the safety of all students; and No. 2, equal treatment of children.

I have a letter from the National School Boards Association. As most people know, it represents 95,000 local school board members.

I will read from the first paragraph of the letter:

> On behalf of the Nation's 95,000 local school board members, the National School Boards Association urges you to support the Frist-Ashcroft amendment to S. 254 that would enhance the safety of all students from gun violence. The amendment provides school officials with the discretion to suspend or expel students covered by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the same manner as other students in cases where they bring firearms to school.

My colleagues, this amendment is about the safety of all students and the equal treatment of children.

Yesterday, we had a very good debate, I thought, on the substance of the amendment. I gave my remarks yesterday, and I wish to also refer today to some statistics that I obtained not too long ago from my own county, Davidson County.

For the 1997–1998 school year there were eight children in my home county who brought either a gun or a bomb to school, eight in that 1 year. Of those eight, six were special education students. What happened? The two who were not special education students, because of the zero tolerance policy in Tennessee, were expelled. They were out for the remainder of the year.

Of the six special education students, three were back in class. These are individuals who brought a bomb or a gun into the classroom already.

Three of them were kept out of school. Why? Because their disability and bringing a gun to school were unrelated. But three of the eight had this manifestation process, and because of the disability, they were treated in a special way and allowed back into the classroom.

Yesterday I was caught a little off guard, and I do not like that, I really do not like that. And I do not think the

Senator from Iowa meant to say what he said. But he said those statistics don't count. And then I said, well, let's look at 1999, He said, no those statistics don't count. And I said Why? And he said basically because the regulations just came out and we fixed that loophole.

That bothered me, so what I did was go back and call to see really when this law took place, the law that is operating today. I found something very different, exactly the opposite of what the Senator from Iowa told all of his colleagues. And I want to straighten that out for the RECORD. It is very, very important.

The Senator from Iowa argued yesterday that the statistics where individuals with disabilities ended up back in the classroom within 45 days of having brought a gun to the schoolroom don't apply and that loophole had been fixed. I found something very, very different.

In fact, the IDEA amendments of 1997 were signed into law on June 4, 1997. The Senator from Iowa and I were both there. It was a good day. We were both there. Yes, the regulations were written. And it really took too long, they just came out a few months ago. The implication yesterday by the Senator from Iowa was that they were written only recently and, therefore, so they could not apply.

In looking a little closer, the IDEA amendments were signed into law on June 4, 1997. And on June 4, 1997, section 615, the discipline provisions, went into effect that day. So every statistic that I have given for the last 2 years shows repetitively individuals with disabilities, because of this special treatment, it is not their fault, it is the fault of the law that they are ending up back in the classroom. These are individuals who brought a gun or a bomb to school.

Again, I was very disappointed, because again and again he said on the floor yesterday and I went back to the RECORD again last night and found that the Senator from Iowa said: ''I say to the Senator from Tennessee, that the school he is talking about was still operating under the old system.''

Not true. Not true. We talked to the director of high schools for Nashville, Davidson County, and the director stated very specifically that every school in the Davidson County was operating under the IDEA amendments of 1997 under advisement of their lawyers. In fact, let me read from the bill that we signed last year. The 1997–1998 school year applied on June 4.

This is from the bill that we signed on a great day, on June 4, 1997. It says: ''Effective dates, these shall take effect upon enactment of this act,'' on that day in June 1997.

So all the statistics of eight individuals were relevant. Two were expelled because they did not have a disability and of the six who had a disability, three were back in the classroom within 45 days. That is the loophole. Why am I concerned? Just because somebody has not been killed yet because of this loophole, I am not going to wait around until somebody has been killed. I want to prevent that from happening. This amendment is about the safety of all students and to have all students treated fairly.

The amendment closes the loophole that I just pointed out. I have demonstrated factually it is occurring in this legislation. So I want to dismiss all of the arguments the Senator from Iowa made yesterday when he said it is not a problem.

This amendment will, in its ultimate passage, end the mixed message that the Federal Government, that we in this body, send to American students on the issue of guns in school.

Under IDEA, a student with a disability who is in possession of a firearm at school is treated differently from anybody else. Our amendment says very simply that if you bring a gun or a firearm to the school, you, as a student, are going to be treated the same, and you are going to be treated by the local principal or other authorities in the school.

Our amendment allows principals or other qualified school personnel the flexibility to treat every student who brings a gun or a firearm or a bomb into the classroom the very same.

Our amendment does not enforce any sort of uniform policy. We might like to think that we in Washington can set good school policy, but this shows how dangerous that can be by trying to set a uniform policy here for some subset of students.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has used 8 minutes.

Mr. FRIST. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the amendment is a simple amendment: Equal treatment for each and every student who brings a firearm, a gun or bomb, to school. It is an amendment which will have an impact, I believe, help individuals in terms of safety in our schools.

The amendment closes a loophole, a loophole that I have definitively demonstrated does occur in our schools. If a student brings a gun to school, they, if our amendment is agreed to, will be treated the same regardless of their educational status.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes 18 seconds remaining.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his leadership on this issue. I began to be concerned about students carrying guns in and out of our schools quite some time ago. On the Ed-Flex bill, which passed this Senate just a couple months ago, I put an amendment to close another loophole which would allow students who possessed guns in school—not just carried guns to school—to be removed from the school environment.

This responsibility for us to close these loopholes is a serious one. It is a responsibility that relates to school safety. That is what we are talking about here. School safety is a responsibility that we can work hard on, and I am glad Senator FRIST of Tennessee and I have been able to join on this amendment.

It should not have taken this long. This is a simple amendment. This amendment merely allows local schools to treat all children who bring guns to school in the same manner. It does not target children with disabilities—simply not so. It protects children with disabilities. This is not a matter of scapegoating. This does not say that any group of students is subject to more severe punishments than any other group of students.

This is a bill that provides for equity, simply saying that principals and superintendents should have the power, without interference from the Federal Government, to remove students from school who come to school with a firearm, an explosive or a gun. I believe we need to make sure we close the loophole in the Federal law that made it very difficult to discipline certain students who came in that setting.

There are those who say: Well, the law is this way and the law is that way. And they will argue about how the law is applied here in the Senate Chamber. We have a lot of experience from around the country about how the law is applied in the schools. The Senator from Tennessee has eloquently spoken to the fact that as applied in the schools, you frequently find that individuals who, if they were not the subject of an individualized education program, would be gone for a year because of a mandated expulsion, are back in the classroom within 45 days, in spite of the fact that they brought a gun or a bomb to school.

It is simply our intention to let local school boards and school officials decide how they should be able to make the school a safe place and not to reinsert a student in the school environment who has threatened the safety and security of the school by bringing a bomb or a gun to school. We must have zero tolerance for guns in school. I think we must let school officials decide on discipline policies.

We should not have taken this long on this amendment, but I am glad that we are at this point.

After we vote on this amendment, there is a consent decree which is going to allow the Harkin amendment to be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes of the remaining 3 and ask to be notified.

The Harkin amendment makes the current law even worse by imposing a new requirement upon schools that they couldn't remove any child for bringing a gun to school unless they provide special services to the child. I will oppose this amendment.

When you tell people that you will make them special for bringing a gun to school, I think you do a great disservice. You are not making victims out of people by pulling them out of school. You are not making them unsafe. If you tell them clearly that if they bring a gun to school that they are not going to be allowed to stay in school, you will make them safer, and you will make the school safer.

This is a school safety issue. It is an issue that requires our attention. The simple fact of the matter is, the current law, as applied and as implemented, is a real impediment to school safety.

There will be arguments that we have yet to have a student shoot someone under these circumstances. I can tell you that we have come very close. I talked to one school superintendent in my State who had such a student threaten seven other students in the classroom, to kill them. When the student finally shot one of the other students, it wasn't in the classroom. It was off the school premises so that it really didn't qualify under IDEA. But we don't have to wait until there is blood on the blackboard or on the floor of the classroom in order to take steps to make sure we don't have guns in the classroom.

The truth of the matter is, we should simply and clearly make it possible on an equal footing to say that no matter who the student is, there are no excuses, there are no special exceptions; if you bring a gun to school, the local school authority should have the opportunity to take that student and to remove that student without regard to other status.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute 4 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

There is no loophole here. The equity they keep talking about is an equity for danger. We keep hearing they are for safety in schools. We all are for safety, of course.

Why is the National PTA opposed to this amendment? Why are 500 police leaders around the country opposed to this amendment? Why is the National Association of the State Boards of Education opposed to this amendment? Because they all know that the amendment we are about to vote on is a recipe for disaster.

It will increase crime. It will increase drug use. It will increase the dropout rate. Why? I am really disappointed that anyone would say that we can take these kids who have severe problems, kick them out of school and cut off all supporting services and make communities safer. The police chiefs who have to deal with the aftermath know better. That is why they are opposed to this amendment. We know more than they do, and the Parent Teacher Association? Why are they opposed to the Ashcroft-Frist amendment? Because they realize it is a formula for disaster. That is what it is.

This is a dangerous, dangerous amendment and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. President, after the vote on this amendment—by unanimous consent—the Senate will adopt the Harkin amendment. This is an amendment I have drafted and is cosponsored by the distinguished ranking member of the HELP committee, Senator KENNEDY. Our amendment is supported by the police and other groups who oppose the Frist-Ashcroft amendment because it would make schools and communities safer. I'd like to say a few words about it and its intent.

Passage of our amendment is very important. It is very important, because it requires that all children—whether they have a disability or not—are not just dumped in the streets after they commit an act of violence, including bringing a gun or firearm to school. Our amendment would require that schools provide immediate and appropriate supervision, tracking, educational, behavioral, health and related services to these children in order to reduce the likelihood that the child will repeat their anti-social and dangerous behavior. The interventions would be tailored to the individual child. This is absolutely critical and is demonstrated to actually make a difference. It will save lives and money in the long run. It makes common sense.

The Harkin amendment also authorizes the funds necessary to assist our schools in providing this critical intervention.

So passage of the Harkin-Kennedy amendment—which will occur by voice vote after this roll call vote on the Frist-Ashcroft amendment—is a very important amendment. Its adoption puts the Senate on record as supporting the recommendations and pleas of the police, parents and teachers.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Frist-Ashcroft amendment pertaining to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. I respect my colleagues' intentions. They want to make schools safer. Their amendment would not make schools safer, nor the sidewalks leading to the schools, nor their communities.

Their amendment would allow a child with a disability caught with a gun or a firearm, whether he knew what he was doing or not, to be suspended or expelled without educational services.

If a child with a disability—if any child for that matter—is suspended or expelled for having a gun or firearm in school and subsequently not provided with educational services and adult supervision—Would schools be safer? Would communities be safer? Given what happened outside of Atlanta today, we must shift the debate. Yesterday, our colleagues from Tennessee, Missouri, and Iowa debated if, and for how long, a child with a disability could be removed from his school if he brought a firearm to school. I think they agreed that under IDEA and under the Frist-Ashcroft amendment a child with a disability could be removed from his school.

The crux of the remaining disagreement was services—why a child with a disability who brings a gun to school should get services, while his peer without a disability in the same situation, would not get services. We don't solve anything by kicking any child out of school without educational services.

There are two letters of opposition to the Frist-Ashcroft on your desk. One is from the National Association of State Boards of Education and one from the National Parent Teacher Association. They make that simple point very well.

Ask yourself this question—If you could prevent a child from committing a violent act for the first time or a second time, by providing appropriate services, what would you do? The answer is obvious. You would provide the services—to make your school safe, to make your community safe, but most importantly, to save the child.

In the rare instances when it occurs, IDEA provides schools with the tools to control and prevent gun and firearm use by children with disabilities. IDEA recognizes and promotes school safety. IDEA recognizes and promotes teaching consequences for wrongful behavior. IDEA recognizes and promotes adult supervision of, engagement with, and responsibility for children who break school rules or criminal laws.

I would like to review some key facts about IDEA. IDEA permits school officials to immediately suspend a child with a disability with a gun or firearm for 10 days without educational services. During that time, a manifestation determination review must be conducted. First, to determine if the child with a disability understood the impact and consequences of having a gun or firearm. Second, to determine if the child's disability did or did not impair the child's ability to control his behavior.

In effect, if the child knew what he was doing, the law allows the child to be disciplined in the same manner as other children caught with guns or firearms. One distinction applies. This child with a disability, perhaps unlike his peers, would continue to receive educational services. However, school

officials have total discretion over the details associated with providing these educational services.

If a manifestation determination review establishes that the child did not know what he was doing, the child could still be removed from his classroom and school and placed in an interim alternative educational setting for 45 days. After 45 days, if the child continued to be dangerous, the child's placement in the interim alternative educational setting could be extended with the concurrence of a hearing officer.

In the wake of the tragedy in Littleton, Colorado, in the wake of Atlanta, hearing officers will give substantial deference to claims from school officials that a child with disabilities continues to be dangerous. Concurrence of a hearing officer at 45 day intervals is a reasonable standard and an appropriate check and balance on the continued use of an interim alternative educational setting.

There is no forum or procedures for due process in the Frist-Ashcroft amendment. How is a child with a disability to prove his innocence? If expelled without education services for 12 months, what will be the impact on the child's family? What will be the reaction of the child's next teacher? What will be the impact on the child's neighborhood? What will be the impact on this child as an adult?

The real driving force behind the Frist-Ashcroft amendment is the obligation to provide services, and not school safety. Local school districts do not want the responsibility for paying for new services. If school districts do not now have interim alternative educational settings that can accommodate children with disabilities, they do not want to spend money to create them. If school districts do not now have home-based programs or alternative school programs, they want additional money to have them.

School districts do not see a windfall of new Federal dollars on the horizon. So in the name of school safety, they bless the Frist-Ashcroft amendment. In the name of school safety, school districts say it is acceptable for Federal policy to close the school house door on the back of a child with a disability, whether the child knew why the door slammed shut or not. In the name of school safety, they say it is acceptable for Federal policy to leave open whether any agency gives the child and the child's family help, so that they can recover from a gun or firearm episode that profoundly altered their lives.

Helping children and their families in these situations is a community responsibility. Schools are part of communities. They must do their part. Other agencies and organizations must do their part. To abdicate responsibility or shift responsibility is not acceptable. It makes no sense.

All parents want their children to be safe in school and out. All parents want their children to have due process when they are accused of wrong doing. All parents want their child's education to continue, even if their child did wrong.

Are we going to disregard some of America's most vulnerable children in the name of political expediency, by pretending that the Frist-Ashcroft amendment will make schools and communities safer.

In an ideal world, we would find a way to work together to develop or expand, and fund, local agencies and organizations that would work collaboratively to assist families and children in crisis, so that the crisis does not reoccur.

In an ideal world, teachers and administrators in America's schools would be thoroughly versed in the referral procedures associated with IDEA; and, if IDEA were fully funded, tragedies with guns and firearms could be prevented.

We don't have an ideal world, but we must try to make a positive difference, one day at a time, especially in the lives of children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I yield myself such time as I have remaining.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa indicates there is not a loophole here. Well, it is strange to me, but the statistics indicate otherwise.

One county in Tennessee, clear evidence, Davidson County, the home of the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. FRIST, four people who squeezed through the nonexistent loophole were back in class within 45 days in that setting.

I think we have to make sure that that nonexistent loophole, if that is what we are talking about, gets closed. It is impossible to have people coming through a door that is not there. There is a loophole that needs to be shut.

Last but not least, it is no accident that the National School Boards Association wants us to pass this. This isn't discriminating against one class of students or in favor of another. It simply says our priority for learning has to be a safe and secure school environment. This particular amendment would enhance the safety of all students from gun violence, according to the National School Boards Association.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 355. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 137 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Allard	Feinstein	Lugar
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Mack
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bayh	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Nickles
Biden	Gramm	Robb
Bingaman	Grams	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Rockefeller
Breaux	Gregg	Roth
Brownback	Hagel	Santorum
Bryan	Hatch	Sessions
Bunning	Helms	Shelby
Burns	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Byrd	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Inhofe	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson	Specter
Collins	Kerrey	Stevens
Conrad	Kerry	Thomas
Coverdell	Kohl	Thompson
Craig	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Levin	Voinovich
Domenici	Lieberman	Warner
Dorgan	Lincoln	

NAYS—25

Akaka	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Chafee	Inouye	Reid
Cleland	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Crapo	Kennedy	Schumer
Daschle	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden
Edwards	Mikulski	
Feingold	Moynihan	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The amendment (No. 355) was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 368

(Purpose: To provide appropriate interventions and services to children who are removed from school, and to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting a crime committed by a child)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we now turn to the Harkin amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I believe if the Senator from Iowa will send his amendment to the desk, it will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa Mr. HARKIN, for himself and Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 368.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. APPROPRIATE INTERVENTIONS AND SERVICES; CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAW.

(a) APPROPRIATE INTERVENTIONS AND SERVICES.—School personnel shall ensure that immediate appropriate interventions and services, including mental health interventions and services, are provided to a child removed from school for any act of violence, including carrying or possessing a weapon to or at a school, on school premises, or to or at a school function under the jurisdiction of a

State or local educational agency, in order to—

(1) to ensure that our Nation's schools and communities are safe; and

(2) maximize the likelihood that such child shall not engage in such behaviors, or such behaviors do not reoccur.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAW.—Nothing in Federal law shall be construed—

(1) to prohibit an agency from reporting a crime committed by a child, including a child with a disability, to appropriate authorities; or

(2) to prevent State law enforcement and judicial authorities from exercising their responsibilities with regard to the application of Federal and State law to a crime committed by a child, including a child with a disability.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to pay the costs of the interventions and services described in subsection (a) such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

(2) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary of Education shall provide for the distribution of the funds made available under paragraph (1)—

(A) to States for a fiscal year in the same manner as the Secretary makes allotments to States under section 4011(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7111(b)) for the fiscal year; and

(B) to local educational agencies for a fiscal year in the same manner as funds are distributed to local educational agencies under section 4113(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) for the fiscal year.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, in our amendment, which we just passed in the Senate, Senator FRIST and I proposed important changes to federal law to give schools more authority to remove from the classroom any student who brings a gun or firearm to school. Schools need current federal barriers removed so that they can preserve a safe and secure classroom for our children.

The Senator from Iowa has proposed an amendment which makes it even more difficult for schools to remove any dangerous student—including one who brings a gun to school—from the classroom. I rise to state my opposition to the Harkin amendment.

The Harkin amendment makes the current law even worse by imposing a new requirement upon schools when they desire to remove any child—disabled or non-disabled—from the classroom for bringing a gun or firearm to school, or for committing any act of violence.

The Harkin amendment takes the unprecedented step of telling schools across the country that if they want to remove any child from school—even a nondisabled student—for possessing a weapon, or for committing any act of violence, schools must provide the child with ''immediate appropriate interventions and services, including mental health interventions and services,'' in order to ''maximize the likelihood that such child shall not engage in such behaviors, or such behaviors do not reoccur.''

This amendment would overturn the discipline policies of schools across the nation, and intrude upon the right of parents, teachers, school administrators, school boards, to set their own discipline policies regarding weapons and violence in schools. Not only this, but it jeopardizes the ability of schools to remove any student from class who has a gun or firearm, and prevents them from keeping their schools safe.

The Harkin amendment would also handcuff schools even more than the current IDEA law does regarding removal of disabled students who possess weapons.

The Harkin amendment says that a school that takes action to remove a child with a weapon from school ''shall ensure that immediate appropriate interventions and services, including mental health interventions and services,'' are provided to the child. This is a new requirement in addition to current IDEA law.

Current IDEA law requires that a school that removes a child from the regular classroom for 45 days for a weapons possession must already conduct a series of procedures in connection with the removal. Let me describe some of these procedures.

First, a school must conduct a functional behavioral assessment. Second, it must implement or modify a behavioral intervention plan for the child. Included in this is the requirement that the IEP team must meet to develop or modify an assessment plan to address the behavior at issue. Third, the school must conduct a manifestation determination review to determine if the child's disability caused the behavior at issue.

The Harkin amendment adds yet another requirement to the list of procedures that a school must undertake when removing a child with a weapon from the classroom, by requiring that schools ''ensure that immediate appropriate intervention and services, including mental health interventions and services,'' are provided to the child. Why do we need to handcuff schools even more with another procedure?

Additionally, the amendment says that these additional interventions and services must be provided ''in order to maximize the likelihood that such child will not engage in such behaviors, or such behaviors do not reoccur.'' We are not simply asking the schools to try to reduce the likelihood of reoccurring behavior: we are requiring them to maximize that likelihood.

School principals, administrators, teachers, school boards, and parents have told me about how difficult the current IDEA makes it to discipline students, and especially in the case of guns and firearms.

Senator HARKIN's amendment adds yet another layer of procedure. Rather than providing schools with more authority to take actions school officials deem appropriate to maintain a safe and secure classroom free from guns and firearms, Senator HARKIN's amendment is going backwards from current law by imposing more federal responsibilities.

The Harkin amendment's attempt to provide funding for the new procedures required under the amendment is disingenuous.

The amendment authorizes ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004'' to pay for the ''interventions and services'' that schools must conduct before they can remove a student with a gun from school. If the Senator from Iowa and others were unwilling to vote for giving schools more IDEA funding during debate on the ed-flex bill earlier this session, what makes us think they really would provide more funding at this time?

In conclusion, the Harkin amendment actually makes current law worse by imposing a new set of requirements on schools when they need to remove any child with a firearm from the classroom. He would require schools to provide ''interventions and services'' to non-disabled students who are expelled for bringing a gun to school. And, he imposes a new requirement upon schools that take action to remove IDEA students from school for weapons possession.

At a time when parents, teachers, school officials, and our children are asking for help in keeping our classrooms safe, we cannot afford to take a step backward and further handcuff schools from taking steps to get guns out of schools. We need to move forward by giving schools more authority to get—and keep—firearms out of the classroom. For these reasons, I oppose the Harkin amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise to support Senator HARKIN in his amendment to reduce juvenile crime by helping schools to maintain safe environments while ensuring that troubled students get the help they need.

Students who bring guns or other dangerous weapons to school should be removed. But they should also be provided with the appropriate interventions and services.

This amendment clearly supports the removal of a child from school who carries or possesses a weapon, including a child with a disability.

This amendment clearly supports an agency reporting a crime committed by a child, including a child with a disability, to the appropriate authorities.

This amendment clearly supports law enforcement and judicial authorities in exercising their responsibilities with regard to crimes committed by a child, including a child with a disability.

But this amendment, unlike the Frist-Ashcroft amendment, will ensure that immediate, appropriate interventions, including mental health services, are provided to a troubled child.

We know that when educational services for students are stopped, those students show increased drop out rates, increased drug abuse, and increased rates of juvenile crime and incarceration.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of the Harkin-Kennedy amendment. It will help to ensure that our schools remain conducive to learning and our communities remain safe.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I'm pleased to join my colleagues Senator HARKIN and Senator WELLSTONE in offering an amendment that will help reduce crime and violence in our nation's schools.

This amendment specifically addresses the issue of our children's emotional well-being, and what we as a nation, can do to provide schools with the necessary resources to help our kids.

The lives of America's children are very different than they were 20, 30 or 40 years ago. Before our children reach their teenage years, they've already been exposed to drugs, alcohol, violent movies and a general culture of violence that influences their thoughts and actions.

Many have expressed that they are even desensitized to violence in their everyday lives.

And today's students bring more to school than just backpacks and lunch boxes. They bring severe emotional problems.

They disrupt classes, they have difficulty learning, they suffer from depression, and they fight with teachers and students.

And when they do not know how to deal with their feelings of anger and rage, they may even kill.

Since the school shooting a year ago in Jonesboro, I have been grappling with ideas to ensure that this type of tragedy never happened again. Unfortunately, it did happen again and we as a nation have got to act.

Children should not be afraid to go to school in the morning and parents should not be scared to send them there. Studies show that 71% of children ages 7 to 10 say they are worried they will be stabbed or shot while at school.

The Department of Education reported that in 1997, there were approximately 11,000 incidents nationally of physical attacks or fights in which weapons were used.

I don't claim to have all the answers on how to help our children, but I do think we should do more to get to the root of the problem.

We've got to look at the source of this problem; we must come up with some kind of preventive medicine, rather than using a haphazard Band-aid approach.

Metal detectors and controlling access to guns can hinder their ability to act out, but doesn't address their illness to begin with.

And as the tragedies in Jonesboro, Paducah and most recently as the horror in Colorado has shown us—while much of our country is prospering economically, we cannot allow our country's economic success cause us to ignore our social ills.

We can train our children to use computers, to analyze stocks and to meet the economic challenges of the new millennium. But if we do not address their emotional needs or teach them the value of human life, then what have we accomplished?

As Theodore Roosevelt said, ''To educate a man in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to society.''

Together, we must call for improvements, changes and accountability. This can be done, and it must be done.

We can install more metal detectors and surveillance cameras in schools, but we won't get to the root of the problem. The youth of America are suffering and all the increased security in the world may ease our minds, but it won't solve their problems.

The United States Congress can lead the way. We can take common-sense steps to see that tragedies like those in Colorado and Jonesboro become a distant, painful memory.

I've traveled all over my home state of Arkansas talking with educators and school administrators about what's happening in our schools.

The one common denominator—the one thing they all tell me is—''We need more counselors in our schools. We need more qualified mental health professionals to adequately deal with the enormous and overwhelming problems kids have today.''

The National Institute of Mental Health estimates that although 7.5 million children under the age of 18 require mental health services, fewer than 1 in 5 receive it.

The Harkin/Lincoln/Wellstone amendment calls for $15 million in authorizing funds for FY 2000. In order for these services to reach children at a younger age, this money must be spent in elementary schools.

Only qualified mental health professionals may be hired with this funding. Fortunately, these funds are eligible to urban, suburban and rural local school districts. As we all know, rural and suburban areas need our help as much as inner city schools.

The additional school counselors, psychologists and social workers will work hand-in-hand with an advisory board of parents, teachers, administrators and community leaders to design and implement counseling services.

School counselors will involve the parents of children who receive services so parents can be more involved in the development and well-being of their children.

This legislation will help accomplish that and will allow teachers to focus more on a student's skills at writing and arithmetic, rather than on his or her potential for violence.

I will fight to see that this legislation passes, so we can begin to make changes happen in my home state and across our country now, and not wait until the next tragedy. I hope my colleagues will work with me in that effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Doug Peters of the Arkansas Democrat Gazette regarding teen death be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Democrat Gazette, May 18, 1999]

STATE'S TEEN DEATH RATE NEAR TOP IN U.S., STUDY SAYS

(By Doug Peters)

Being a teen-ager is risky, no matter where you are.

In Arkansas, it can be downright dangerous.

Only two states and the District of Columbia had higher rates of teen-age deaths by accident, homicide or suicide in 1996, according to a study of childhood risk factors released today by the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

According to the Kids Count 1999 study, 181 Arkansas teen-agers between 15 and 19 died of such causes in 1996, for a rate of 94 deaths per 100,000. Arkansas' rate is more than 50 percent higher than the national rate of 62 deaths per 100,000 teen-agers.

And while the national rate decreased slightly between 1985 and 1996, Arkansas' rate increased by 16 percent.

Only Mississippi, Wyoming and the District of Columbia had higher teen-age death rates in 1996, the most recent year statistics were available for all states and the District of Columbia.

Dr. Bob West, a pediatric medical consultant for the state Department of Health, said Arkansas' increase appeared to be caused by increasing numbers of teen suicides and homicides.

Between 1985 and 1989, Arkansas averaged 18 suicides and 15 homicides a year among 15 through 19-year-olds, according to Health Department statistics. In 1996, 32 Arkansans in that age group committed suicide. Another 32 were murdered.

Arkansas traditionally has a high rate of accidental deaths among teen-agers, West said. And although the number of traffic deaths among 15 through 19-year-olds dropped from an average of 95 a year between 1985 and 1989 to 85 in 1996, the state's rate remains significantly higher than the national average.

Traditionally, Arkansas accidental death rates run about 40 percent above the national average, West said.

West said that accidents in rural areas sometimes turn fatal because of a lack of nearby trauma services. But location isn't the only factor, he said. Attitude also may play a role.

Some people, he said, simply don't see accidents as being preventable.

''I think there are a lot of folks who think, 'If it happens, it happens,' '' West said. ''There doesn't seem to be the willingness to do the kind of things that will keep you safe'' such as wearing seat belts or installing smoke detectors.

The dismal teen-age death rate helped Arkansas slip to 43rd overall in the Kids Count rating, an annual state-by-state ranking of risk factors to children's well-being. Arkansas ranked 41st last year.

The survey wasn't all bad news, though.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, four weeks ago, an unspeakable act of violence occurred at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado when 12 innocent students, a heroic teacher and the two student gunmen were killed. This incident was the 8th deadly school shooting in 39 months.

The tragedy at Columbine High School is still very fresh in our minds

and our hearts. Our thoughts and prayers remain with the people of Littleton, Colorado.

The students of Columbine have returned to classes in a neighboring school. They have taken an important first step in the healing process. Unfortunately, the scars of this tragedy will remain with them, their families, the Littleton community and the nation for a long time to come.

In the aftermath of this most recent school shooting, we must examine the causes of the outbreak of violence and work on initiatives that will prevent such occurrences in the future.

During the course of the debate on the pending legislation, Juvenile Justice Bill we have already discussed many of the issues related to violence. We must examine the impact that movies, music, television and video games have on outbreaks of violence. We must also curtail the easy access to guns that enable individuals to commit such acts of violence.

We must also talk about how we can prevent such heinous acts from happening again. I would like to take a few moments to discuss one innovative program that can help us prevent violent acts from happening in the first place.

Two weeks ago, the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, of which I am a member, held a hearing on the important topic of school safety. We heard testimony from many experts about the extent of the problem and began an important search for solutions so that it will never, ever happen again.

One of the witnesses was Jan Kuhl, the Director of Guidance and Counseling for the Des Moines School District. Jan talked about an innovative elementary school counseling program called Smoother Sailing and the impact the program has had on students in the Des Moines schools.

Smoother Sailing operates on a simple premise—get to kids early to prevent problems rather than waiting for a crisis. As a result, the district more than tripled the number of elementary school counselors to make sure that at least one well-trained professional is available in every single elementary school building.

Smoother Sailing began in 1988 as a pilot program in 10 elementary schools. The program increased the number of counselors in the elementary schools so there is one counselor for every 250 students—the ratio recommended for an effective program. The participating schools began seeing many positive changes.

After two years, the schools participating in Smoother Sailing saw a dramatic reduction in the number of students referred to the office for disciplinary reasons.

During the 1987–88 school year, 157 students were referred to the office for disciplinary action. After two years of Smoother Sailing, the number of office referrals in those schools dropped to 83—a 47% reduction in office referrals.

During the same period, Des Moines elementary schools with a traditional crisis intervention counseling program had only a 21% reduction in office referrals.

There were other changes as well. Teachers in Smoother Sailing schools reported fewer classroom disturbances and principals noticed fewer fights in the cafeteria and on the playground. The schools and classrooms had become more disciplined learning environments. It was clear that Smoother Sailing was making a difference so the counseling program was then expanded to all 42 elementary schools in Des Moines in 1990.

Smoother Sailing continues to be a success.

Smoother Sailing helps students solve problems in a positive manner. Assessments of 4th and 5th grade students show that students can generate more than one solution to a problem. Further, the types of solutions were positive and proactive. We know that the ability to effectively solve problems is essential for helping students make the right decisions when confronted with violence or drugs.

Smoother Sailing gets high marks in surveys of administrators, teachers and parents. They report a high degree of satisfaction with the program.

95% of parents surveyed said the counselor is a valuable part of my child's educational development. 93% said they would seek assistance from the counselor if the child was experiencing difficulties at school.

Administrators credit Smoother Sailing with decreasing the number of students suspensions and referrals to the office for disciplinary action. In addition, principals report that the program is responsible for creating an atmosphere that is conducive to learning.

Experts tell us that to be effective, there should be at least one counselor for every 250 students. Unfortunately, the current student-counselor ratio is more than double the recommended level—it is 531:1. That means counselors are stretched to the limit and cannot devote the kind of attention to children that is needed.

In most schools, the majority of counselors are employed at the middle and secondary levels. Therefore, the situation is more acute in elementary schools where the student to counselor ratio is greater than 1000:1. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this table be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Smoother Sailing was the model for the Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Act, a section of the Elementary and Secondary School Act.

It reauthorizes the program and authorizes $15 million to establish more effective elementary school programs.

The amendment I am offering with Senators LINCOLN and WELLSTONE is supported by several organizations—the American Counseling Association, the American School Counseling Association, the American Psychological Association the National Association of School Psychologists, the School of Social Work Association of America and the National Association of Social Workers.

Mr. President, CNN and USA Today recently conducted a public opinion poll of Americans. They asked what would make a difference in preventing a future outbreak of violence similar to those that have occurred over the past 39 months.

The leading response was to restrict access to firearms. The second most popular response—a response selected by 60% of those polled—was to increase the number of counselors in our nation's schools.

We should heed the advice of the American people. We have a desperate need to improve counseling services in our nation's schools. Our amendment is an important first step in addressing this critical issue and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent a table of U.S. counselor-to-students ratios be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. COUNSELOR-TO-STUDENT RATIOS

[Maximum recommended ratio (250:1)]

U.S. States	Number of—		Counselor-to-student ratio [1]
	Students	Counselors	
Alabama	780,999	1,688	463:1
Alaska	136,196	231	590:1
Arizona	864,226	1,046	826:1
Arkansas	482,590	1,213	398:1
California	6,157,320	5,208	1,182:1
Colorado	723,591	1,121	645:1
Connecticut	569,268	1,123	507:1
Delaware	126,870	221	574:1
District of Columbia	74,395	225	331:1
Florida	2,455,079	4,855	506:1
Georgia	1,398,787	2,472	566:1
Hawaii	213,404	544	392:1
Idaho	256,946	558	460:1
Illinois	2,240,199	2,838	789:1
Indiana	1,083,851	1,735	625:1
Iowa	539,413	1,332	405:1
Kansas	505,870	1,097	461:1
Kentucky	706,820	1,272	556:1
Louisiana	888,620	2,703	329:1
Maine	227,590	593	384:1
Maryland	911,929	1,825	500:1
Massachusetts	1,033,899	2,125	487:1
Michigan	1,849,721	2,943	629:1
Minnesota	925,347	915	1,011:1
Mississippi	551,418	869	635:1
Missouri	1,025,704	2,410	426:1
Montana	175,563	411	427:1
Nebraska	327,982	757	433:1
Nevada	293,979	560	525:1
New Hampshire	219,006	656	334:1
New Jersey	1,408,761	3,231	436:1
New Mexico	362,001	650	557:1
New York	3,211,827	5,467	587:1
North Carolina	1,316,796	3,025	435:1
North Dakota	125,666	263	478:1
Ohio	2,082,841	3,247	641:1
Oklahoma	647,533	1,730	374:1
Oregon	591,539	1,268	467:1
Pennsylvania	2,117,697	3,707	571:1
Rhode Island	170,732	307	556:1
South Carolina	692,743	1,546	448:1
South Dakota	150,243	345	435:1
Tennessee	953,463	1,525	625:1
Texas	3,879,363	8,359	464:1
Utah	490,706	594	826:1
Vermont	110,228	352	313:1
Virginia	1,172,672	3,202	366:1
Washington	1,047,132	1,804	580:1
West Virginia	313,685	604	519:1
Wisconsin	1,004,584	1,884	533:1
Wyoming	101,652	285	357:1

[1] Calculated ratio is based on 1996 data, counting guidance counselors as full-time equivalents. Produced by the American Counseling Association, Office of Public Policy and Information, 5999 Stevenson Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22304, Phone 703–823–3800.

Source: "Digest of Education Statistics 1998" U.S. Dept. of Education.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we are prepared to accept the amendment on this side.

Mr. LEAHY. We accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous agreement, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 368) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 345, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To establish a commission to study the motion picture industry and make recommendations to Congress and the President to promote accountability in the motion picture industry in order to reduce juvenile access to violent, pornographic, or other harmful material in motion pictures)

Mr. BOND. I send a modified amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator DOMENICI, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], for himself and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 345, as modified.

Mr. BOND. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 345), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. COMMISSION ON ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Motion Picture Industry Accountability Act''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to establish a commission to study the motion picture industry and make recommendations to Congress and the President to promote accountability in the motion picture industry in order to reduce juvenile access to violent, pornographic, or other harmful material in motion pictures.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the ''Motion Picture Industry Accountability Commission'' (in this section referred to as the ''Commission'').

(d) COMPOSITION.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members appointed as follows:

(A) Four members shall be appointed by the President.

(B) Four members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(C) Four members shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(2) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be jointly designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate from among the members of the Commission.

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—At least one member of the Commission appointed by each of the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Majority Leader of the Senate shall be the parent of a child under the age of 18 years.

(e) COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive review of the motion picture industry with a focus on juvenile access to violent, pornographic, or other harmful materials in motion pictures.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—In conducting the review, the Commission shall assess the following:

(A) How the Federal Government and State and local governments, through their taxing power or otherwise, subsidize, facilitate, or otherwise reduce the cost to the motion picture industry of producing violent, pornographic, or other harmful materials, and any changes that might curtail such assistance.

(B) How the motion picture industry markets its products to children and how such marketing can be regulated.

(C) What standard of civil and criminal liability currently exist for the products of the motion picture industry and what standards would be sufficient to permit victims of such products to seek legal redress against the producers of such products in cases where the content of such products causes, exacerbates, or otherwise influences destructive behavior.

(D) Whether Federal regulation of the content of motion pictures is appropriate.

(E) What other actions the Federal Government might take to reduce the quantity of and access to motion pictures containing violent, pornographic, or other harmful materials.

(f) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Majority Leader of the Senate a report on the review conducted under subsection (e).

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report may include recommendations of the Commission only if approved by a majority of the members of the Commission.

(g) POWERS.—The Commission may for the purpose of carrying out this section—

(1) conduct hearings, take testimony, issue subpoenas as provided in subsection (h), and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate;

(2) secure directly from any department or agency of the Federal Government such information as may be necessary for the Commission to carry out the duties of the Commission under this section;

(3) use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

(4) receive from the Secretary of Commerce appropriate office space and such administrative and support services as the Commission may request.

(h) SUBPOENAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a person fails to supply information requested by the Commission, the Commission may by majority vote require by subpoena the production of any written or recorded information, document, report, answer, record, account, paper, computer file, or other data or documentary evidence necessary to carry out its duties under this section. The Commission shall transmit to the Attorney General a confidential, written notice at least 10 days in advance of the issuance of any such subpoena. A subpoena under this paragraph may require the production of materials from any place within the United States.

(2) INTERROGATORIES.—The Commission may, with respect only to information necessary to understand any materials obtained through a subpoena under paragraph (1), issue a subpoena requiring the person producing such materials to answer, either through a sworn deposition or through written answers provided under oath (at the election of the person upon whom the subpoena is served), to interrogatories from the Commission regarding such information. A complete recording or transcription shall be made of any deposition made under this paragraph.

(3) CERTIFICATION.—Each person who submits materials or information to the Commission pursuant to a subpoena issued under paragraph (1) or (2) shall certify to the Commission the authenticity and completeness of all materials or information submitted. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to any false statements made with respect to the certification required under this paragraph.

(4) TREATMENT OF SUBPOENAS.—Any subpoena issued by the Commission under paragraph (1) or (2) shall comply with the requirements for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

(5) FAILURE TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.—If a person refuses to obey a subpoena issued by the Commission under paragraph (1) or (2), the Commission may apply to a United States district court for an order requiring that person to comply with such subpoena. The application may be made within the judicial district in which that person is found, resides, or transacts business. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as civil contempt.

(i) PROCEDURES.—The Commission shall meet on a regular basis or at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of the members of the Commission.

(j) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—The members of the Commission shall serve on the Commission without compensation, but shall be allowed travel expenses including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5702 of title 5, United States Code, when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(k) STAFF.—The Commission shall appoint a staff director and sufficient support staff, including clerical and professional staff, to carry out the duties of the Commission under this section. The total number of staff under this subsection may not exceed 10.

(l) DETAILED PERSONNEL.—At the request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of any department or agency of the Federal Government may detail, without reimbursement, any personnel of the department or agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out the duties of the Commission under this section.

(m) FUNDING.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 to carry out this section.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

(n) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate 60 days after the date on which the Commission submits the reports required by subsection (f).

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we have heard a lot about gun shows, pawn shops, and ammo clips these past few days. We have been told that if we just tweak the law a little here, or add another provision making something else illegal that somehow people who gun down others in cold blood won't do it anymore.

It's as if wishing would make it so.

Thirty years ago we had very few gun laws, and surprisingly, no high school shooting sprees to document every few days, every few weeks, or every few months.

But thirty years ago we also had stricter discipline in schools, no school officials worried about lawsuits if they expelled a violent child, and parents who also exerted more control.

Now we have a new gun law a year. We have school officials who fear lawsuits, and federal law which seems designed to keep violent kids in classrooms, rather than removed—although I hope the Frist-Ashcroft amendment will make some improvements. And we have an industry—in the name of entertainment—that produces violence and violent pornography at such a pace that no one has any idea of the breadth and width of exposure our kids now have to it.

Movies, television, videos, music, computer games. Killing, maiming, and destruction—all in the name of entertainment.

Why is anyone surprised in this new topsey-turvy world, that some students plan mass murders rather than planning their graduation party.

Today I thought it time to inject a little dose of reality into these proceedings, and get us started down a road which I believe needs to be explored. My amendment empanels an independent commission to study the motion picture industry—from top to bottom—to see if the federal government is subsidizing, facilitating or otherwise encouraging the production of violent, or pornographic materials. And if so, to make recommendations to Congress and the President to promote accountability in the motion picture industry in order to reduce juvenile access to violent, pornographic, or other harmful material in motion pictures. Simply put, we want to discourage, not encourage access to these materials.

At the outset, let's make it clear that a great deal of what kids see on the big screen is not harmful and it is done by talented people who are just as concerned about our young people as anyone else. However, there are hundreds, if not thousands of releases each year that have profound effects on teens who see them.

Let us be very clear about one other thing before we continue, because we have head a lot about the gun industry and their so-called political power.

Mr. President, they don't hold a candle to the movie industry. Hollywood has the money, the glamour, the lifestyle of the rich and famous. They have Beverly Hills, they generate publicity for a living, and they have access to the Lincoln Bedroom. In fact, the NRA actually brought in a famous actor in order to have some hope of getting a fair hearing for its position.

But the most disturbing, and least discussed these past few days, is exactly who it is in this country that has glamourized guns and violence. It is certainly not everyone's favorite bogeyman the NRA. It is not the biathletes who compete in the Olympics. Quite simply, it is the entertainment industry. Guns, gore, and violence, targeted not at soccer moms—but to their sons.

And worse yet, it is not just gun use, but gun misuse which is glorified. Gun-toting murders as heros, out to right some perceived wrong. Who even knew what an Uzi or Tech 9 was until they saw it in some show?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a May 11, 1999, article by Michael Atkinson entitled ''The Movies Made Me Do It.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Village Voice, May 11, 1999]

THE MOVIES MADE ME DO IT

(By Michael Atkinson)

On March 5, 1995, Sara Edmondson, the 18-year-old scion of one of Oklahoma's most prominent political clans, holed up with her 17-year-old boyfriend Ben Darras in her family's cabin with a video Copy of Natural Born Killers, a Smith & Wesson .38, and a reported 17 tabs of acid. It's clear neither how many times they watched the film nor what the timetable had been for dropping all that dope, but, over the next two days, the teenagers road-tripped south, first shooting Hernando, Louisiana, cotton-gin manager Bill Savage, and then, the following day, convenience-store clerk Patsy Byers. Initially they had intended to go to a Grateful Dead concert in Memphis, but got the date wrong. Edmondson got 35 years; Darras got life.

Savage was DOA, and his hometown friend John Grisham raised a public stink over the Oliver Stone film, threatening to sue for product liability but never filing. Luckless, Byers was left a quadriplegic and later died of cancer, but her family's lawyer has filed a civil suit against Edmondson, Darras, Edmondson's parents, Stone, and Time Warner, maintaining that the film's creators ''knew. . . . or should have known'' that violence would result from its being shown. In March, after bouncing around Louisiana courts, the case went to the Supreme Court and was seen as good to go.

Here comes the flood. This April, the families of three Kentucky girls left dead after the prayer-group shooting spree of 14-year-old Michael Carneal in 1997 have filed a $130 million lawsuit against no fewer than 25 parties, including five film companies involved with the film The Basketball Diaries; a single scene allegedly incited Carneal to action. The dream sequence, of Leonardo DiCaprio gunning down his classmates, should be immediately familiar to even those who haven't bothered seeing the film, thanks to the news coverage of the Littleton rampage. Littleton itself is destined to become the nation's mother lode of hydra-headed copycat—crime civil suits directed at the manufacturers of pop culture, just as the Klebold-Harris scenario immediately became something to mimic in high schools from coast to coast. Copycat crimes have attained front-burner notoriety, and some day soon Hollywood's liberty will be pitted against the perceived welfare of America children.

It's an old but neglected dynamic, and wherever you stand on the issue, itemizing the carnage attributed to the influence of movies is chilling business. After The Birth of a Nation hit big in 1915, the KKK enjoyed a huge resurgence and lynching stats shot up. James Cagney's psycho gangster in White Heat (1949) was blamed for inspiring Brit Chris Craig's 1952 shooting of a policeman. A clockwork Orange's 1971 release was followed by several rapes in England accompanied by the rapists' renditions of ''Singin' in the Rain,'' after which Stanley Kubrick permanently removed the film from British circulation. Magnum Force's murder-by-Drano was reenacted in Utah, The Deer Hunter precipitated a rash of fatal Russian roulette duels, a fierce love of First Blood sent a deranged Englishman named Michael Ryan tearing through his village commando-style, killing randomly. Taxi Driver spoke to John Hinckley; RoboCop gave ideas to two separate killers, each of whom admitted that their evisceration methods were adopted from the film. Just days after its premiere, Money Train, itself based in part on real incidents, inspired token-booth thieves to incinerate the clerk inside. High school footballers were maimed and killed lying down on busy highways after viewing The Program. Child's Play and it first two straight-to-tape sequels hold the record for the sheer number of dead: besides two-year-old Jamie Bulger, stoned to death by a pair of 10-year-old Chucky fans in Liverpool, and 16-year-old Suzanne Capper, burned alive in Manchester by Chucky fans who played lines of the movies' dialogue to here as she was being tortured, there is the dizzying slaughter of 35 Tasmainian vacationers by Martin Bryant, a mental patient ''obsessed'' with Chucky.

But for sheer inspirational force, and the highest number of captured impulse killers who have directly credited the film Natural Born Killers might be the one plus ultra of copycat-killing source material. Besides the Edmondson-Darras road trip, there have been killings in Utah, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Texas (where a 14-year-old boy decapitated a 13-year-old girl), all involving children who afterward quoted the film to firends and authorities. In Paris, a pair of young lovers, Florence Rey and Audry Maupin, led the police on a chase that killed five; supposedly, Rey said, ''It's fate,'' a la Woody Harrelson's character Mickey, when caught. Another pair of Parisians, Veronique Herbert and her boyfriend Sebastien Paindavoine, lured a 16-year-old to his stabbing death with promises of sex; a scene right out of Stone's film. Herbert has even named the Stone film in ther defense

There are scores of other examples—even Beavis and Butt-head has its ghosts, innocent bystanders killed by child-lit fires or child-tossed bowling balls. Hunt-and-kill computer games, which provide ersatz combat training, have also been cited in the Carneal suit. Of course, in each case, the precise psychological role media played is never clear—nor can it be, until we can map a brain like a computer hard drive. In fact, some of what the press has reported about the similarities between particular murders and particular films is flat-out wrong—scores of scenes that never occurred in Child's Play 2 were said to have been reenacted in the Bulger murder. Still, when a Georgia teen yells out ''I'm a natural born killer!'' to news cameras after being arrested for killing an elderly man, the tie-in is hard to ignore.

Legally, it may be impossible to prove intent on behalf of a filmmaker or a beyond-a-reasonable-doubt cause-and-effect affiliation between specific movies and specific violence. How do you account for the millions of unaffected consumers? What's equally at issue is the common cultural presupposition that the entertainment media bear no culpability for those who wreak havoc in imitation of it. Movies are movies, homicidal nuts are homicidal nuts, the crimes would occur with or without a movie's sensationalized prodding. So the wisdom goes. But is our relationship with movies so simple, or is there in fact something deeper, darker, going on? Could it be that visual media aren't merely a harmless, ephemeral diversion from reality, but a powerful factor in that reality bearing consequences we haven't foreseen?

Since most of the incidents we're aware of have children at their centers, this may prove to be true. According to University of Michigan professor L. Rowell Huesmann, an expert researcher on the relationship between violent media and violent behavior, ''It's been well established that media violence makes kids behave more aggressively.

Of course, there's no scientific way to evaluate how media violence may have or many have not caused real violence, but there's definitely a relationship, a ''priming'' or ''curing'' of behavior for certain individuals. The reasons are well understood in psychology: even as toddlers, if we see other kids push and hit to get what they want, we imitate it, we begin to learn scripts for that behavior. In addition, there have been studies: you show images of gore to young children, they have a universally negative reaction: their heartbeat goes up, their palms sweat, and so on. You show it to them again and again, and those indications go away. They adapt, they become desensitized.''

Dr. Carole Lieberman, a Beverly Hills-based ''media psychiatrist,'' blames parental patterns of consumerism. ''There's no question that parents see it happen. The Ninja Turtles were a significant sign: everyone could see how specific violent behaviors were derived directly from that show. But they still buy the kids the computer, the violent CD games. It's cognitive dissonance—they know, but they don't want their kids to be left out, to be unarmed.''

It seems the entertainment complex knows, too: Last week, MGM announced they'd like to recall every copy of The Basketball Diaries from store shelves but can't thanks to a prohibitive rights agreement that lasts until June 30. Even within the Hollywood chambers, the cattle can get spooked: Money Train scriptwriter Doug Richardson was voted down for membership in the Academy thanks to the subway-booth torching. ''Nobody would say it was because of that incident,'' Richardson says, ''but no one would deny it. So, as a writer, am I supposed to wonder if what I'm doing is drama or pornography? Science is going to have to get in up to its elbows in this, I think. It's a very complicated issue, and doesn't deserve sound-bite answers. Especially since there's so much suffering.

And the suffering, not of Hollywood filmmakers told they shouldn't make ultraviolent movies but of families with murdered children, may be what the debate should be about. ''We could make a great step forward by simply restricting the amount of violence to which children are exposed,'' Huesmann says. ''That's no great constitutional dilemma. I wouldn't be surprised if at this point Oliver Stone came forth and said, 'Yes, the film obviously affects some people in a certain way,' and if he did, that would be a significant first step.'' (Oliver Stone declined to comment.)

''Every study indicates a relationship,'' Huesmann concludes. ''Here's a not greatly known fact: that the statistical correlation between childhood exposure to violence in media and aggressive behavior is about the same as that between smoking and lung cancer.''

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it outlines ''copycat'' acts of violence who fashion their criminal actions—murder and rape—off brilliant ''how to'' works of theater such as ''Natural Born Killers'' and ''Basketball Diaries.''

We know that merchants of violence profit handsomely from some products which hurt our children and cost our society. Who for a second believes that the 40,000 murders that our children witness on the TV screen during their childhoods does not have some terrible numbing effect. We can't stop Hollywood from producing the insanity, but we can attempt to discourage it and to help them share in the burden that their ''profiteering at any cost'' imposes on society.

Now I don't believe we need any more studies outlining the numbing effects that movie and television violence have on our children. What we need to know is—are the American taxpayers subsidizing this numbing down of American youth? And if so, what can and should we do about it?

That is why our Commission looks to people who are independent of the power and influence of the motion picture industry.

Clearly, advertising is directed at attracting all audiences including our young. These wealthy and talented industry people have a right to produce this material but we should not extend them every courtesy when it comes to polluting the minds of our young. There is always parental responsibility, but that does not excuse others from acting responsibly as well.

Does it, or does it not, take a village to raise a child? Last I looked, Hollywood is part of our village. So where is the responsibility of those who produce the harmful material?

Though the power of the motion picture industry is great, we should take a turn listening to parents instead of actors and show leadership instead of cowardice. Some may object on behalf of the wealthy merchants of carnage and smut saying they have a constitutional right to pollute the minds of our children and have no responsibility as an artist or producer to use their power to try and help our nation's parents. But I think they are wrong. Short-sighted and wrong.

Thus if we adopt the Bond-Domenici amendment, we will be saying it is time that parents, and grandparents—not just Hollywood moguls—will have an opportunity to participate in the debate on how best to protect our children. And if this notion offends the Hollywood crowd and their ubiquitous presence in Washington—so be it. We should make quite certain that the public is not contributing or facilitating the production of this sort of material and not facilitating its marketing to our young people. Of, that if we are, people understand it and decide it is good use of national resources.

Now there are other thoughtful amendments to this underlying bill which call on Clinton Administration agencies to study advertising or antitrust provisions. My amendment is designed to get the best minds outside of the Clinton Administration and Hollywood—and if you have any serious questions why, I think this past weekend's multi-million fund-raising trip to Beverly Hills answers those immediately.

It is with a great sense of frustration that I come to you and that is because I am tired of telling parents that there is nothing we can do to help shield their kids beyond relying on the good will and tender mercies of the same ones making blood money off the trash.

If the government can't do anything about it at this time, I think it is worth letting someone on the outside see if it is possible to bring some discipline and responsibility to those who are producing and marketing the insanity. As you all know, not everyone in the film industry is proud of what their colleagues produce for the public. I have no intention of painting with a broad brush, but the ones without discipline—the ones that don't care about our children, should not be shielded from scrutiny just because they may be some of the best people to invite to parties, vacations and fund-raisers.

The Commission is proposed to be made up of 12 members appointed by the President, the Majority Leader and the Speaker and review the following:

(1) How the government, through the tax code or otherwise, subsidizes, facilitates or otherwise reduces the cost of the production of violent, pornographic, or harmful materials and changes necessary to curtail such assistance;

(2) How the movie industry markets to children and how such marketing can be regulated;

(3) What standard of civil and criminal liability currently exists and what standard is sufficient to allow victims to seek legal redress against motion picture productions in cases where content leads to destructive behavior;

(4) Whether federal regulation of content is appropriate;

(5) What other federal action might be taken to reduce the quantity of and juvenile access to movies containing violent, pornographic, or harmful materials.

The amendment requires that a majority report be made within a year of enactment and requires that a minimum number of parents be appointed to the commission. Further, it authorizes a budget for professional staff to assist on these very complex issues.

This would be a powerful commission with a broad mandate that could recommend that we make merchants of death liable for their work, that we make the polluter pay; or outline ways to discourage advertising to our children. We may not enact their recommendations but I think it is time we hear the truth from parents—parents without connections to Hollywood.

It is a balanced commission and the President will get his opportunity to make appointments. He must appoint a parent of a child but he can also appoint a first amendment absolutist and he can appoint Oliver Stone to the commission if he so desires.

I know Members on both sides of the aisle share my frustration. They too have had parents tell them that each year it gets harder and harder to keep the violent images out of their kids lives. Not only movies and videos, but television, CDs, video games, radio, and even print ads.

The images are starker, the violence more pronounced, the mayhem more graphic. No parent can keep it all out because it comes from everywhere. What I am saying here today is that it is time to start holding people responsible for their choices, and that at a

minimum, we should know if the parents of America are paying taxes to subsidize the filth they then try to keep out of their homes.

The Bond-Domenici amendment is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I might not even take that long.

I want to compliment the Senator from Missouri for his proposal and just speak a little bit about a word that is on a lot of people's minds these days. In fact, many people are saying: Boy, it sure would be great if we could get responsibility back into our schools so our children could learn what responsibility means.

I think it would be great if we could get the entertainment industry to show a little responsibility. Some responsibility from those who make films and produce TV shows, produce advertisements, produce many of the vile computer games our young people are using so they become excellent sharpshooters, excellent killers. In fact, some of these computer games have made our children proficient at shooting people right through the head, one after another, because they learned it on the computer game.

Everyone seems to be saying that our children need to learn greater responsibility. Actually, Hollywood and those who produce television shows and movies, they are the ones in need of a new sense of responsibility. I do not know any way, under our Constitution, to stop what is happening. I do not know if I would be wise enough to figure it out. But I tell you, the adults who are in the entertainment industry have to, sooner or later, look at themselves and say: What is our responsibility to the young people of this country?

Right now it seems there is none, other than to make money. If the adults in the entertainment industry continue to refuse to produce films that are good for our young people, even if it is more difficult to sell them, if they refuse to go out and get innovative people to write the kinds of things that are salutary and healthy and helpful, then I believe they are irresponsible. I believe they need a lesson in responsibility. Instead, they hide admirably behind the Constitution.

I believe, if our forefathers who put the First Amendment in the Constitution, the freedom of speech that the entertainment industry hides behind, could see what they produce, what they feed to our young people, what they feed to our society under the alleged protection of that Amendment, I believe they would reconsider and try to figure some way to make sure we had a bit more responsibility built into this aspect of the American free enterprise system.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have to oppose this $1 million study of ''how the Federal Government and State and local governments, through their taxing power or otherwise'' helps support or subsidize the cost of producing ''violent, pornographic or other harmful materials.'' Even though this is just a study, I have serious concerns about researching the need for more taxing power.

Second, the juvenile crime bill already contains a package of amendments regarding the study of the motion picture industry. Third, the causes of teen violence are complex and difficult to handle with tax policy. Fourth, the amendment provides broad subpoena powers.

I appreciate that Senator BOND modified his amendment by taking out the study of how another tax, an excise tax, might be structured for ''violent, pornographic, or other harmful motion picture materials.'' What is considered harmful in Tulsa, may not be considered harmful in Niagara Falls, or Boise, or Key West. But in terms of the ''power to tax'' language still in the amendment it is not clear if the Federal Government, or towns or states, would tell movie producers what content they considered ''harmful'' or ''violent.'' Thus while the ''excise tax'' language was just taken out the study of the ''power to tax'' is still in the amendment. And that raises a lot of issues.

If this power to tax authority were used what would that mean? It is not at all clear how that would work. I do not see why we should spend $1 million to study the ''power to tax.'' There were major fights years ago about whether to censor the line in ''Gone with the Wind''—''Frankly, my dear, I don't give a damn.'' In many towns, that line could have been taxed under a ''power to tax'' if they had it then. Now, that line caused enormous numbers of debates and editorials. I suspect that could have gotten a whopping tax back then. Or Clark Gable could have just said: ''Frankly, my dear, I am really annoyed.''

How would a new ''power to tax'' given to local, state or the Federal government work? The earlier ''excise tax'' idea that was recently dropped raised lots of questions also. I do not know what editing of movies local governments might have ended up doing.

Concerning the excise tax language, now dropped, I wondered would the local or the Federal government have imposed the tax before the movie was produced, after the movie was produced, or during the editing of the movie? Or, would the States or the Federal Government have told the producers ahead of time how much they would tax them on each scene? If they were to do it that way, could they take some scenes out or pay the extra tax, like a gas-guzzler tax? I understand there are a lot of violent battle scenes in the new Star Wars movie. That would have had a pretty big gross to tax. Fortunately, the ''excise tax'' language was taken out by the sponsor of the amendment, but the ''power to tax'' language remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the ranking member for yielding. I hope he will stay on the floor just a moment because I wanted to ask him something. In this amendment, on page 4, is something that completely astounds me. This commission is going to look at whether the regulation of the content of motion pictures is appropriate.

Federal regulation—is this the Soviet Union? What are we doing? I ask my friend if this disturbs him that we would be considering the Federal Government regulating the content of motion pictures.

Mr. LEAHY. I say to my friend from California, what I also worry about is how you determine what it is. I heard one Senator on the floor speak of having more wholesome movies. I am all for that. There are a lot of movies that I consider absolutely classic. I like the ''Quiet Man'' with John Wayne. It was filmed near the part of Ireland from where my father's family came. But there is violence, fighting, drunkenness a little bit here and there. What do you determine it is? Does the market carry that? There are a lot of wholesome films that make it.

I see some things that might be considered wholesome. One very popular with children are Teletubbies, but yet we heard one leading conservative religious leader say that it should be taken off the air because he objected to one of the Teletubbies.

Maybe we have Teletubbies on one side and televangelists on the other. Somebody suggested in one cartoon: Teletubby Tinky Winky; Televangelist Dopey Wopey. But that is what I read in the paper.

Do we take that off or tax it? Maybe after the $1 million this amendment refers to we might have a better idea. I am not too sure I want even my own communities to determine what tax they will impose and the Federal Government determine what tax they will impose and then have censor boards all over the place determining this one we will tax a little itty-bitty, and this one we will tax biggie bitty-bit.

I point out, we do already have in the juvenile justice bill a package of amendments regarding the study of the motion picture industry, so that is going to be done anyway.

Mrs. BOXER. I point out to my friend, who is such an advocate of the Constitution, that this is the third one. We have investigation mania going on here. This is the third investigation of the entertainment industry that is going to be voted on in this Senate; the third investigation. Fortunately, on the first one, we expanded it to include the gun industry. So there is one investigation of the gun industry and how it peddles its products to kids, and then

there are three investigations of the entertainment industry. But this is the very first one where it says in this bill—and I say to my friends, read it. They are going to look at whether there should be Federal regulation of the content of motion pictures.

Maybe the Senator from Missouri is interested in writing movies, but I am not. This is what it is about. None of us was elected to be a movie writer. There is no bureaucrat I know who ought to sit around and write movies. We now have three investigations of the motion picture industry in this bill.

Let me tell you what they are. The first one was the Brownback amendment. I actually supported it. Everybody did. I thought: OK, we will have a commission; it will look at youth violence. That commission calls for the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General, with all the powers of their offices, to look at the marketing tactics of the motion picture industry, the entertainment industry, and the video games industry and see if they are, in fact, taking advantage of our children.

Then we have the Lieberman Commission, which is part of the managers' amendment, which sits in this bill. I have it in front of me. Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BROWNBACK, Ms. LANDRIEU, et cetera. They are establishing a national youth violence commission and it refers to the various powers of that commission. That is investigation No. 2.

Now comes along, in case we did not do enough of this, investigation No. 3. Duplicative, I add, of the others, but a lot more frightening, because it includes the possibility of Federal regulation of the content of motion pictures.

It refers to changing the law to seek legal redress against producers. My friend from Missouri can take comfort in the fact that we are already doing what he wants to be done, with the exception of looking at the content.

I do not know whether this is going to be accepted or if there is a vote. More than likely it is going to be adopted. Set up a commission. How about doing something that will help? How about keeping our kids busy after school? Oh, no, I only got two people from the other side of the aisle. Keep our children busy after school so they are not sitting in front of the television? Oh, no, we couldn't do that, even though we have a million children waiting in line to get into afterschool programs.

But, oh, let's have a third commission and beat up on the entertainment industry and that is going to help keep our kids out of trouble.

Look at the FBI statistics. That is when there is juvenile crime. This is a juvenile justice bill. We do a little something for afterschool in this bill, but it is just that, a little something. It will not take care of the backlog of all the children who are waiting, but, oh, we can feel real good and set up a third investigation of the entertainment industry.

This is amazing to me. And this one is frightening to me, to think that the Federal Government may now begin to regulate the content of movies. I simply think that the American people do not want to see their Government regulating what can be said in a movie. If you do not like a movie, don't go see it, as Senator LEAHY said yesterday. Don't spend your dollars on violence. Turn the movie channel. But to set up now a third commission on the entertainment industry, this is just going over the top. And suggesting that they look at ways to regulate content, that is a frightening thought to me.

I do not have much hope that this will be defeated because it seems to be something we are getting used to here: Let's have an investigation; it's easy; it's easy; have an investigation.

By the way, it is going to cost $1 million. Do you know how many slots that could take care of for kids waiting in line to get in afterschool programs? Let's use it on something that works. A million dollars on this commission. I know my friend is a fiscal conservative. I hope when this bill gets to conference, they can take these three investigations and put them into one, because this is simply amazing to me.

I have every belief that the Senator's commission will be adopted. The Senate is in the mood to launch yet another investigation, point another finger and, ''Yes, I voted against afterschool, but I voted for that commission; I am going to save our kids.''

I am very surprised we are looking—as a matter of fact, I did not even know this was coming up until somebody said it. I thought: Wait a minute, that is confusing; we already have two investigations. Now we have yet a third.

I know what I am saying is not popular around here, but I worry when we start talking about the Government regulating content. That reminds me of the old Soviet Union. That is gone. Let's not follow that model.

I hope people vote against this. Again, I do not hold out much hope, but I hope people vote against this. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BOND. One always is impressed with the ability of Hollywood and their obfuscation. We have heard some responses from the Hollywood community. They said this is a massive tax bill. That is not what the purpose was. We amended the amendment so it does not even refer directly to taxes.

The Senator from Vermont mentioned and gave a wonderful rendition of ''Gone With The Wind'' and ''Star Wars.'' We are not worried about ''Star Wars.'' We are not worried about ''Gone With The Wind.'' We are worried about parents who cannot stop all of the mayhem and violence and murder that is being marketed to their kids, to their kids' friends, to their kids' neighbors every time they turn around.

We think it is time that somebody looked at how we hold Hollywood accountable. I am asking not that we investigate. I believe there is enough evidence of these teenage killers, citing the fact that they have been inspired by movies, to know that something has to be done.

My good friend from California said, we are regulating content. I believe she was one of the leaders who argued for regulating the content of tobacco advertising and said we are going to eliminate tobacco advertising. That is content. That is regulation. That is regulation of speech.

Incidentally, you can regulate what is going to children. We do regulate speech. We do not allow pornography to go to kids. We do not allow tobacco advertising to go to them. I will tell you something, when I see ''Basketball Diaries,'' with Leonardo DiCaprio as a teenage hero walking into a classroom in a black trenchcoat, with a gun, and murdering his fellow students, I see there is a message that Hollywood has sent to our kids. If I could regulate it, if I could stop it, I would like to stop it.

I want to get a national debate going and ask and see how we can stop this filth being targeted at our kids. Does anyone think ''Basketball Diaries'' is designed to attract older movie viewers like me? I do not think so. That is targeted directly to kids. How do we deal with that? That is what the Domenici-Bond amendment asks. All of the obfuscation and all of the misleading arguments put up by the good folks in Hollywood are not going to take attention away from the fact that they are responsible.

Just in the last couple days the President of CBS said he was going to withdraw a violent drama called ''Falcone.'' I quote Leslie Moonves.

> While it's not fair to blame the media for the rampage, Moonves said that ''anyone who thinks the media has nothing to do with this is an idiot.''

I suggest that tells the tale.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HATCH. All the Senator wants to do is set up a Commission to review these matters. We have plenty of work in this bill to take care of it.

Now look, the first amendment is not absolute. There are a lot of limitations on the first amendment recognized by the courts: obscenity, pornography, fighting words, time restrictions, such as nudity in television programming—that may be stopped, television programming that may be aired—indecent speech, exposure to children, and we could go on and on. It isn't like this is something unprecedented.

I think we have to look at these matters and see what we can do to change the culture in this society, because that is what is wrong. It is a lot more important than guns or anything else.

We have made it possible for these kids to see all kinds of filth and violence coming out of their ears. After a while, they get so that it becomes part of their lives. That is why this bill is so important. It is a lot more important than some of the assertions by some people on behalf of their amendments. But this is an amendment that I think we ought to vote for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

The Senator from Vermont has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this side has how many minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two and a half minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. We yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields back the remainder of their time.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that we stack this amendment along with the Biden amendment to be voted upon at a time to be determined by the two leaders.

Mr. LEAHY. I agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EDWARDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. EDWARDS. On rollcall vote No. 137, I voted ''no.'' It was my intention to vote ''aye.'' I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote. This would in no way change the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 369 AND 370, EN BLOC

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send a Helms amendment on safe schools and a Harkin-Lincoln amendment to the desk and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] proposes amendments numbered 369 and 370, en bloc.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments, en bloc, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 369

(Purpose: To amend the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 to require a local educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to treat possession, on school property, of felonious quantities of illegal drugs the same as gun possession on such property)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

''SEC . SAFE SCHOOLS.

''(a) AMENDMENTS.—Part F of title XVI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.) is amended as follows:

''(1) SHORT TITLE.—Section 14601(a) is amended by replacing ''Gun-Free'' with ''Safe'', and ''1994'' with ''1999''.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 14601(b)(1) is amended by inserting after ''determined'' the following: ''to be in possession of felonious quantities of an illegal drug, on school property under the jurisdiction of, or in a vehicle operated by an employee or agent of, a local educational agency in that State, or''.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 14601(b)(4) is amended by replacing ''Definition'' with ''Definition'' in the catchline with ''part'', by redesignating the matter under the catchline with ''part'', by redesignating the matter under the catchline after the comma as subparagraph (A), by replacing the period with a semi-colon, and by adding new subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as follows:

''(B) the term ''illegal drug'' means a controlled substance, as defined in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)), the possession of which is unlawful under the Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), but does not mean a controlled substance used pursuant to a valid prescription or as authorized by law; and

''(C) the term ''illegal drug paraphernalia'' means drug paraphernalia, as define in section 422(d) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 863(d)), except that the first sentence of that section shall be applied by inserting 'or under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 915 et seq.)' before the period.

''(D) the term ''felonious quantities of an illegal drug'' means any quantity of an illegal drug—

''(i) possession of which quantity would, under federal, State, or local law, either constitute a felony or indicate an intent to distribute; or

''(ii) that is possessed with an intent to distribute.''.

''(4) REPORT TO STATE.—Section 14601(d)(2)(C) is amended by inserting ''illegal drugs or'' before ''weapons''.

''(5) REPEALER.—Section 14601 is amended by striking subsection (f).

''(6) POLICY REGARDING CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM REFERRAL.—Section 14602(a) is amended by replacing ''served by'' with ''under the jurisdiction of'', and by inserting after ''who'' the following: ''is in possession of an illegal drug, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property under the jurisdiction of, or in a vehicle operated by an employee or agent of, such agency, or who''.

''(7) DATA AND POLICY DISSEMINATION UNDER IDEA.—Section 14603 is amended by inserting''current'' before ''policy'', by striking ''in effect on October 20, 1994'', by striking all the matter after ''schools'' and inserting a period thereafter, and by inserting before ''engaging'' the following: ''possessing illegal drugs, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property, or in vehicles operated by employees or agents of, schools or local education agencies, or''.

''(b) COMPLIANCE DATE; REPORTING.—

''(1) States shall have two years from the date of enactment of this Act to comply with the requirements established in the amendments made by subsection (a).

''(2) Not later than three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit to Congress a report on any State that is not in compliance with the requirements of this part.

''(3) Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit to Congress a report analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of approaches regarding the disciplining of children with disabilities.''

AMENDMENT NO. 370

(Purpose: To amend section 10102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding elementary school and secondary school counseling)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. SCHOOL COUNSELING.

Section 10102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8002) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 10102. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELING DEMONSTRATION.

''(a) COUNSELING DEMONSTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants under this section to local educational agencies to enable the local educational agencies to establish or expand elementary school counseling programs.

''(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give special consideration to applications describing programs that—

''(A) demonstrate the greatest need for new or additional counseling services among the children in the schools served by the applicant;

''(B) propose the most promising and innovative approaches for initiating or expanding school counseling; and

''(C) show the greatest potential for replication and dissemination.

''(3) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall ensure an equitable geographic distribution among the regions of the United States and among urban, suburban, and rural areas.

''(4) DURATION.—A grant under this section shall be awarded for a period not to exceed three years.

''(5) MAXIMUM GRANT.—A grant under this section shall not exceed $400,000 for any fiscal year.

''(b) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each application for a grant under this section shall—

''(A) describe the school population to be targeted by the program, the particular personal, social, emotional, educational, and career development needs of such population, and the current school counseling resources available for meeting such needs;

''(B) describe the activities, services, and training to be provided by the program and the specific approaches to be used to meet the needs described in subparagraph (A);

''(C) describe the methods to be used to evaluate the outcomes and effectiveness of the program;

''(D) describe the collaborative efforts to be undertaken with institutions of higher education, businesses, labor organizations, community groups, social service agencies, and other public or private entities to enhance the program and promote school-linked services integration;

''(E) describe collaborative efforts with institutions of higher education which specifically seek to enhance or improve graduate programs specializing in the preparation of school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers;

''(F) document that the applicant has the personnel qualified to develop, implement, and administer the program;

''(G) describe how any diverse cultural populations, if applicable, would be served through the program;

''(H) assure that the funds made available under this part for any fiscal year will be used to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would otherwise be available from non-Federal sources for the program described in the application, and in no case supplant such funds from non-Federal sources; and

''(I) assure that the applicant will appoint an advisory board composed of parents, school counselors, school psychologists, school social workers, other pupil services personnel, teachers, school administrators, and community leaders to advise the local educational agency on the design and implementation of the program.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Grant funds under this section shall be used to initiate or expand school counseling programs that comply with the requirements in paragraph (2).

''(2) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—Each program assisted under this section shall—

''(A) be comprehensive in addressing the personal, social, emotional, and educational needs of all students;

''(B) use a developmental, preventive approach to counseling;

''(C) increase the range, availability, quantity, and quality of counseling services in the elementary schools of the local educational agency;

''(D) expand counseling services only through qualified school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers;

''(E) use innovative approaches to increase children's understanding of peer and family relationships, work and self, decision-making, or academic and career planning, or to improve social functioning;

''(F) provide counseling services that are well-balanced among classroom group and small group counseling, individual counseling, and consultation with parents, teachers, administrators, and other pupil services personnel;

''(G) include inservice training for school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, other pupil services personnel, teachers, and instructional staff;

''(H) involve parents of participating students in the design, implementation, and evaluation of a counseling program;

''(I) involve collaborative efforts with institutions of higher education, businesses, labor organizations, community groups, social service agencies, or other public or private entities to enhance the program and promote school-linked services integration;

''(J) evaluate annually the effectiveness and outcomes of the counseling services and activities assisted under this section;

''(K) ensure a team approach to school counseling by maintaining a ratio in the elementary schools of the local educational agency that does not exceed 1 school counselor to 250 students, 1 school social worker to 800 students, and 1 school psychologist to 1,000 students; and

''(L) ensure that school counselors, school psychologists, or school social workers paid from funds made available under this section spend at least 85 percent of their total worktime at the school in activities directly related to the counseling process and not more than 15 percent of such time on administrative tasks that are associated with the counseling program.

''(3) REPORT.—The Secretary shall issue a report evaluating the programs assisted pursuant to each grant under this subsection at the end of each grant period in accordance with section 14701, but in no case later than January 30, 2003.

''(4) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall make the programs assisted under this section available for dissemination, either through the National Diffusion Network or other appropriate means.

''(5) LIMIT ON ADMINISTRATION.—Not more than five percent of the amounts made available under this section in any fiscal year shall be used for administrative costs to carry out this section.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'school counselor' means an individual who has documented competence in counseling children and adolescents in a school setting and who—

''(A) possesses State licensure or certification granted by an independent professional regulatory authority;

''(B) in the absence of such State licensure or certification, possesses national certification in school counseling or a specialty of counseling granted by an independent professional organization; or

''(C) holds a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling from a program accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs or the equivalent;

''(2) the term 'school psychologist' means an individual who—

''(A) possesses a minimum of 60 graduate semester hours in school psychology from an institution of higher education and has completed 1,200 clock hours in a supervised school psychology internship, of which 600 hours shall be in the school setting;

''(B) possesses State licensure or certification in the State in which the individual works; or

''(C) in the absence of such State licensure or certification, possesses national certification by the National School Psychology Certification Board;

''(3) the term 'school social worker' means an individual who holds a master's degree in social work and is licensed or certified by the State in which services are provided or holds a school social work specialist credential; and

''(4) the term 'supervisor' means an individual who has the equivalent number of years of professional experience in such individual's respective discipline as is required of teaching experience for the supervisor or administrative credential in the State of such individual.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

Mr. HATCH. With respect to the amendment offered today by Senator HELMS, which amends the Gun Free Schools Act of 1994, I must say that I support this effort to make our schools gun and drug free.

The amendment would require an educational agency that receives federal funds to expel for not less than one year a student determined to be in possession of felonious quantities of illegal drugs. We're talking about quantities that indicate hard-core drug use, or drug trafficking. We're talking about dangerous, and predatory, behavior. We've simply got to get the people who bring these things into our schools out of our schools.

Now, I know that some of my colleagues may be concerned with the consequences of turning disruptive students out onto the streets for one year. I assure everyone that I understand that concern and direct their attention to the Alternative Education Grant provision found in the underlying bill. This demonstration grant provides funding to state and local education agencies to set up alternative education in appropriate settings for disruptive or delinquent students. These services are designed to improve the academic and social performance of these students and to improve the safety and learning environment of regular classrooms. This three-year demonstration project will provide alternative education to juveniles in trouble with or at risk of getting in trouble with the law, such as students who are expelled for carrying firearms or drugs to school.

I applaud the efforts of Senator HELMS for continuing to seek effective ways to curb the spiraling increase in drug abuse among our nation's youth. Anyone familiar with my record on combating illegal drug use knows that I am in favor of stiff penalties designed to deter criminal behavior, and never more so than when we are talking about behavior that harms our school children. I think this amendment, which contains a specific exception to the one-year expulsion rule by allowing the chief administering officer of the local educational agency to modify the expulsion requirement for students on a case-by-case basis, is a measured and principled response to the scourge of drugs in our schools.

Like the original Gun Free Schools Act, this amendment is motivated not only by a desire to punish those who bring illegal objects into schools, but also to address the immediate threat to the entire student population created by the presence of those objects. As with guns, felonious quantities—drug-trafficking quantities—of illegal drugs present a direct and serious hazard, both to the individual possessors, and to the other students as well. For this reason, it is appropriate that sanctions be the same in both cases.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be accepted en bloc and that any statements relating to the amendments be printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 369 and 370), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATCH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. I understand we now move to the Biden amendment, the last amendment before final passage.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 371

(Purpose: To establish a 21st century community policing initiative)

Mr. BIDEN. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. KOHL, proposes an amendment numbered 371.

Mr. BIDEN. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 22½ minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I beg your pardon? I thought I had 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am sorry. The Senator from Delaware has 30 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I send this amendment on behalf of the primary sponsors: The Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER; the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER; the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER; and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. KOHL; and others.

This is a pretty straightforward amendment. My amendment extends for another 5 years the COPS Program which was created in the 1994 crime bill. As we all know, the COPS Program has put over 100,000 police officers on the—well, they are not all on the street yet, but it funded 100,000 police officers, of whom about 11,000 are in training now. I have put on the desk of every Member of the Senate a list of the number of police officers, State and local police officers, that have been funded under the COPS Program in their States.

I have put on the desk of every Member of the Senate the reduction in violent crime, in property crimes, that has occurred in their State since the crime bill of 1994, which was passed, and I would make the argument that we do not have to reinvent the wheel here; it works. Cops on the street through the COPS Program work.

The COPS Program is going to expire next year. Our amendment authorizes $1.15 billion per year through the year 2005.

Let me explain what it does. There is $600 million more for police on the streets every year, which would give the States up to another 50,000 police officers over the next 5 years. This money, though, can always be used to retain current officers hired under the COPS Program; it can be used to pay overtime; it can be used to reimburse current cops for college and graduate school courses up to a percentage of the total money here.

Since the original crime bill was the Biden crime bill that became the 1994 crime bill—we put in this COPS amendment. At the time, we were told by everyone, whether it was liberal newspaper editorials saying, we have tried this before and more cops don't work, or conservatives arguing that this was just a great big social welfare program—it was going to hire a bunch of social workers—we have demonstrated that it had never been done before and it works when it is done.

I am reminded of the quote attributed to G.K. Chesterton. He said, it is not that Christianity has been tried and found wanting; it has been found difficult and left untried.

The truth of the matter is, up to the time of the crime bill of 1994, we had never made a full blown major commitment to help local law enforcement officers increase their number. We have, in fact, increased the number of cops wearing uniforms—of local police officers, not Federal cops—by 100,000 cops. The crime rate has plummeted, not solely because of that but, I would argue, in large part because of that.

Now, I have been here long enough to know that one of the dangers of being here long enough and having worked hard on setting up a government program, which you thought about and conceived and worked on for years and years to get adopted, is that you become a captive of your own program. So the Senator from Pennsylvania and I would talk, back in the early days when he got here and I got here, about community policing and how important it was.

Cops didn't want community policing. Mayors did not want community policing. No one wanted it. My friend from Pennsylvania talked about career criminals and pointed out that only 6 percent of the criminals in America committed over 60 percent of the violent crimes in America. To both of us, it didn't seem like rocket science. If you focused on going after that 6 percent and you put more cops on the street and you took them out of patrol cars and put them on a beat, that would have a positive impact.

I didn't have the experience my friend from Pennsylvania had of being a prosecutor. I might add, the office he was the chief prosecutor of in Philadelphia tries more criminal cases in 1 year than the entire Federal system tries in a year. The entire Federal system tries fewer cases than are tried in the Philadelphia prosecutor's office, the Philadelphia DA. I didn't have the experience, but I was smart enough to listen to him. And I was smart enough to listen to enough people who have been out there and had the experience. So as hard as it is to believe, it took us about 6 years to convince people that putting local cops on the beat made sense.

I have spent, as has the Senator from New Mexico who was on the floor, a long time in this body. I think we both agree that if you take this job seriously and you sit in hearings year after year, day after day, month after month, unless you are an absolute idiot, you eventually learn something. Every single, solitary criminologist, every single expert, every single person who testified before the Judiciary Committee in the 16 years I chaired it or was a ranking member, said, we don't know a lot about crime but one thing we know: If there is a cop on this corner and no cop on the other corner and a crime is going to be committed, it is going to be committed where the cop is not.

The second thing we know: If you have a cop in a neighborhood and they get to know the folks in the neighborhood, a simple thing happens—trust gets built. They know the cop's name. If they know who the cop is, they are going to be more inclined to call the officer aside when a crime has been committed and say, Officer John, I know who did that. If it is a wave-by and a cop is going by in a car and he is not a community cop, they don't want to take the chance of putting them on the line.

I realize these are very simple, basic, trite-sounding things I am saying, but this program works. It works well.

There are a lot of ideas here that ended up being rejected because they do not pass the test of ''not invented here.'' I realize there are some concerns, on the part particularly of my Republican colleagues, that this may be—and I am not talking about the Senator from Pennsylvania or anyone in particular—a program that is viewed as being identified with the Democratic Party, the President; therefore, why do we keep it going for another 5 years?

I respectfully suggest that there have been some incredibly good ideas that have come out of the Republican caucus, including the block grant notion for police departments, including more flexibility to be given to local law enforcement officers. I want my colleagues to know—and I understand the limitations my friend from Utah had in being able to reach an agreement here—I was prepared to accept the community block grant portion of the Republican program in order to get a consensus in this process. We didn't get there. I hope that when this passes, if it passes, we can still, as we move on through this year, move on to that good idea as well. I didn't try to incorporate it here because it is not my idea, it is the idea of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and others on the Republican caucus with whom I have to agree.

Now, let me say this: One of the things we learned from the COPS Program and its functioning is that, as well as it works, it can be made to work better. I say to my friend from New York, Senator SCHUMER, he has

been deeply involved. He carried this load in the House when we did this in 1994. He was a leader on the COPS Program. What he and I have both found out from our local law enforcement officers is that they need more flexibility. They need to be able to use this COPS money in ways that go beyond hiring a new shield, to be able to keep cops who are on the beat and use this money. They also want to be able to pay overtime, because they get the same coverage as they would if they hired a new cop, if they are allowed to pay overtime. So we built into this extension of the COPS Program more flexibility.

To the best of my knowledge—my staff is behind me; I don't have it in front of me—I believe every major police organization has endorsed this and endorsed it on this bill, because it works.

The second thing—and I will shortly yield to my friend from Pennsylvania, and then I want to reserve time for my friend from New York as well—is that there is $350 million in here for law enforcement to get new technologies to enhance crime fighting, such as better communications systems so cops in different jurisdictions can communicate, and even the ability to target hot spots, and new investigative tools like DNA analysis. The cops have come to me and they have said, this is what we need; this is what we need.

I am one who believes that as long as they keep doing the job as well as they have been, we should give them the tools they need.

There is one last piece, and then I will yield. The cops have been doing such a good job that the prosecutors in Senator SPECTER's old office are overwhelmed. They are overwhelmed. You put 100,000 more cops on the job, 545,000 cops who have already been on the job and who had not been in community policing but are all now community police, and you have had a phenomenal impact on crime, but also a phenomenal impact on putting more pressure on the court systems in the State and local governments.

So there is in this bill $200 million for community prosecutors to expand the community policing concept to engage the whole community in preventing crime. These cops, as I said, have been so successful with their jobs that the next piece of the puzzle, the new bottleneck, is State prosecutors. Local prosecutors, they need help. So the next major piece of this bill is $200 million for community prosecutors.

Lastly, you are only allowed to use a portion of the COPS money for this, but one of the things the cops have come to us and said is, we have a lot of cops who want to increase their education; we have a lot of cops who want to go back to college, who want to be better cops. If you are a schoolteacher in most districts and you go off and teach school and you go off and get your graduate degree, the school district helps you pay for that. I think we should be allowing the cops to take a portion of the money they get and pay for the continuing education of law enforcement officers. I still believe that the greatest safety lies in educated police officers who fully understand the Constitution, who increase their educational background. So that is another innovation in this bill.

There is much more in it that I will not bore the floor with at this time. I know a lot of people are trying to get through this bill. I respectfully suggest—and it is imprudent of me to say this—I think this is, in a substantive sense, the single most important amendment we could add to this bill.

I guarantee you—and I am willing to bet anybody in this body dinner—that if we add another 50,000 cops out there and this technology, we are going to have a significantly greater impact on reducing juvenile crime than we would without it. It works, folks. Let's not reinvent the wheel.

I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. How much time remains in control of the Senator from Delaware?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes 33 seconds remaining.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I yield 9 minutes to my friend from Pennsylvania and 9 minutes to my friend from New York. I will reserve 2 minutes for myself to close.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Delaware for yielding me the time and for submitting this amendment, which I have cosponsored. I believe that police on the street constitute a very significant deterrent effect—and that the 95,000 or 100,000 police who have been added across America have been a factor in reducing the crime rate—which we have noted in the past several years. I think that is one factor.

The additional prison space, the fact that more men and women are incarcerated—regrettably, but necessarily—I think has been a contributing factor. The armed career criminal bill, which provides for a sentence for 15 years to life for those found in possession of a gun and have committed three or more serious offenses has been a significant contributing factor.

I would like to offer a comment or two about the bill. I compliment Senator HATCH and Senator LEAHY, the managers of the bill, for the work they have done. I am hopeful that within the authorized portions of this bill comes to the appropriations process, there will be an even 50/50 split on measures designed for prosecution and incarceration, contrasted with measures for rehabilitation, job training, and education.

When we deal with juvenile offenders, we deal with a category of offenders who will one day get out. I believe—based on the experience I had being district attorney of Philadelphia for 8 years where the principal job was prosecution, tough sentences for tough criminals, and dealing with career criminals—that when we deal with offenders who are going to be released, we ought to have rehabilitation. It is no surprise when a functional illiterate, without a trade or a skill, leaves incarceration will go back to a life of crime. It is not only in the interest of the individual to have rehabilitation, but also in the interest of law-abiding citizens to avoid having that individual become a repeater.

The same thing, candidly, applies to first and second offenders. Where we have a career criminal—somebody who has three or more major offenses—then I think life imprisonment and throwing away the key is the appropriate consequence. When we deal with juveniles, we ought to be aware of the so-called seamless web, to apply 50 percent of the funding which, of course, comes to the attention of the appropriators. I considered submitting an amendment which would have called for a 50/50 split between the tough aspect of prosecution and incarceration contrasted with rehabilitation, literacy training, and job training. I decided not to do that since it really is within the function of the appropriators.

I have a comment on the vote in the Senate to defeat the provision that was offered as an amendment yesterday. This would have imposed, in this bill, a mandatory requirement on the States that all those 14 years and older be tried as adults on a category of serious offenses. That was defeated soundly. A majority of Republicans voted against it, and I voted against it, and I was glad to see that amendment rejected on a number of grounds. One is that we ought not to be dictating to the States how they construct their juvenile justice system. And we ought not to condition Federal funding, which would be the stick to dictate the States as to how they operate.

The other concern I had was that being tough on crime is very, very important, but there are a lot of variations on juveniles. The theory of the juvenile court was to treat an adjudication of delinquency as those under 18. There is ample discretion in the juvenile court to have a juvenile tried as an adult for a serious offense. That flexibility ought to be left to the juvenile courts, and that flexibility and that determination ought to be left to the States.

Overall, I think this bill will be a step forward. The legislation that has been enacted with respect to guns, I think, has to be viewed as only a part of the picture. My own reluctance on the restrictions on guns has come from the fact that there has not been an appropriate response by the courts on tough sentences for tough criminals.

There are three layers that we have to attack on this line. I have discussed two. One is the life sentences and the long periods of incarceration for career criminals. Second, is realistic rehabilitation for juveniles and other offenders

who will be released from jail. Third, is the violence that has gripped America—juvenile violence especially.

After Littleton, CO, I called Dr. Koop, former Surgeon General, who commented to me that he had—as early as 1982—filed a report identifying juvenile violence as a medical problem. I conferred with Surgeon General Satcher on the issue. We are trying to structure hearings on the Appropriations subcommittee I chair on health and human services which funds the Office of Surgeon General. Those three lines, I think, have to be studied very closely—the sentencing for career criminals and rehabilitation for those who will be released and an effort to understand and try to deal with the culture of violence we have in our society today.

I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleague from Delaware. I yield the floor, releasing the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Delaware not only for his generous use of the time—which I will not need all of—but, more importantly, for his leadership on this issue in 1994, and again today. And I thank my friend from Pennsylvania, as well, for both of those things.

I have been in this Congress a long time; this is my 19th year. I have rarely seen a program be as effective as the COPS Program. It has worked. It has brought police officers and, just as important, new policing techniques from the largest city to the smallest rural hamlet. Before this bill passed, America, from one end of the country to the other, was crying out: Do something about ending crime.

Some said it is a local issue, not a Federal issue. But the average person didn't care about that. The average person just said to his or her government: Please, in God's name, do something. Stop the robberies, stop the burglaries, stop the auto thefts, and stop the murders.

A number of us who were concerned about this issue, including the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and myself when I was then in the House, just scoured the country. We tried to find out what worked—not ideological, but something where we could have prevention or punishment. We found out that community policing worked just about better than anything else. Yes, we should have incarcerated more criminals—now we are—and had tougher penalties. Yes, we needed afterschool programs and things to help.

The bill Senator BIDEN and I authored—he in the Senate and myself in the House—was called ''tough on punishment, smart on prevention.'' That was our credo. Probably the most important and best program in that bill was the COPS Program. As I say, I have seen it work in every part of my State.

Violence is down, property theft is down, police officers are more fulfilled in the job that they do. In my own home State, in Buffalo, crime has been slashed more than 30 percent; in Albany, 24 percent; in Nassau County, 24 percent; in New York City, 44 percent. Talk to police chiefs, talk to ordinary cops, talk to criminologists; they will all point to the COPS Program.

My colleagues, this program expires in the year 2000. If it is so successful, and if we want to continue our fight against crime, we should be doing this. Keep up tough punishment, keep up smart prevention, but continue to fund this successful program.

My colleague from Delaware is not being hyperbolic when he says this is one of the most important programs that we passed. We need to continue it. And putting 30 to 50 new officers on the beat, particularly the middled-sized and small cities, which have not applied because they haven't had the chance that the larger cities have had, is vital. It will help economically distressed communities, which all of us represent—no matter what part of the country we are in—to absorb some of the long-term costs of new police hires. And when crime goes down, which it does, because of the COPS Program, there are more jobs in a community, there is better health in a community, and the educational system works better in a community. It is good in every way.

COPS isn't the only reason crime has gone down. But, just the same, no one can reasonably claim it is not a good part of the reason.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest of terms to support this amendment to continue this magnificently successful program.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I would like to reserve the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator reserves 9 minutes 4 seconds.

Mr. SCHUMER. The time the Senator from Delaware so generously yielded to me I yield right back to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from Oklahoma desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator BIDEN, who is on the floor. Maybe he can answer a couple of questions.

I am trying to find out how much this amendment costs. Can you tell me how much it costs a year?

Mr. BIDEN. It will cost over 5 years $1.15 billion—total cost for 5 years.

Mr. NICKLES. Maybe I am reading the amendment wrong. The way I am reading the amendment, it says——

Mr. BIDEN. I beg the Senator's pardon. It is $1.150 billion per year.

Mr. NICKLES. Just a few billion dollars.

Mr. BIDEN. Over 5 years—it is over $1 billion.

Mr. NICKLES. $1.150 billion each year.

Mr. BIDEN. That is correct.

Mr. NICKLES. That is to hire how many cops?

Mr. BIDEN. It could hire up to 50,000 cops.

Mr. NICKLES. One-hundred and fifty thousand, or fifty thousand?

Mr. BIDEN. It could fund 50,000 cops for the entirety of the 5 years. But it could also only hire 30,000 cops, if in Oklahoma City they decide to use the COPS money for overtime instead of hiring new shields.

Mr. NICKLES. What is the estimated cost, or subsidy, or the Federal payment per cop?

Mr. BIDEN. It is roughly $50,000.

Mr. NICKLES. The first year?

Mr. BIDEN. The first year—per year.

Mr. NICKLES. Let me back up. I will reclaim my time, but please correct me if I am wrong. I asked staff how much this subsidy cost, and they said the old program cost a total of $75,000 over 3-year period—$50,000 the first year, $15,000 the second year, and $10,000 the third year—for a total over a 3-year period of $75,000 in a Federal subsidy.

Mr. BIDEN. That is correct.

Mr. NICKLES. The staff tells me that under the proposed new authorization that cost rises from $75,000 to $125,000 per police officer. Is that correct?

Mr. BIDEN. I don't know how they get that number.

Mr. NICKLES. I am just getting it from staff. My point is that this is an enormously expensive program.

Let me ask the question a different way. If I can have the Senator's attention, I only have 7 minutes and I have to go kind of quick.

Can he tell how much the cost is per cop per subsidy per year? It is graduated—100 percent the first year, and some other reduced percentage over the next 2 years. Can the Senator give us those percentages?

Mr. BIDEN. The same as the existing COPS Program.

Mr. NICKLES. Let me reclaim my time. On page 10 of the amendment, it says ''hiring cops.'' It says the bill is amended by striking $75,000 and inserting $125,000.

The cost of this program—the subsidy of this program right now of the current program, the one we have had for the last 5 years—has been a Federal subsidy per cop of $75,000. That is a pretty generous subsidy. I believe the first year subsidy is $50,000. In Oklahoma that may pay the entire salary of a cop. Maybe it doesn't in some places. But it does in my State. Then the subsidy is reduced the next couple of years so that by the fourth year, the total cost of the program needs to be borne by the city.

This subsidy is much greater. The Senator's amendment says the subsidy increases from $75,000 to $125,000. For

$125,000, you can pay, frankly, probably the entire 3-year salary in many areas—certainly in rural areas. And some people said we purported to help them particularly.

I just question the wisdom of doing it.

I have just two more comments. We are having the Federal Government provide for police in cities, and that is not a Federal responsibility. I think it is a mistake.

I also think it is kind of gratuitous to say this program is responsible for the decline in crime rates. I think that might be a lot more attributable to a change in political leadership in the states and in the Congress. I know the mayor in New York City has had a different philosophy on crime which is greatly responsible for the reduction in crime. Now he may take advantage of this program. In a lot of cities they are going to say: Hey, if you will help pay for our police force, thank you very much.

But why should we be doing it? Is that a Federal responsibility?

The whole purpose of the program initially, if I understand it, was that we were going to put 100,000 cops on the street, but then phase it out. This was not going to be an addiction for cities. We would phase it out where the Federal Government may pay 100 percent the first year, but by the fourth year the subsidy is reduced to zero. Put another way, where the Federal Government was paying most of the subsidy to get this thing started to hire new cops, but by the fourth year the cost would be totally borne by the city. Now we are saying let's extend it. Let's just keep this thing going. Let's have more Federal cops.

Then we passed an amendment yesterday, for the information of my colleagues, over my objection. But it passed by unanimous consent, unfortunately. It said that we have a COPS Program, and some of these cops are going into schools, and we will waive the requirement of local matching funds. In other words, the cops will be paid for 100 percent by the Federal Government. That is now part of this bill. We will waive the local contribution. So it won't be just a partial Federal subsidy, it will be a total Federal subsidy.

Is that the Federal Government's responsibility? I don't think so.

If we want to subsidize cities, subsidize cities. We are saying: Well, let's have the Federal Government do it. We have a problem. Let's just write a check. We don't think the city should be able to decide their own needs.

Maybe they need computers and cars, and not cops. Maybe they need a different training program. But we are saying, no: you are going to have the cops.

There is a study that was done by the inspector general, the IG. Maybe the Senator from Utah will allude to it. The IG's research said—in just one example—52 out of 67 grantees are receiving more grants; 78 percent either could not demonstrate that they redeployed officers, or could not demonstrate they had a system in place to track the redeployment of officers into community policing. At that point, the COPS office counted 35,852 officers under more programs toward the President's goal of adding 100,000: we hadn't made it to 100,000. It says 60 of 147 grantees—41 percent—showed indicators of using Federal funds to supplement local funding instead of using grant funds to supplement local funding.

In other words, hey, Federal Government, thank you very much. You are helping meet our budgets, and we appreciate the contribution. Meanwhile, it just so happens that we have a Federal Government that doesn't have a surplus, if you do not include the Social Security surplus.

I don't think we should be subsidizing cities. I don't think we should get cities addicted to this program that will never end, especially when you are talking about increasing the cost from $75,000 per police officer to $125,000. I don't think we can afford that.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I recommend to the Senator from Delaware that what we should have done is consider this amendment—that is, the Senator's legislative proposal—on the Department of Justice reauthorization bill, and deal with this issue at that time, but only after hearings to see whether we can resolve some of these problems raised by the Inspector General. The Biden amendment reauthorizes the Clinton administration's COPS Program. This amendment would cost in the neighborhood of $7 billion. It doubles the cost of this bill. I don't oppose more money to hire police and have law enforcement, but we need to ensure flexibility in our grant programs. The Biden amendment does not provide for adequate flexibility. The Congress has provided flexible grants to law enforcement through the local law enforcement block grants.

Ironically, the President's budget zeros out funding for the block grant program. Here we are debating a $7 billion amendment. The Department of Justice is proud of this program, but the Department of Justice's Inspector General does not share their view. The Department of Justice's Inspector General found serious mismanagement and inappropriate use of funds.

Let me cite a few examples that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma referred to:

20 out of 145 grantees, 14 percent, overestimated salaries and or benefits in their grant application. I won't read all of this, but let me cite just a few more.

74 of 146 grantees, 51 percent, included unallowable costs in claims for reimbursement; 52 out of 67 grantees receiving COPS MORE grants, 78 percent, either could not demonstrate that they redeployed officers or could not demonstrate they had a system in place to track redeployment of officers in community policing; 60 of 147 grantees, 41 percent, showed indications of using Federal funds to supplant local funding, instead of using grant funds to supplement local funding; 83 of 144 grantees, 58 percent, either did not develop a good-faith plan to retain officer positions or said they would not retain the officer at the conclusion of the grant.

I believe there are some positive aspects to the COPS Program, but a $7 billion program with serious questions concerning the management of the program and the use of grants by recipients should not pass the Senate with only a 45-minute debate.

I want to work with my colleagues on the law enforcement grant programs, but we should not try to do it on this bill. I will work with anyone who wishes to join me, but not on this bill. I plan to move a Department of Justice reauthorization bill later this year. If my colleagues truly wish to work with me, I suggest to them we do this on that authorization bill.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I reserve my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 9 minutes and the Senator from Utah has 5 minutes 14 seconds.

Mr. HATCH. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, Senator HATCH chairs the Judiciary Committee. It would be the responsibility of that committee to give oversight to the COPS Program. It has been a 5-year program and requires a reauthorization.

We just received, within the last month or 6 weeks, an inspector general's report from the Department of Justice. This is President Clinton's Department of Justice. It raised serious concerns about how this program is being managed and administered.

When 78 percent of the recipients could not demonstrate they redeployed officers, or could not demonstrate they had a system in place to track the redeployment of officers in the community policing, then we have a problem, since the whole COPS Program was sold as a program to further community policing. It was supposed to bring new police officers on line.

We found 41 percent of the programs inspected by President Clinton's Department showed indicators of using Federal funds to supplant local funds instead of using grant funds to supplement local funding.

I am reading directly from the report.

These are very serious allegations. To pass this amendment, $7 billion to reauthorize this program, in the dead of night without any hearing would be a colossal blunder. It would be an abdication of our responsibility, especially

in light of this scathing report by the inspector general's office. The thought of it boggles my mind. I can't believe it would be even suggested.

We ought to review, as we were supposed to when the program passed 5 years ago, how it has worked. We haven't had any hearings on it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Delaware, Senator BIDEN. I would like to take this moment to highlight one element of Senator BIDEN's amendment, the extension and expansion of the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Program.

I have heard one consistent theme throughout the debate on this juvenile justice bill: a desire to stop, once and for all, the senseless schoolhouse shootings like those that occurred in Littleton, Jonesboro and Paducah. There is a growing sense among Americans that we are no longer safe in our homes, in our schools, in our communities. But while we have heard sharply disparate views about issues like gun control and content of video games in the debate so far, one sure way to reduce crime and restore peace of mind is through community oriented policing.

As you are aware, the COPS Program was established in 1994 to put more police officers on the streets and to encourage police interaction with the communities in which they work. This program is a shining example of an effective partnership between local and federal governments. It provides federal assistance to meet local objectives. It does not interfere with local prerogatives; it does not impose mandates. The program provides funding to counties, towns and cities to enable communities to put more police on the street. Individual police and sheriff's departments have discretion over how those funds are used, because they know what problems their communities face and the places they need help most.

COPS has had a positive, and very tangible, impact on communities throughout the country, including in my home state of Wisconsin, by putting more police officers on our streets and making our citizens safer. In the state of Wisconsin alone, COPS has funded over 1,100 new officers and contributed more than $70 million to communities to make it happen. The COPS Program has succeeded because it helps individual officers to be a friendly and familiar presence in their communities. They are building relationships with people from house to house, block to block, school to school. This community policing helps the police to do their job better, makes the neighborhoods and schools safer and, very importantly, gives residents peace of mind.

Let me illustrate the strong causal relationship between community oriented policing and a reduction in the crime rate. I would like to share with you the story of Chief Jeff Lieberman of Fountain City, Wisconsin. Chief Lieberman polices a small town with big city crime problems. Chief Lieberman moved to Fountain City in 1992 and was faced with an alarming juvenile crime rate. What could he do to decrease the juvenile crime rate? While jails were being built and sentences were being stiffened, Chief Lieberman reached out to the community. He embarked upon a crusade to visit classrooms and teach children about law enforcement and safety. To allow the children to relate to him as they would to any other person and feel comfortable talking to him, he would sometimes dress in shorts and bring his dog to class. Not only has he won their respect, the children now show greater respect for their community. This success is reflected by the fact that during his tenure, he has reduced the juvenile crime rate by an astonishing 99%.

Chief Lieberman has earned a reputation in the community as a caring and compassionate citizen, as well as an outstanding law enforcement officer. I might add that Chief Lieberman was recently recognized for his effective community oriented policing by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund as the March 1999 Officer of the Month.

I do not believe the answer to the tragedies in Littleton, Jonesboro and Paducah is one extreme or the other—a ban on all guns or censorship of the entertainment industry. The answer is to educate our young people, nurture them, protect them and give them thousands more ''Chief Liebermans'' across this country. Senator BIDEN's bill does just that. It provides for expanding the much-lauded COPS Program to ensure that we have 30,000 to 50,000 ''Chief Liebermans'' in schools, towns and cities across, not only Wisconsin, but the entire nation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment and continuing our drive to put more police officers on the streets and in touch with their communities.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Let me make just a few more comments on this amendment. It has been suggested by the amendment's sponsors that the COPS program is responsible for the decline in crime in our country. Now, crime rates are still far too high, and are very high by historical standards. Be that as it may, we have seen some improvement in the past several years. But has the COPS Program been responsible for even the modest improvements we have seen? The evidence certainly suggests not.

First of all, the program's grants have always been too spread out to have more than a marginal impact on crime rates. Second, law enforcement authorities themselves have been skeptical. For instance, in 1995, Chicago experienced sizable reductions in murder, robbery, and assault well before the COPS Program ever got off the ground. The Chicago Police Department cited a number of local initiatives that made a difference, including tracking every gun used by juvenile offenders, and using a towing ordinance in effect for narcotics and prostitution enforcement.

Time and time again, the factor cited by the successful police executives traced the roots not to the Federal Government, but to local institutions, citizens, and police chiefs imposing accountability on their local police departments.

Perhaps the best example of all is New York City, where a new police chief successfully attacked quality-of-life crimes and enforced accountability for the officers of the New York Police Department by setting standards of performance backed by a system of incentives and disincentives. New York City's murder rate fell so fast its decrease alone accounted for over 25 percent of the total nationwide drop in homicides in 1996.

In 1997, the 21.7-percent drop in murders in New York City represented 14.8 percent of the total national decrease in murders. Yet, in New York City, which had 38,189 police officers in 1996, they added precisely 342 Clinton cops by 1995. Only 28 of the 342 new cops were actually new hires.

I would like hearings on this matter. I would like another full authorization bill. I hope our colleagues will not vote to double the costs of this bill with this particular amendment, as well intended as it is.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware knows that I have great feelings for him and for what he is trying to do, but I also believe we ought to do it in the right way.

Mr. BIDEN. Benjamin Disraeli says there are three kinds of lies: lies, damn lies, and statistics.

I don't know where my friends have been. Every major police agency in the United States of America strongly endorses this particular bill. The National Fraternal Order of Police, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National District Attorneys Association, the National Association of Police Organizations.

You all ought to go home and speak to your chiefs. Find me in your State more than a handful of police officers who will come and say this is a bad idea. Find me anybody in this country who will say adding 92,000 cops on the street has not had an impact on crime.

Where have you been? What are we talking about here? This doesn't even pass the smell test. Those cops don't matter? Ask Rudy Giuliani, who picks up the phone and calls me and says, JOE, great idea, when the COPS bill passed.

Mr. Riordan, a Republican mayor in Los Angeles: Great bill.

I wonder if anybody goes home to their States. My Lord, I don't know where you all are. I look at these numbers.

Let's talk about that report. Remember, I said there are three kinds of lies: lies, damn lies, and statistics.

That report referred to by the inspector general says 1.2 percent of the COPS Program could have been spent better. Name for me a multibillion-dollar program the Federal Government has ever conceived that has a 1.2-percent problem.

Come on. As my daughter's friends would say, Get real. What are we talking about here?

I was so amazed by the assertions being made, I lost my train of thought here. The inspector general's report, ''Summary of the Findings of the IG,'' page II:

> In considering our COPS audit results it should be kept in mind that they may well not represent the overall universe of grantees because, as a matter of policy, the COPS program has referred to us for review those riskiest grantees.

Do you get this? Unlike the Defense Department, the Department of Education, any other Department, the Attorney General's Office said, we think maybe some of what we put out there may not be being used properly, so you go out and investigate for us. Give me a break.

When is the last time you heard someone at the Defense Department say: You know, we may have overpaid a contract; you ought to go investigate.

When is the last time you heard someone at the Department of Education say: You know, we think we may have given a school district too much money; go investigate.

With the Attorney General of the United States of America, in the COPS Program, there is a department called COPS. They said: We want you to look at this. We could have made some mistakes here. We are not certain that every municipality used this money for cops the way we wanted to use it. Go look at it.

Now these guys are trying to hoist them on their own request?

By the way, 1.2 percent? I ask my friend from Oklahoma, let's look at the Defense Department; 1.2 percent? I will lay you 8 to 5 I can find a 50-percent waste of money in half the programs you support: 1.2 percent, what an indictment. Come on. You do not like the COPS Program because it was not invented there.

By the way, I find it fascinating. One of my friends said: You know, part of the problem here is this has nothing to do with COPS. It had to do with political leadership.

Guess who has been in charge. A guy named Clinton. That is the first admission I have heard: Clinton reduced crime, more than the COPS Program. More than the COPS Program. I find that not true, but kind of encouraging.

Look, COPS makes a difference. Ask your folks back home, ask the people in the gallery, ask the people out in the street, where would they rather have their money being spent? This works. This works.

By the way, this bill has a little provision BARBARA BOXER has in here. It says we will pay for all the money it costs to put a cop in a school. Go home and tell the folks you do not want to do that. Go home and tell the folks that is simply a local requirement.

Inflexibility? The reason it is under $25,000 is flexibility. We want to give them more flexibility to use the moneys they can use, still requiring the local municipality, the State, to put up their own money to do this. Come on, name a program that has worked this well. Name a program that has had this much success. Name a program that has this little amount of waste. Name a program that has fewer Federal strings attached to it. Name a program.

By the way: Oversight; oversight. We have had 5 years to have oversight. One of the reasons we have not had oversight hearings, I suspect, is you do not want to hear the results. Call in your mayors, call in your chiefs of police, call in your citizens, call in the PTA, call in the Marines. Call in anybody you want. Say: ''By the way, I'll tell you what we are going to do. We are going to cut funding for COPS, that's what we're are going to do.'' I dare you. Come on.

In New York City—I do not know how many New York received. I will tell you what, New York State over this period received—I bring up the subject because New York was mentioned —New York State has 10,550 cops. ''But they did not make any difference, by the way. New York is safer because there is a Republican mayor. That is the reason. COPS had nothing to do with this, nothing to do with this. I want you all to know that, COPS had nothing to do with crime going down.''

Does everybody hear that? Is everybody listening? ''The additional cops have nothing to do with this.'' That is the Republican position. COPS do not have anything to do with this. If they do, the Federal Government should not be involved.

Let me conclude by saying this. My friend says, why should the Federal Government be involved? Because Federal policy is part of the problem. The drug problem in America is a Federal problem, not just a local problem. A significant portion of the crime is caused as a consequence of the international drug problem, and it is a Federal problem, Federal responsibility.

I thank my friend. I hope my colleagues will vote for this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I note the distinguished Senator did not dispute the findings of the inspector general.

I ask unanimous consent an editorial from USA Today entitled ''100,000–cops program proves to be mostly hype'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From USA Today, Apr. 13, 1999]

100,000-COPS PROGRAM PROVES TO BE MOSTLY HYPE

Nassau County, N.Y., needed more police, or so it said. So, Uncle Sam ponied up $26 million from President Clinton's much-vaunted Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program to help it add 383 police to the beat.

And what happened? In an audit being compiled for the Justice Department, its Office of Inspector General found that the actual number of county-funded police officers went from 3,053 in May 1995 to 2,835 in May 1998—a decline of 218.

What's going on? A lot of funny number crunching at the expense of taxpayers and possibly crime-fighting.

When President Clinton initiated the $8.8 billion program in 1994, he promised it would put 100,000 more police on the street after five years. Then, communities pay their own tabs.

But Nassau County is one of more than 100 communities where federal auditors found costly problems. A final report detailing them is expected this week. And initial research for that report paints a bleak picture.

Richmond, Calif., for example, received $944,000 in COPS grants from 1995 to 1997 to add nine officers. It used the money to fund vacant positions instead. Atlanta, federal auditors found, used COPS money to replace it own police funds, too. And auditors looking at $400,000 in grants for Alexandria, Va., found no documentation that equipment purchased with the grant money put more officers on the street as pledged.

Many of the communities have excuses. For instance, Nassau County is in fiscal crisis.

The discrepancies, though, indicate much of the hype for COPS is misleading.

Two weeks ago, Vice President Al Gore claimed COPS had already added 92,000 police, who were playing ''a significant role in reducing crime,'' Yet, as the audits indicate, the numbers don't add up. Many of the new police are fictitious. In addition, the administration counted 2,000 police hired with prior federal grants toward the 100,000 goal.

Finally, a third of the counted positions have come from grants funding new civilian positions and equipment, not police. Spokane, Wash., which wasn't audited, says it added only a couple of dozen officers, though it was credited with adding more than 90. The reason: a $2.5 million equipment grant.

As for the claim that more police equals less crime, the evidence isn't clear.

Nassau County, despite its drop in police, has seen its crime rate drop as much as in New York City, which has increased its force by a third since 1992. And many communities that didn't accept any COPS grants saw crime decline precipitously, too.

The COPS program has done little to explain these discrepancies. It instead points to support from police chiefs and national crime statistics as proof the program works.

The public naturally wants safer streets, and the Clinton administration is trying to politically cash in again by pushing a new $6.4 billion plan to add up to 50,000 more police on the beat. But before Congress gives it the money, it should demand that the administration better monitor its grants and results. Taxpayers shouldn't be asked to pay for police who may not even be there.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the report of the IG be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICE HIRING AND REDEPLOYMENT GRANTS SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, OCTOBER 1996–SEPTEMBER 1998—EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. BACKGROUND

In 1994, the President pledged to put 100,000 additional police officers on America's streets to promote community participation in the fight against crime. He subsequently signed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Crime Act), authorizing the Attorney General to implement over six years an $8.8 billion grant program for state and local law enforcement agencies to hire or redeploy 100,000 additional officers to perform community policing.

The Attorney General established the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) to administer the grant programs and to advance community policing across the country. Management of the COPS grants entails both program and financial management. The COPS office is responsible for: (1) developing and announcing grant programs, (2) monitoring programmatic issues related to grants, (3) receiving and reviewing applications, and (4) deciding which grants to award. The Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs (OJP) is responsible for financial management of the COPS program and is charged with: (1) disbursing federal funds to grantees, (2) providing financial management assistance after COPS has made an award, (3) reviewing pre-award and post-award financial activity, (4) reviewing and approving grant budgets, and (5) financial monitoring of COPS awards.

In order to meet the President's goal of putting 100,000 additional police officers on the street, COPS developed six primary hiring and redeployment grant programs for state and local law enforcement agencies. Hiring grants fund the hiring of additional police officers and generally last for three years. Redeployment grants are generally one-year grants and fund the costs of equipment and technology, and support resources (including civilian personnel) to free existing officers from administrative duties and redeploy them to the streets. At the end of the grant period, the state or local entity is expected to continue funding the new positions or continue the time savings that resulted from the equipment or technology purchases using its own funds.

According to COPS, as of February 1999, COPS and OJP had awarded approximately $5 billion in grants under the six programs to fund the hiring or redeployment of more than 92,000 officers, of which 50,139 officers had been hired and deployed to the streets. COPS obtains its ''on the street'' officer count by periodically contacting grantees by telephone.

II. SUMMARY FINDINGS

From October 1996 through September 1998, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) performed 149 audits of COPS and OJP hiring and redeployment grants totaling $511 million, or 10 percent of the funds COPS has obligated for the program. We continue to perform additional grant audits as our resources permit. Executive summaries of these audits are available for public review on our website: <http://www.usdoj.gov/oig>. A comprehensive program audit of COPS' and OJP's administration of the overall $8.8 billion Community Policing Grant Program is nearing completion and should be issued in the next few months.[1]

Our audits focus on: (1) the allowability of grant expenditures; (2) whether local matching funds were previously budgeted for law enforcement; (3) the implementation or enchantment of community policing activities; (4) hiring efforts to fill vacant sworn officer positions; (5) plans to retain officer positions at grant completion; (6) grantee reporting; and (7) analyses of supplanting issues. For the 149 grant audits, we identified about $52 million in questioned costs and about $71 million in funds that could be better used. Our dollar-related findings amount to 24 percent of the total funds awarded to the 149 grantees.

In considering our COPS audit results, it should be kept in mind that they:

(1) Are snapshots as of the grant report's issuance date. Subsequent communication between the auditee and COPS/OJP may result in correction to, or elimination of, the issues noted during our audit; and

(2) May well not be representative of the overall universe of grantees because, as a matter of policy, COPS has referred to us for review what it believes to be its riskiest grantees. During FY 1998, we began supplementing COPS requests for audits by selecting about one-half of the grantees ourselves. Our results to date, however, may still be skewed because of the number of audits conducted on COPS-requested grantees and because our selections were not entirely random. Some of our audits were also intended to be targeted at suspected problem grantees. (Of the 149 audits we performed through September 30, 1998, 103 were referred to us by COPS or OJP. Although we selected only 46 of the 149 audits summarized in this report ourselves, our results to date do not differ markedly from the results in the COPS/OJP referred audits.) It should also be noted that COPS and OJP do not always agree with our findings and recommendations. Upon further review and follow-up, COPS and/or OJP may conclude that, in their judgment, a grant violation did not occur.

Other findings include:

20 of 145 grantees (14 percent) overestimated salaries and/or benefits in their grant application. The COPS office depends primarily on the information provided by the law enforcement departments that submit the grant applications. When grantees overestimate salaries and/or benefits, COPS overobligates funds that could be available for use elsewhere. Also, grantees may be using the excess grant funds for purposes that are unallowable.

74 of 146 grantees (51 percent) included unallowable costs in their claims for reimbursement. Types of unallowable costs include overtime, uniforms, and fringe benefits not previously approved by OJP. When grantees overstate costs, COPS program costs are overstated and taxpayer money is at risk.

52 of 67 grantees receiving MORE grants (78 percent) either could not demonstrate that they redeployed officers or could not demonstrate that they had a system in place to track the redeployment of officers into community policing. The COPS office counts 35,852 officers under the MORE program towards the President's goal of adding 100,000 additional officers.

60 of 147 grantees (41 percent) showed indicators of using federal funds to supplant local funding instead of using grant funds to supplement local funding. The findings included budgeting for decreases in local positions after receiving COPS grants (27 grantees), using COPS funds to pay for local officers already on board (7 grantees), not filling vacancies promptly (22 grantees), and not meeting the requirements of providing matching funds (35 grantees). When grantees use grant funds to replace local funds rather than to hire new officers, additional officers are not added to the nation's streets. Instead, federal funds are used to pay for existing police officers.

83 of 144 grantees (58 percent) either did not develop a good faith plan to retain officer positions or said they would not retain the officer positions at the conclusion of the grant. COPS and OJP started awarding community policing grants in FY 1994 and most grants last for about three years. If COPS positions are not retained beyond the conclusion of the grant, then COPS will have been a short-lived phenomena, rather than helping to launch a lasting change in policing.

106 of 140 grantees (76 percent) either failed to submit COPS initial reports, annual reports, or officer progress reports, or submitted these reports late. The reports are critical for COPS to monitor key grant conditions such as supplanting and retention.

137 of 146 grantees (94 percent) did not submit all required Financial Status Reports to OJP or submitted them late. Without these reports, OJP cannot monitor implementation of important grant requirements.

33 of 146 grantees (23 percent) had weaknesses in their community policing program or were unable to adequately distinguish COPS activities from their pre-grant mode of operations. The findings suggest a need for COPS to refine its definition of the practices that constitute community policing as well as those that do not.

After we issue our grant reports, COPS, OJP, and the grantee are responsible for ensuring that corrective action is taken. By agreement with COPS, OJP is our primary point of contact on follow-up activity for the grants, although COPS works with OJP to address our audit findings and recommendations, particularly those that indicate supplanting has occurred. The options available to COPS and OJP to resolve our dollar-related findings and recommendations include: (1) collection or offset of funds, (2) withholding funds from grantees, (3) bringing the grantee into compliance with grant terms, or (4) concluding that our recommendations cannot or should not be implemented. To address our non dollar-related findings and recommendations, COPS and OJP can, in addition to other options, bring the grantee into compliance with grant requirements or waive certain grant requirements. When OJP submits documentation to us showing that it has addressed our recommendations, the audit report is closed.

The report consists of the body of the report; a detailed matrix setting forth the audit findings made during the 149 audits; the response of COPS and OJP to a draft of the report, and our reply to their response.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, are the yeas and nays ordered on any of these amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Bond amendment only.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

[1] In addition to expanding on issues contained in this summary report, the program audit will report on COPS' ability to meet the President's goal to put 100,000 additional police officers on the street by 2000. The exact nature of the goal has become confused because of conflicting statements made by Administration officials, who state that the goal is to put 100,000 new officers on the street by the year 2000, and recent statements made to use by COPS officials, who state that the goal is to fund 100,000 new officers. The program audit addresses that issue at length and also addresses COPS' and OJP's monitoring of grantees and the quality of guidance provided to grantees to assist them in implementing essential grant requirements.

Mr. HATCH. I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 345, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 345, as modified.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 138 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Ashcroft	Enzi	Murkowski
Bennett	Fitzgerald	Roberts
Bond	Frist	Rockefeller
Bunning	Gorton	Roth
Burns	Grassley	Sessions
Byrd	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Hutchison	Specter
Cochran	Inhofe	Stevens
Coverdell	Kohl	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thurmond
Crapo	Lott	Warner
DeWine	Lugar	

NAYS—56

Abraham	Feinstein	Mack
Akaka	Graham	Mikulski
Baucus	Gramm	Moynihan
Bayh	Grams	Murray
Biden	Gregg	Nickles
Bingaman	Hagel	Reed
Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Breaux	Hutchinson	Robb
Brownback	Inouye	Santorum
Bryan	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cleland	Johnson	Schumer
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Thompson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Voinovich
Durbin	Levin	Wellstone
Edwards	Lieberman	Wyden
Feingold	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—3

Hollings	Landrieu	McCain

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 371

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes—there are two of them in a series—be limited to 10 minutes in length. Senators, please don't leave the room. We are actually going to see if we can do one in 10 minutes. It is this one right now.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader allow a minute on each side just prior to the vote?

Mr. LOTT. Usually we do that. I hope that we will not exceed that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, on the Biden amendment, Biden-Kohl-Schumer-Boxer-Specter amendment, it is very basic. Every major police organization in the country endorses this amendment. It adds a total of $600 million a year for the next 5 years for cops and $200 million a year for the next 5 years for prosecutors. It is endorsed by every major police organization. I hope my colleagues will vote for it.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, our bill is $1.1 billion per year. This is a $7 billion add-on. The fact of the matter is, we are going to have a Department of Justice authorization bill in the future. We will look at this and try to do it. We will have hearings on it, and we will do it the right way. It shouldn't be done on this bill.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 371. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 139 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Abraham	Edwards	Lieberman
Akaka	Feingold	Lincoln
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bayh	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Inouye	Reed
Boxer	Jeffords	Reid
Breaux	Johnson	Robb
Bryan	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kerrey	Roth
Cleland	Kerry	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kohl	Schumer
Daschle	Landrieu	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden

NAYS—50

Allard	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Gorton	Nickles
Bond	Gramm	Roberts
Brownback	Grams	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Shelby
Campbell	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Hatch	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Helms	Snowe
Collins	Hutchinson	Stevens
Coverdell	Hutchison	Thomas
Craig	Inhofe	Thompson
Crapo	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Voinovich
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Enzi	Mack	

NOT VOTING—2

Hollings	McCain

The amendment (No. 371) was rejected.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am grateful to Senators HATCH, ALLARD, ASHCROFT, and SESSIONS who have spent countless hours over the past two Congresses addressing the complex issues of school safety and juvenile violence.

And, needless to say, I deeply appreciate their accommodating my concerns regarding a bill that I regard as among the most significant pieces of legislation to be considered this Congress—and for their having included three of my amendments in the manager's education package.

When enacted, these provisions will improve access to public school disciplinary records by other schools; expand the authority of schools to run a national criminal background check on their employees; and encourage State and local governments to run such checks on all school employees who are charged with providing educational and support services to our children.

Together, these provisions will make sure that local public, private, and parochial schools are able to make informed decisions about these individuals—whether a student, a teacher, or other school employee—who pose an unreasonable risk to the safety and security of our children.

Mr. President, we all share a common responsibility to protect our children and a common hope that our children will have a bright future. Though we disagree on the wisdom of creating more gun control laws, there are things that we ought to agree are necessary and in our children's best interests.

In this spirit, I introduced a bill in the past two Congresses seeking to extend the provisions of the Gun-Free Schools Act to illegal drugs. This amendment is based on that bill and is cosponsored by the distinguished Assistant Majority Leader, Mr. NICKLES, and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Mr. THURMOND. I trust that this amendment will be looked upon favorably by Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, this amendment will strike an important blow in the war against drugs by helping to protect America's school-children from the scourge of drugs in their classrooms. It does this by requiring States to adopt a low mandating ''zero tolerance'' for illegal drugs at school in order to qualify for Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funds. Zero tolerance is defined as requiring any student in possession of a felonious quantity of this contraband at school to be expelled for not less than one year. Its adoption will finally send a clear unambiguous message to students, parents, and teachers—drugs and schools do not mix.

Anybody who questions the necessity of this measure should consider these excerpts from the 1998 CASA National Survey of Teens, Teachers and Principals. This outstanding report was

prepared by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University under the direction of President Carter's former HEW Secretary, Joseph Califano. Under the heading ''Drug Dealing In Our Schools'', the report states:

For too many kids, school has become not primarily a place for study and learning, but a haven for booze and drugs. . . . Parents should shutter when they learn that 22 percent of 12- to 14-year-olds and 51 percent of 15- to 17-year-olds know a fellow student at their school who sells drugs. . . . Indeed, not only do many of them know student drug dealers; often the drug deals take place at school itself. Principals and teachers may claim their schools are drug-free, but a significant percentage of the students have seen drugs sold on school grounds with their own eyes. . . . In fact, more teenagers report seeing drugs sold at school (27 percent) than in their own neighborhoods (21 percent).

In other places, the report details that students consider drugs to be the number one problem they face and that illegal drugs are readily available to students of all ages. Exacerbating this terrible situation, illegal drugs are not cheaper and more potent than ever before. The CASA report goes on to state that ''one in four teenagers can get acid, cocaine or heroin within 24 hours, and given enough time, almost half (46 percent) would be able to purchase such drugs.'' Clearly, eliminating drugs from America's classrooms is a necessary first step to the restoration of order in our schools.

The harm that illegal drugs causes our students in incalculable. Though its' ill effects, disruptions, and the violence associated with it are not limited to those actually involved in the drug trade. The PRIDE survey, conducted by the National Parents' Resource Institute for Drug Education, found a link between school violence and drugs when it demonstrated that:

Gun-toting students were 23 times more likely to use cocaine;

Gang members were 12 times more likely to use cocaine; and

Students who threatened others were 6 times more likely to use cocaine than others.

Clearly, the connection between drugs and school violence is an irrefutable as it is frightening.

Mr. President, it should seem obvious that many children take guns to school because they are either involved in illegal activity or because they seek to defend themselves from those who are. It is clear that any further effort to eliminate guns and violence from schools must focus not merely on the gun but on the reasons why students choose to arm themselves. My amendment does precisely that.

My home state of North Carolina has not been immune to the ravages of illegal drugs. In fact, ''possession of a controlled substance'' has been either the first or second most reported category of school crime in North Carolina for the past four years. That's according to North Carolina State University's Center for the Prevention of School Violence, an outstanding organization that tracks the incidence of school crime and suggests ways to prevent it.

As bleak as the picture is, there are immediate steps that we can take to reverse course. Those who are on the ''front lines'' of our country's drug war have important things to contribute to the discussion. Overwhelmingly, students, teachers and parents support the adoption of a zero tolerance policy for drugs at school.

Among those surveyed, the CASA study found broad support for the adoption of firm policies on random locker searches, drug testing of student athletes, and zero tolerance policies. Regarding zero tolerance, 80% of principals, 79% of teachers, 73% of teenagers and 69% of parents voiced support for the adoption of such a policy at their school.

Additionally, 85% of principals, 79% of teachers and 82% of students believe that zero tolerance policies are effective at keeping drugs out of schools and that they would actually reduce drugs on their campus. Quoting from the CASA report again:

If these students believe them [zero tolerance policies] so effective, these policies must make an impact on their decisions to not bring drugs on campus. Given this, it seems that schools . . . should implement and strictly enforce zero tolerance policies. Perhaps in doing so they can increase their likelihood of eradicating drugs on their school grounds.

It is not my position that this amendment, by itself, will eliminate all drugs from our schools but it is clear that this is a long overdue step in the right direction.

This policy is firm but fair. The drug trade and the violence associated with it have no place in America's classrooms. Schools should foster an environment that is conducive to learning and supportive of the vast majority of students who want to learn. Children and teachers deserve a school free of the fear and violence caused by drugs.

Removing drugs and violence from our schools is a goal that we should all agree on. The President, in his 1997 State of the Union address, said ''we must continue to promote order and discipline'' in America's schools by ''remov[ing] disruptive students from the classroom, and hav[ing] zero tolerance for guns and drugs in school.'' I could not agree more with the President on this point: it is time that the Senate go on record in support of removing illegal drugs from America's classrooms, by approving this amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, there was yet another tragedy in Atlanta this morning. This is one more violent act that brings America together in sorrow. We hope that it is also an opportunity to bring us together to learn some important lessons. What are people—young people especially—saying to us all when they turn to violence to address their problems?

This is an American challenge. We all have to do our part—in partnership. We must each do our job, but we must all work together. We in Congress are trying to do our part—passing bills, appropriating funds. But the Congress, like all of us, will do a better job when it really listens to the American people, and listens to young people. Every young person has the capacity to grow up to be a constructive citizen or a violent criminal. It's our job—all of us—to listen better.

When we do listen, we find two issues at the core: working in partnership, and improving the tools to help build the adult/child relationship.

How do we work together? There are many people who have answered this problem in communities all over the Nation. They abandon turf issues and special interests, they listen, and they remember that the child is at the center of the work. There are specific things we can learn in Congress from these communities—where to find the money and time and energy to get the work done together.

How do we improve the relationships and connections that young people make with adults?

It frustrates me that we cannot do some fairly obvious things—for young people, families, teachers, and communities.

What can we do for students? Why is it that we can't figure out ways of building meaningful roles for young people in their own education, and in their own community? Why is it that if you are too young to vote, you are not taken seriously or treated as a citizen? Why is that when a child's hand goes up in the classroom, that child can't get the attention he or she needs from a teacher?

We can do some simple things. We can ask young people what they think about how to prevent violence. We can reduce class size. We can make sure that when we hire more teachers, we have better and smaller schools in which to put them. We all have a role in making these things happen.

What can we do to better support parents and families? We all know that a strong family unit is the engine that drives our economy, and that when it works well, it is the best and cheapest prevention program out there. So why is it so difficult to improve the tools and information available to parents?

All parents want to do their best, so why is it off limits to talk about the problems with our economy, to talk about how parents spend too much time at work and not enough time with kids? Why can't we do the simplest things to make life easier for people who work harder and harder to provide for their family and spend less and less time with their kids?

We can start with something simple, like making sure parents don't suffer at work just because they want unpaid leave time to go to a school conference, or take care of an emergency at their child's day care. We should improve the Family and Medical Leave Act. Again, there are things we all can do to make these things happen.

What can we do for teachers and other educators? Why can't we give them a small enough class so they get to know each child, and can find 5 extra minutes with the child who needs the most help that day? Why do we expect our teachers to deal with every educational and social issue under the Sun, but we can't treat them as professionals?

We need to reduce class size. We need to improve teacher training. We need to improve teacher pay and professionalism. And, we need to think about one thing we can each do to act as a resource to that classroom. Is there a phone call we could make? An educational tool we could buy for the class? A day we could give to working for the passage of the school levy? There are things we all can do.

What can we do to help communities support the adult-child relationship, and build connections for young people? Why is it that we don't have more adults participating in the lives of young people? Why is it that a student can walk from home to school to the mall to the quickie-mart and back home again and feel invisible and anonymous? Why can't we allow our communities into our public school buildings at nights and on weekends?

We should expand community education opportunities, and when we offer tax incentives, they should be the right ones that help communities invest in young people. We should each make sure to smile at young people, to keep an eye on them, to set high expectations, and to give them meaningful opportunities. Again, there are things we all must do.

All over America, there is a conversation going on around the kitchen table, and on the school bus, and at the mall, and around the water-cooler. We need to listen carefully to this conversation—to what is being said and asked for, and what is not. We need to act carefully, and invest wisely. But, most importantly, each of us need to keep this conversation going—to find out what to do and do it—until we create the America we want for our children and young people. And you know one of the best, most overlooked resources for building the America we all want? The young people themselves. Let's start by listening to them.

The juvenile justice bill fails to fully address these problems. While many amendments have been adopted that focus on the right solutions, we failed to achieve support for most of those that would have focused this legislation on those things that could best solve youth violence. With that said, I will vote for the bill because I believe it has many positive provisions that combat youth violence.

The bill provides important block grants to States to assist them in their efforts to address juvenile crime. While I prefer a high percentage of these funds be required for prevention, I know my State of Washington intends to continue to invest in steering kids away from crime through proven community-based prevention programs. The bill also provides for Internet filtering and screening software that will allow parents to regulate what their children are viewing over the Internet. It also made transfers of several types of firearms to children illegal.

As I have already said, I agree with many of my colleagues who have said that there is no legislative ''quick fix'' to this terrible problem that is destroying so many young lives. The issue of youth violence involves complex and interrelated factors. From prevention programs that involve parents, teachers and communities, to strong law enforcement measures, there are many different tools we must use to attack the problem from all angles and prevent further tragedies like the one in Littleton.

We must punish those who commit crimes, but we must also do all we can to prevent crimes before they happen, to intervene before small problems grow to crisis proportions. We must give schools and law enforcement officers the tools they need to identify the warning signs that lead to juvenile violence and to let youth know that crime is not an acceptable answer.

While the bill does contain a ''prevention block grant,'' there is no guarantee the money will be used for prevention. Dollars from these grants could be used to build more prisons or increase enforcement. While these are laudable goals, without a guaranteed set-aside for prevention, a State could fail to attack youth violence before it starts. We must reach out to prevent at-risk youth from starting down a path of crime in the first place. While we were unable to secure specific amounts for prevention, I am hopeful that States will use their discretion and undertake prevention programs. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Some of my colleagues have offered amendments to provide resources for effective violence prevention, and I am disappointed they have not been adopted. Last week, Senator ROBB offered an amendment that would have provided funds for schools and law enforcement to identify and effectively respond to juvenile violent behavior. It would have established a National Clearinghouse of School Safety Information and provided an anonymous hotline to report criminal behavior and a support line for schools and communities to call for assistance.

In addition, the Robb amendment would have provided treatment programs that identify and address the symptoms of youth violence to steer juveniles away from criminal behavior. It also would have provided authorization for afterschool programs, which have been very effective at keeping high-risk youth off the street and involved in activities that assist in their education and growth.

I am hopeful that similar legislation will be offered again and that my colleagues will reconsider and give it their support.

In addition to my disappointment at the lack of adequate resources for violence prevention, I have other concerns about this bill.

I am very concerned about the fate of our youth serving time in prisons and other detention facilities. While we must certainly punish those who have committed crimes, we must make a serious attempt at rehabilitation and not allow juveniles to turn into hardened criminals in the course of their incarceration. It is well-known that juveniles who have contact with adults in prison are further indoctrinated into a life of crime or worse, assaulted or even killed. Current requirements prohibit juveniles, whether they were tried as adult or juveniles, from being kept in any adult jail or corrections institution where they have regular contact with adult inmates.

The Hatch bill weakens that standard by allowing ''incidental'' contact and permitting construction of juvenile facilities on the same site as those for adults. Even convicted juveniles should be protected from hardened criminals. Those youth who are the most successful in a mixed juvenile-adult environment will be the ones we will least want back on the streets once they have served their time. It is my understanding that the Feinstein-Chafee amendment improved this provision, for which I am thankful, increasing protection of our children while they are in state custody.

I also feel the Hatch bill critically weakens measures to address disproportionate minority confinement. The legislation replaces references to ''minority'' or ''race'' with the vague phrase ''segments of the juvenile population.'' Further, the Hatch bill is less instructive on what must be done to address the problem of discrimination, essentially making the issue a mere concern rather than a problem we must correct. This is the wrong direction to be heading if we truly seek to achieve fair and unbiased treatment of all people within the judicial system. An amendment to correct this problem was defeated.

The Hatch bill also contains very troublesome provisions to allow the prosecution of children as young as 14 as adults, and gives prosecutors—not judges—the discretion to try a juvenile as an adult. Judges make judgments; prosecutors prosecute. It is obvious who is better qualified to render an unbiased decision on whether a 14-year-old should be considered an adult.

There is another idea missing from this bill. To solve youth violence we must all talk to the true experts: young people themselves. We need to listen to more than the student body presidents and the class valedictorians. We need to hear from ''regular'' kids.

I know that I have learned a tremendous amount from doing that. Two weeks ago, I met with 10th graders in Kent, WA who told me some shocking

things. They said that nearly all of them knew where they could get a gun within a day. That is a sad statement abut the lives of our youth. They are afraid and they are thinking about how to defend themselves with a gun.

In the end, we were able, through the Lautenberg amendment on gun shows, to close one of the more glaring loopholes that allow young people and children to get guns. After much flip-flop on the issue by Republicans, a handful of their courageous Members lent enough support to this amendment by Senator LAUTENBERG to close some of these guns show loopholes, but this was not until they had tried two amendments of substance on the issue. Furthermore, it took the Vice President of the United States, acting in his role as the President of the Senate, to cast the final vote to break the tie that will help keep kids and guns separate.

Overall, S. 254 does much to tackle the tough questions surrounding juvenile justice. But as I have stated, there are a number of ways we could have improved this bill. We need to focus on preventive measures that bring together parents, kids, counselors and teachers; provide resources to enable people to identify and intervene in potentially dangerous situations; and give law enforcement the tools it needs to deal with the symptoms of youth violence not just the results of the violence.

I hope in the future we can pass legislation that will address the remaining problems and can come up with even better solutions. We owe that much to our children.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I am voting in favor of the juvenile crime bill, S. 254, because on balance it comes close enough to promoting the kind of approach that we need to reduce juvenile violence—the type of plan that is already working to reduce crime in cities like Milwaukee and Boston, and the type of strategy that will help us prevent future tragedies like the recent school shootings in Jonesboro, AR, Peducah, KY, Springfield, OR, Conyers, GA and Littleton, CO. There are many causes of juvenile crime—poverty, a deterioration of American families and family values, increased youth access to firearms, and the explosion of violent images in our culture, just to name a few—and it would be naive to presume there is a simple solution. Indeed, we need a comprehensive crime-fighting strategy to address all of these root causes and the entire range of juvenile offenders and potential offenders, from violent predators to children at-risk of becoming delinquent. That is the approach this bill takes, more or less.

Let me explain the four keys to this balanced, proven strategy: keeping guns out of the hands of kids and of criminals; punishment; prevention; and reducing kids' exposure to violence in our culture.

First, this bill will help keep firearms out of the hands of young people. It promotes gun safety with the Kohl/Hatch/Chafee amendment to require the sale of child safety locks with every new handgun. Child safety locks can help save many of the 500 children and teenagers killed each year in firearms accidents, and the 1,500 kids each year who use guns to commit suicide. Just as importantly, they can help prevent some of the 7,000 violent juvenile crimes committed every year with guns children took from their own homes. This measure passed with an overwhelming 78 votes, twice the number of votes a virtually identical proposal received last year.

The bill also helps identify who is supplying kids with guns, so we can put them out of business and behind bars. Through the ''Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative,'' the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms has been working closely with cities like Milwaukee and Boston to trace guns used by young people back to the source. Using ATF's national database, police and prosecutors can target illegal suppliers of firearms and help stop the flow of firearms into our communities. While I served as Ranking Member of the Subcommittee for Treasury Appropriations, we provided funding to expand this initiative to 27 cities. This measure will expand the program to up to 200 other cities and, with the increased penalties outlined above, help stanch illegal gun trafficking.

And not only will this bill prohibit all violent criminals from owning firearms, no matter what their age, through ''Project CUFF'' it also encourages aggressive enforcement of this federal law by dedicating federal prosecutors and investigators to this task. This builds on a successful program, supported by the NRA, that has helped reduce gun violence in Richmond, Va., and Boston through increased federal prosecution, close coordination with state officials, public outreach and fewer plea bargains. Still, to be truly effective, this measure needs to be improved, so that we don't force it on uncooperating cities where it's unlikely to succeed.

Unfortunately, the bill fails in its stated intent to close an inexcusable loophole that allows violent young offenders to buy guns legally when they turn eighteen. Under current law, violent adult offenders can't buy firearms, but violent juveniles can—for example, even the kids convicted of the schoolyard killings in Jonesboro, Arkansas—once they are released at age eighteen. Simply put, this has to stop, and the bill tries to do this—sort of. A provision declares that all violent felons are disqualified from buying firearms, regardless of whether they were 10, 12, or just a day short of their 18th birthday at the time of their offense. However, although the bill technically closes this loophole, because it only applies to violent crimes committed once juvenile records become ''routinely available'' on-line, its indefinite effective date merely opens another loophole in its place. This provision may never take effect. When juvenile records are all ''on-line'' is a long way away, and in the meantime many young criminals will continue to have the ability to get a gun at 18 once they get out of jail.

Each of these provisions was addressed in my juvenile crime bill, the 21st Century Safe and Sound Communities Act. In addition, after much back-and-forth—and forth-and-back—we finally agreed to close the gun show loophole once and for all. I am pleased to see a bipartisan consensus start to emerge over taking these steps to keep guns out of young hands.

Second, we need to lock up the worst offenders, including dangerous violent juveniles. Naturally, we can't even begin to stop violent kids unless we have police officers on the street to catch them, and the state and local prosecutors, defense attorneys and courts we need to try them. To that end, this bill provides $100 million per year for state and local prosecutors, defense attorneys and courts for juveniles. Unfortunately, we missed an opportunity to extend the highly successful COPS program—which is due to expire after next year—in this bill. Extending the COPS program will make it easier to lock up dangerous juveniles, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to make that happen.

Of course, we can't keep criminals off the streets unless we have a place to send them. So this measure dedicates funding for juvenile prisons or alternative placements of delinquent children—a long-needed measure for which I have advocated since before the 1994 Crime Act.

This proposal also helps rural communities keep dangerous kids behind bars. Now, although the closest juvenile facility may be hundreds of miles away, federal law prohibits rural police from locking up violent juveniles in adult jails for more than 24 hours. This means that state law enforcement officials either have to waste the time and resources to criss-cross the state even for initial court appearances, or simply let dangerous teens go free. In my view, that's a no-win situation. This measure gives rural police the flexibility they need by letting them detain juveniles in adult jails for up to 48 hours, or longer with parental consent, provided they are separated from adult criminals. Working with Wisconsin's rural sheriffs, I first proposed a similar extension three years ago.

Moreover, this measure will help lock up gun-toting kids—and the people who illegally supply them with weapons. It builds on my 1994 Youth Handgun Safety Act by turning illegal possession of a handgun by a minor into a felony. And the same goes for anyone who illegally sells handguns to kids. Both of these provisions were in my juvenile crime bill. Kids and handguns don't mix, and our Federal law needs to make clear that this is a serious crime.

In addition, this measure makes it easier to identify the violent juveniles who need to be dealt with more severely—by strongly encouraging states to share the records of juvenile offenders and providing the funding necessary for improved record-keeping. The fact is that law enforcement officials need full disclosure to make informed judgments about who should be incarcerated, but current law allows too many records to be concealed or to vanish without a trace when a teen felon turns eighteen.

Finally, this measure includes my proposal, cosponsored by Senator DEWINE: the Violent Offender DNA Identification Act of 1999, which will promote the use of modern DNA technology to resolve unsolved crimes committed by both juveniles and adults. Our measure will reduce the backlog of hundreds of thousands of unanalyzed DNA samples from convicted offenders by providing the funding necessary to analyze them and put them ''on-line,'' so they can be shared between states and matched with crime scene DNA evidence. And, while all 50 states authorize collection of DNA samples, it closes the loophole that allows DNA samples from Federal and Washington, D.C. offenders to go uncollected. The Department of Justice estimates that upgrading our DNA databases alone could solve a minimum of 600 crimes tomorrow.

Third, a balanced approach also requires a significant investment in crime prevention, so we can stop crime before it's too late. In fact, no one is more adamant in support of this approach than our nation's law enforcement officials. For example, last year more than 400 police chiefs, sheriffs and prosecutors nationwide endorsed a call for after-school programs for all children. And in my home state of Wisconsin, 90 percent of police chiefs and sheriffs I surveyed agreed that we need to increase federal prevention spending.

This proposal promotes prevention by concentrating funding in programs that already have a record of success and those that rely on proven strategies, like the ones that give children a safe place to go in the after-school hours between 3 and 8 p.m., when juvenile crime peaks.

For example, it includes my amendment to expand the Families and Schools Together (FAST) program, a successful program that finds troubled youth and reconnects them with their schools and families. FAST, which was created in my home state of Wisconsin and is already being implemented in 484 schools in 34 States and five countries, helps ensure that youth violence does not proliferate to our schools and communities by empowering parents, helping to improve children's behavior and performance in school, preventing substance abuse, and providing support and networking for families by linking them to community resources and services.

The bill also promotes innovative prevention initiatives by reauthorizing and expanding the Prevention Challenge Grant program (formerly known as Title V), which former Senator Hank Brown and I authored in 1992. This program encourages investment, collaboration, and long-range prevention planning by local communities, who must establish locally tailored prevention programs and contribute at least 50 cents for every federal dollar. And, in response to concerns I raised about the risk of watering down this program with non-prevention uses, 80 percent of its funding is reserved for prevention—that is, programs addressing at-risk kids before they ever enter the juvenile justice system.

It also builds on our support for the valuable work of Boys & Girls Clubs by continuing to dedicate funding to the Clubs and expanding funding to other successful organizations like the YMCA. And it requires that at least 25 percent of $450 million juvenile accountability block grant be dedicated to prevention.

Of course, we shouldn't blindly invest in prevention programs, just because they sound good. Quality matters. And it would foolish to throw good money after bad. That's why this measure requires at least 5 percent of all Prevention Challenge Grant funds—and more than 15 percent of FAST funds—be set aside for rigorous evaluations, so we can keep funding the programs that work, and zero out programs that don't.

Finally, this bill also aims to provide us with a better understanding of how violence in our culture is marketed to children, and it encourages industry to take self-regulatory steps to reduce this violence. For example, the Brownback amendment, which I consponsored, orders a joint FTC/DOJ study of the marketing practices of the video game, motion picture, and television industries to determine whether or not the industries are peddling violence to kids. In particular, it will help us determine whether or not the industries are peddling violence to kids. In particular, it will help us determine whether the video game industry is marketing the same ultraviolent games to children that are rated ''adults only.''

Mr. President, while explaining what causes a tragedy like Littleton remains a mystery, the question about how to reduce juvenile crime no longer is. We have a good idea about what works. And this bill overall is a step in the right direction. Like any piece of legislation, of course, it isn't perfect. For example, we need to really close the loophole that allows violent juvenile offenders to buy guns. We need to extend the COPS program so that we have enough police officers on the streets to catch and lock up dangerous juveniles and criminals. We should restore the so-called ''mandate'' requiring states to make efforts to reduce disproportionate minority confinement. This requirement, which I helped write in 1992, at most simply encourages states to address prevention efforts at minority communities. And it may be most important for its symbolic recognition of continuing racial divisions that dominate our society and our justice system, whether or not the justice system is actually discriminatory. Still, it makes no sense to cast away this provision without any hearings, any organized opposition, or any constitutional challenges to it over its seven-year history. I am hopeful that the House, which has always been supportive of this provision, will insist on restoring it in Conference.

And while the bill is a step forward for prevention, we can still do better. Although some suggest that as much as 55 percent of the $1 billion in spending at the heart of the bill goes toward prevention, in reality less than 30 percent is dedicated to prevention ($160 million through the 80 percent set-aside of the Prevention Challenge Grant, $112.5 million through the 25 percent earmark from the Accountability Block Grant, and $15 million for mentoring). To effectively reduce juvenile crime, the ratio of prevention spending to enforcement spending has to be a lot higher.

Finally, Mr. President, I express my appreciation to Senators HATCH and LEAHY, and their staffs—Beryl Howell, Manus Cooney, Rhett DeHart, Mike Kennedy, Bruce Cohen, Ed Pagano, Craig Wolf, and, of course, Brian Lee, Jessica Catlin, Kahau Morrison and Jon Leibowitz of my staff—for their hard work in putting together this balanced bill, which is significant improvement from where we were headed last Congress. I look forward to continuing to work with them when we move to conference.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of final passage and explain why I plan to vote for final passage of S. 254, the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999. At the outset, I must make clear that I do not support every provision in this bill. There is much in this bill that is simply extraneous—provisions that do not address the problem of youth violence. Moreover, there are items included in this bill by amendment that I opposed. There are also items that were included through the manager's amendment, such as the creation of new federal judgeships, that I oppose.

However, there are many provisions in this bill that I have long championed and have worked hard to include in the bill. Let me briefly summarize these key provisions of this law:

ASHCROFT PROVISIONS IN S. 254

There are four main Ashcroft initiatives in the core Senate juvenile justice bill, S. 254. Those provisions are: (1) Trying juveniles as adults on the federal level, (2) targeting adults who use juveniles through increased penalties, (3) funding for improving juvenile record system and incentives for

recordsharing, and (4) Charitable choice—preventing discrimination against faith-based organizations that stand ready to provide counseling to troubled youth.

First, the core bill makes it easier for federal prosecutors to try juveniles as adults in federal court. Specifically, the bill provides local United States Attorneys with new authority to try juveniles 14 and older who commit violent federal crimes and federal drug crimes as adults. This provision is an important improvement in the law. Violent federal crimes and major federal drug crimes are not youthful indiscretions or juvenile pranks—these are serious adult crimes. The bill makes important steps to ensure that in the federal system juveniles who commit adult crimes do adult time.

Second, the core bill also targets adults who would exploit children and ensnare them into a life of crime. One sad consequence of a juvenile justice system that treats juvenile crime less seriously than adult crime is that adults try to game the system by using juveniles to perform criminal tasks with the greatest risk of detection. Adults use children as drug runners or couriers precisely because the children are likely to end up back on the street even if they are caught. The core bill addresses this problem by including two provisions from my Protect Children from Violence Act, S. 2023, from the last Congress. Specifically, section 202 increases the mandatory minimums for adults who use juveniles to commit drug crimes from 1 year to 3 years for first-time offenders and from 1 year to 5 years for repeat offenders. Section 203 doubles the penalties on adults who use juveniles to commit crimes of violence and trebles penalties for repeat offenders.

The core bill also includes important provisions to facilitate the sharing of juvenile criminal records. This legislation encourages States to keep records on violent juveniles that are the equivalent of the records kept for adults committing comparable crimes. In addition, the bill conditions the availability of federal funds on States' participation in a nationwide system for collecting and sharing juvenile criminal records. Under the bill, state authorities must make these criminal records available to federal and state law enforcement officials and school officials to assist them in providing for the best interests of all students and preventing more tragedies. Providing judges and school officials with accurate records is a critical step in preventing tragedies. School officials and judges have a right and a need to know when they are dealing with dangerous juveniles. Providing accurate records is not only an important role for the government, it is a role that only the federal government can fulfill. Violent juveniles routinely cross state lines. The federal government has an important role in ensuring that their criminal records cross state lines with them.

Finally, the core bill includes my provision ensuring that faith-based organizations have an equal opportunity to provide services to at-risk youth. The experience of the past decade has made clear that government does not have all the answers for what ails our culture. No organizations should be excluded from the process of trying to heal our violent culture, let alone faith-based organizations. The ''charitable choice'' provisions in the bill do not provide for any special treatment for faith-based organizations, but they do ensure that faith-based groups will not be arbitrarily excluded when the government turns to non-governmental organizations to deal with at-risk juveniles.

The bill in its current form also includes a number of important provisions that were added by amendment. These include:

Semi-automatic assault rifles ban for juveniles. The Senate overwhelmingly adopted this Ashcroft amendment. The amendment had three major provisions:

(1) Ban on juvenile possession of semi-automatic assault rifles. This provision extends the current limitations (subject to the current exceptions) on youth possession of handguns to semi-automatic assault weapons. The provision does not affect a juvenile's right to possess hunting rifles.

(2) Requirement that juveniles be tried as adults for weapons violations in a school zone. Juveniles who commit firearms violations near a school zone must be sent a clear message—such actions will not be tolerated and will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

(3) Increased penalties for unlawfully transferring a firearm to a juvenile with knowledge that it will be used in a crime of violence.

ASHCROFT EDUCATION PACKAGE

The Senate overwhelmingly approved this comprehensive amendment which reflects not only specific Ashcroft initiatives but the work product of the Republican Education Task Force, which Senator ASHCROFT chaired. The major Ashcroft initiatives in the package include:

(1) Flexibility for local schools to address school violence. This provision provides schools with the flexibility to use existing education funds, and the new education funds included in the Republican budget, to address security concerns as they see fit. Permissible uses include everything from the installation of metal detectors, to the formulation of inter-agency task forces, to the introduction of school uniform policies.

(2) School uniforms. Another Ashcroft provision makes clear that nothing in federal law prevents local school districts from instituting school uniform policies.

(3) School records. Another provision makes clear that student disciplinary records should follow students to a new school, without regard to whether it is public or private. Teachers and administrators need to know who they are dealing with and whether they have security risks in their midst.

FRIST-ASHCROFT IDEA AMENDMENT

This amendment removes a loophole in federal law that prevents States from disciplining an IDEA student in the same manner as a non-IDEA student, if an IDEA student brings a gun to school. The Senate passed this common sense amendment 74–25. A number of my colleagues also added my initiatives to the bill through their own amendments. These include:

HATCH/CRAIG COMPREHENSIVE CRIME PACKAGE

This amendment included a number of Ashcroft mandatory minimums. Specifically, Ashcroft provisions in the bill raised mandatory minimums:

(1) From 1 to 3 years for distributing drugs near a school zone (from 1 to 5 years for subsequent offenses). This provision was adopted from ASHCROFT's Protect Children from Violence Act, S. 2023.

(2) From 1 to 3 years for distributing drugs to a juvenile (1 to 5 years for subsequent offenses). This provision was adopted from ASHCROFT's Protect Children from Violence Act, S. 2023.

(3) From 7 to 10 years for brandishing a firearm during the commission of a federal crime. This provision was adopted from ASHCROFT's Juvenile Misuse of Firearms Prevention Act, S. 994.

(4) From 10 to 12 years for discharging a firearm during the commission of a federal crime. This provision was adopted from ASHCROFT's Juvenile Misuse of Firearms Prevention Act, S. 994.

The amendment also included two new Ashcroft mandatory minimum sentences also adopted from S. 994:

(1) A 15-year mandatory minimum for maiming or injuring someone with a firearm during the commission of a federal crime

(2) A 5-year mandatory minimum for transferring a firearm with knowledge that it will be used in a crime of violence.

HATCH/FEINSTEIN GANG AMENDMENT

The Senate also overwhelmingly passed the Hatch-Feinstein amendment designed to target and punish gang violence. The amendment included many provisions long-championed by ASHCROFT, including almost the entirety of the gang subtitle of ASHCROFT's ''Protect Children from Violence Act,'' S. 538, introduced on March 4, 1999.

Specifically, the amendment included the following Ashcroft provisions: enhanced sentences for crimes committed as part of gang violence, new crimes for interstate gang activities, the treatment of juvenile crimes as adult crimes for purposes of the federal laws imposing severe penalties on armed career criminals, and increased penalties for witness tampering. All of these provisions were included in the ''Combating Gang Violence'' subtitle of ASHCROFT's Juvenile Crime bill.

In summary, this is not a perfect bill. There is much that is extraneous and some that is misguided. I am hopeful some of these provisions will be removed in conference. On balance, however, this bill will help make our schools places of learning, not places of fear.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to final passage of S. 254, the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999. I do so because I believe that the gun control amendments to this bill that have been adopted by the Senate will do lasting damage to the fundamental right to keep and bear arms, which is guaranteed by the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I am outraged, Mr. President, that the gun control lobby in this country has taken advantage of the tragedy last month at Littleton, Colorado, as well as the incident today in Georgia, to mount an unprecedented assault on the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding gun owners. They cast blame on law-abiding gun owners, while leaving the movie moguls and video game makers who promote wanton violence to children virtually unscathed.

Frankly, Mr. President, I am also disappointed by some of my colleagues in my own political party here in the Senate. I have spent a great deal of time, over the past two weeks as the Senate has debated this bill, arguing privately with these colleagues and trying to persuade them to hold the line against this onslaught of gun control amendments. Sadly, Mr. President, I have not been successful. Nevertheless, I am proud to have stood up for the Second Amendment, even, in one case, when I was only one of two Senators to vote against a gun control amendment to this bill.

I am particularly angered, Mr. President, by what the Senate has voted to do with respect to gun shows. Sadly, it seems evident to me that the practical effect of the Lautenberg Amendment, adopted earlier today when Vice President GORE cast the tie-breaking vote, will be effectively to ruin gun shows—to put them out of business. This, unfortunately, seems to me to be the aim of the Lautenberg Amendment.

I am also deeply concerned about the effects of the so-called ''trigger lock'' amendment. Even though the amendment appears only to require trigger locks to be sold with guns, the legal effect of the amendment may well be to do great damage to the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding gun owners. This is because courts may construe the amendment as creating a new civil negligence standard under which gun owners will be seen as having a legal obligation to use their trigger locks or face legal liability if their gun is misused by some third party.

If, in fact, the law develops such that gun owners have a legal obligation to use trigger locks, these law-abiding gun owners may be forced to put their safety, and that of their families, at risk. It is certainly not unreasonable to imagine a single mother of small children, depending on her gun for safety, panic-stricken as she struggles unsuccessfully with her trigger lock in the middle of the night after hearing a burglar break into her home.

Mr. President, these are but two examples of the grave harm that the gun control amendments adopted to this bill by the Senate have done to the Second Amendment rights of Americans. When the heat of this moment is gone, and the passions so shamelessly stirred up by the gun control lobby have subsided, I am afraid that many of those who supported these amendments will realize that they have done the Second Amendment serious and lasting harm. Sadly, though, it will be too late.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 322

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to address an issue raised by the Hatch amendment number 322, which the Senate agreed to on Tuesday, May 11. While I support both the underlying bill and this amendment, I am concerned about a portion of this amendment which is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on the Budget. The Hatch amendment contained language which amends that portion of the 1994 Crime Bill which created the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

This portion of the amendment does two things: (1) it extends the fund through fiscal year 2005 and (2) it extends the discretionary spending limits (albeit indirectly) through fiscal year 2005 for the violent crime reduction category. As a result, the amendment was subject to a point of order pursuant to section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 because it contained matter within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee and was offered to a bill that was not reported by the committee. I chose not to challenge this provision because I support the underlying legislation and I have been assured by the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH, that my concerns will be addressed when the bill goes to conference.

Let me begin by saying that I support full funding for crime fighting efforts. I am, however, troubled by this amendment because—in its attempt to ensure funds are available for these important programs it has stumbled into a series of, as yet, unresolved issues regarding the budget process: should the discretionary spending limits be extended beyond fiscal year 2002? If yes, should there be limits within the overall cap for items such as defense, highways and mass transit, and crime? Current law (section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) provides limits on discretionary spending (the ''caps'') through the end of fiscal year 2002.

When the issue of the caps was last addressed during deliberations on the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, Congress decided that the overall caps on discretionary spending would end after 2002, that the defense cap would end after 1999, and that the crime cap would end after 2000. This was decided as part of a very carefully crafted compromise between the Congress and the President, involving both mandatory and discretionary spending, that has now led us to a balanced budget. Our ability to live within these discretionary caps has played a significant role in producing not only a balanced budget, but surplus for the foreseeable future. Thus I feel it is not appropriate at this time to extend only the crime cap without addressing the broader issue of the appropriate level of discretionary spending. Moreover, I fear that raising the issue of the caps at this time will unnecessarily complicate the passage of this important juvenile justice legislation.

I know that I do not have to remind my colleagues how difficult it is going to be both this year and next to pass all 13 appropriations bills and stay within the caps which we currently have in place for the next three years. While I am supportive of funding for criminal justice programs, I am concerned that extending the crime cap will only make an already difficult task that much harder. I might also point out to my colleagues that by extending only the crime cap and not the overall cap, this legislation has the effect of limiting crime spending for fiscal years 2003 through 2005 when there will be no such limits upon any other type of discretionary spending.

I thank my colleague from Utah, Senator HATCH, for recognizing my concern with this amendment and I look forward to working with him on this issue when the bill is in conference.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to thank the distinguished managers of this bill, Senators LEAHY and HATCH, for including the Feinstein-Chafee amendment regarding separation of juveniles from adults in custody in the managers' ''technical amendment.'' I also wish to thank Senators AKAKA, FEINGOLD, KOHL, and JEFFORDS, who agreed to co-sponsor our amendment, for their support.

This amendment resolves a major concern that many, many people had with this bill, and will help speed the way to its final passage.

Our amendment is designed to strengthen the bill's requirements for separating juveniles in custody from adult criminals. We should not be counter-productive by allowing juvenile detention to be a school for crime, nor should we be cruel in permitting the victimization of youths by hardened adult criminals.

Under current law, juveniles cannot have any contact with adult inmates. None whatsoever. When a juvenile is in an adult facility, that juvenile cannot be within ''sight or sound'' of any adult—ever!

Why is that one of the four so-called ''core'' requirements?

Because I remind my colleagues that we are talking about children.

Children who may or may not have committed a violent offense.

Children who may have been arrested for the first time.

Children who perhaps are on the wrong path but most likely never commit another offense ever: statistically, over two-thirds of juveniles arrested never commit another crime.

In the early 1970s, before there were protections for children who came into contact with our court system, a number of studies found that children in adult jails were subject to rape, assault, sodomy, murder, and other acts which sometimes, frankly too often, led to suicide.

The Judiciary Committee at the time learned of numerous tragedies and outright atrocities, including a report on practices in Philadelphia which estimated that 2,000 sexual assaults occurred inside adult jails or ''sheriff's vans'' used to transport juvenile and adults to court over a 26-month period. One juvenile was raped five times while inside such a van.

The numbers tell the story. Children in adult jails are 8 times more likely to commit suicide; 5 times more likely to be sexually assaulted; twice as likely to be assaulted by staff; and 50 percent more likely to be attacked with a weapon than are children in juvenile facilities, according to studies by the Justice Department and others.

In my state of California, we passed our laws to keep juveniles out of adult jails in the mid-1980s in the wake of tragedies such as the case of Kathy Robbins, a 15-year-old girl who hung herself when she was placed in an adult jail in Glenn County for violating a juvenile curfew.

After those reports were released, Congress enacted the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act and subsequent renewals of the law to ensure that children would be treated fairly by the juvenile justice system and be kept safely away from adults in jail.

Kentucky chose to forgo Federal money and continue placing juveniles in adult jails. This chart shows the result: four suicides, one attempted suicide, two physical assaults by other inmates, two sexual assaults by other inmates, and one rape by a deputy county jailer.

Let me give you some of the names behind the numbers:

In Oldham County, 15-year-old Robert Lee Horn, Jr. was put in jail for truancy and beyond parental control. He was paraded through the jail in front of adult inmates who called out to him for sex. He hung himself.

In McCracken County, a 16-year-old Todd Selke was put in adult jail for being a runaway and disorderly conduct. He committed suicide.

In Franklin County, a 16-year-old runaway was raped by a deputy county jailer.

The core protections help to prevent these tragedies elsewhere around the country.

Yet, this bill as introduced would have weakened the core protections for children. I was puzzled by why the authors felt the need to weaken the current standard. According to the latest figures from the Justice Department, 48 of the 50 states are in compliance with the current standard for separating children from adults, including such large, rural states as Alaska and Montana.

And yet this bill would have allowed for juveniles to be in close proximity to adult inmates. While it generally prohibits physical contact between juveniles and adults in custody, there is an exclusion. And the exclusion to the definition of prohibited physical contact said that the term ''does not include supervised proximity between a juvenile and an adult inmate that is brief and incidental or accidental.''

In other words, it permitted regular contact, planned contact, between delinquent juveniles and adult criminals, as long as it is deemed to be ''brief and incidental.''

Senator CHAFEE and I were concerned that this standard would have allowed juveniles to be paraded in front of adult inmates as they are being transported from one area of a facility to another. That means that every day the same youth could be required to walk by the adult cell block.

Adult inmates would have a chance to tease, taunt, harass, use suggestive body language, expose areas of their private parts, spit, and otherwise scare juveniles as they are being transported through the facility.

Now some might think that's OK. That to scare a child by exposing them to adults may reduce the likelihood of the child committing another crime.

But, actually, these young children who might be tough on the outside, but not so tough on the inside, could be scared to death—meaning scared enough to commit suicide—just as Robbie Horn was in Oldham County, Kentucky.

Older gang members, or veteranos, could pass messages on to younger gang members to coordinate criminal activities, or to intimidate them from turning state's evidence.

The amendment which we have agreed upon remedied this. In fact, it is even better than what Senator CHAFEE and I originally proposed. It makes two changes, which bring the bill into line with the current Justice Department regulations:

1. It eliminates any planned or regular contact between juvenile delinquents and adult criminals by changing the exception to ''brief and inadvertent, or accidental,'' contact. The minority report to last Congress' juvenile crime bill, S. 10, erroneously stated that the Justice Department's regulations, like the bill, excepted ''brief and incidental'' contact. However, there is a world of difference between ''incidental'' and ''inadvertent.'' Changing this exception to the Justice Department standard has the same effect as the amendment which Senator CHAFEE and I originally proposed, and will provide much greater protection for juveniles in custody.

2. The amendment passed in the manager's package then goes even further, limiting even this exception to nonresidential areas only. In other words, there is no exception at all in residential areas to the prohibition on physical contact between juveniles and adults. Specifically, the amendment provides that the inadvertent/accidental exception applies only ''in secure areas of a facility that are not dedicated to use by juvenile offenders and that are nonresidential, which may include dining, recreational, educational, vocational, health care, entry areas, and passageways.'' This language is taken almost verbatim from the Justice Department regulations.

This amendment ensures that a juvenile cannot be in close proximity such as supervised ''brief and incidental'' parades by adult cells or other planned or spontaneous actions by adults to transport children from one area of a jail to another.

Our amendment was endorsed by: The Department of Justice; the Children's Defense Fund; the National Network for Youth; and the National Collaboration for Youth, an alliance of 28 youth service groups, including Boy Scouts, 4-H, Girl Scouts, American Red Cross, National Urban League, United Way and YMCA.

A coalition of 22 other organizations wrote to the Majority Leader, asking that the standard for separating delinquent juveniles and adult criminals be strengthened, including: Minorities in Law Enforcement, National Association for School Psychologists, National Council of Churches of Christ-Washington Office, the Alliance for Children and Families, Campaign for an Effective Crime Policy, and Covenant House.

With the passage of this amendment, we have provided this protection, and substantially improved this bill. Coupled with the passage of other amendments that I offered, including banning imports of large-capacity ammunition magazines, the Federal Gang Violence Act, the James Guelff Body Armor Act, and anti-bombmaking legislation, this bill now represents a great step forward in the effort to reduce juvenile and violent crime. I ask that I be added as a co-sponsor of the bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support Senator KERRY's amendment on early childhood development. The nation's highest priority should be to ensure that all children begin school ready to learn. Our governors realized this a decade ago when they said that the country's number one goal should be to prepare all children to enter

school ''ready to learn.'' We aren't going to meet our school readiness goals by the year 2000, but we must do all we can to reach this objective soon. We cannot afford to let another decade pass without investing more effectively in young children's educational development.

As we debate how to prevent youth violence, it is gratifying that Senators on both sides of the aisle are recognizing the importance of investing in children while they are young. During these early, formative years, constructive interventions have the potential to make the greatest impact. Early learning programs—including pre-kindergarten, Early Head Start, Head Start, and other activities for young children—are building blocks for success. Scientific research confirms that in the first few years of life, children develop essential learning and social skills that they will use throughout their lives.

Quality early education stimulates young minds, enhances their development, and encourages their learning. Children who attend high quality preschool classes have stronger language, math, and social skills than children who attend classes of inferior quality. Low-income children are particularly likely to benefit from quality programs.

These early skills translate into greater school readiness. First graders who begin school with strong language and learning skills are more motivated to learn, and they benefit more from classroom instruction. Quality early education programs also have important long range consequences and are closely associated with increased academic achievement, higher adult earnings, and far less involvement with the criminal justice system.

Investments in these programs make sense, and they are cost effective as well. Economist Steven Barnett found that the High/Scope Foundations' Perry Preschool Project saved $150,000 per participant in crime costs alone. Even after subtracting the interest that could have been earned by investing the program's funding in financial markets, the project produced a net savings of $7.16—including more than $6 in crime savings—for every dollar invested.

At risk 3 and 4 years olds in the High/Scope program were one-fifth as likely, by age 27, to have become chronic lawbreakers, compared to similar children randomly assigned to a control group. In other words, failure to provide these services multiplied by 5 times the risk that these infants and toddlers would grow up to be delinquent teenagers and adults.

Over 23 million children under 6 live in the United States, and all of these children deserve the opportunity to start school ready to learn. To make this goal a reality, we must make significant investments in children, long before they ever walk through the schoolhouse door. Our children cannot wait, nor can we.

In March, Senator STEVENS and I introduced a bill, S. 749, cosponsored by Senators DODD, JEFFORDS, and KERRY, to create an ''Early Learning Trust Fund'' to improve funding for early education programs. This bipartisan bill provides states with $10 billion over 5 years to strengthen and improve early education programs for children under 6. By increasing the number of children who have early learning opportunities, we will ensure that many more children begin school ready to read. The ''Early Learning Trust Fund'' will provide each state with resources to strengthen and improve early education.

Governors will receive the grants, and communities, along with parents, will decide how these funds can best be used. Grants will be distributed based on a formula which takes into account the relative number of young children in each state, and the Department of health and Human Services will allocate the funds to the states. To assist in this process, governors will appoint a sate council of representatives from the office of the governor, other relevant state agencies, Head Start, parental organizations, and resource and referral agencies—all experts in the field of early education. The state councils will be responsible for setting priorities and approving and implementing state plans to improve early education.

One of the great strengths of the ''Early Learning Trust Fund'' is its flexibility. States will have the flexibility to invest in an array of strategies that give young children the building blocks to become good readers and good students. Essentially, our proposal does four things: (1) it enhances educational services provided by current child care programs and improves the quality of these programs; (2) it builds on the momentum of states like Georgia and New York, which are expanding their pre-kindergarten services; (3) it expands Head Start to include full-day, full-year services to help children of working parents begin school ready to learn; and (4) it ensures that children with special needs have access to as wide a range of these services as possible.

This legislation will give communities what they have been asking for—funding for coordinated services to ''fill in the gaps.'' Communities needs this so-called ''glue'' money to strengthen their early education services, and this approach will give them much needed support. As a result, many more children will benefit and begin school ready to learn, ready to reach their full potential.

The nation's future depends on how well today's children are prepared to meet the challenges of tomorrow. If we are serious about improving our children's lives, I urge my colleagues to support the Early Learning Trust Fund that Senator STEVENS and I will bring to the floor soon.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in the past week the Republican majority in the Senate finally has begun to show signs of understanding that Americans want reasonable gun control policies in this country. We have made some progress by passing a ban on juvenile possession of semiautomatic assault weapons and a ban on the importation of high-capacity ammunition clips. We saw most Republicans join all Democrats in voting to require that child safety devices be sold with all handguns. And finally, this morning, with a tie-breaking vote by the Vice President, we passed the Lautenberg amendment to firmly close the gun show loophole.

These are the kinds of measures that Democrats in Congress have been advocating for years, and it is unfortunate that it took a tragedy like Littleton to bring our colleagues in the majority around to our way of thinking, but we welcome even these small steps in the right direction.

But small steps they are, Mr. President, and we need to do much more. We should reinstate the Brady waiting period, which expired last November, to provide a cooling off period before the purchase of a handgun. We should pass a child access prevention law to hold adults responsible if they allow a child to gain access to a firearm and that child then uses the firearm to harm another person. And we should firmly close the Internet gun sales loophole, something the Senate failed to do last week.

I also believe that we should apply the same consumer product regulations which apply to virtually every other industry and product in this country to guns. If toy guns, teddy bears, lawn mowers and hair dryers are subject to regulation to ensure that they include features to minimize the danger to children, why not firearms? I plan to introduce legislation to allow the Consumer Product Safety Commission to regulate firearms to protect children and adults against unreasonable risk of injury. I know my friend Senator TORRICELLI has introduced a bill to allow the Treasury Department to regulate firearms. Whichever agency ultimately has oversight, the important thing is that guns should no longer be the only consumer product exempt from basic safety regulations.

Mr. President, the NRA's own estimate is that there are over 200 million guns in this country. That's nearly one for every American. But let's remember that most Americans don't own guns. For most Americans, especially in urban areas, a gun in a public place in the possession of anyone other than a law enforcement officer usually brings on a sense of fear, not a sense of protection.

As the President said a few weeks ago, this fundamental difference in perspective is at the heart of this gun debate. If we are to solve the problem of gun violence in this country, we have to come to a meeting of the minds between gun owners and non-gun owners, between rural and urban America.

Americans who live in urban and suburban communities need to understand

the legitimate use of firearms for hunting and sports activities. But at the same time, members of Congress from mostly rural states must recognize the immense pain and suffering that guns cause in our nation's urban areas, and they should work with us to convince their constituents that reasonable, targeted gun restrictions can make a world of difference by saving lives in America's cities and suburbs.

I would also add that this is not simply an eastern vs. western states issue. For example, the Washington Post recently reported that in Florida, six of the state's most urban counties have adopted measures to require a waiting period and background checks on all firearm sales at guns shows, while the rest of the state has not. Every senator, from every region of the country, has some constituents who legally use firearms, and others who want nothing to do with them and see them as a deadly threat. My state is no different, and I recognize that many of my constituents are decent people who hunt or sport-shoot safely.

While much more needs to be done, and while we are still far from passing comprehensive gun safety legislation, we have seen in the past week at least a few limited examples of how, working together, we can bridge the gap and approve reasonable, targeted restrictions on gun access without taking away a law-abiding, adult citizen's ability to own a gun.

I also believe that gun dealers should be held responsible if they violate federal law by selling a firearm to a minor, convicted felon, or others prohibited from buying firearms. Currently, there are over 104,000 federally licensed firearms dealers in the United States. While most of these dealers are responsible small business people, recent tracing of crime-related guns by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) has found substantial evidence that some dealers are selling guns to juveniles and convicted felons. This direct diversion of weapons from retail to illegal markets is taking place both through off-the-book sales by corrupt dealers and through so-called straw purchases, when an ineligible buyer has a friend or relative buy a firearm for him or her.

To remedy this situation, I have introduced legislation, the Gun Dealer Responsibility Act, that would provide a statutory cause of action for victims of gun violence against dealers whose illegal sale of a gun directly contributes to the victim's injury. I believe this legislation will make unscrupulous gun dealers think twice about who they are selling weapons to, particularly minors, convicted felons, or any other ineligible buyer, either directly or through straw purchases.

Our nation's federal juvenile justice programs establish four core principles that have served as the foundation of federal juvenile justice policy for years. States are required to uphold these principles in order to receive federal grant funds for juvenile justice activities. These four core principles include:

(1) Juveniles may not be within sight or sound of adult inmates in secure facilities. The evidence is overwhelmingly clear that youth held in adult prisons are frequently preyed upon by adult inmates. Compared to juveniles in juvenile facilities, they are 8 times more likely to commit suicide, 5 times more likely to be sexually assaulted, and 50% more likely to be attacked by a weapon.

(2) States should not confine juveniles for so-called ''status'' offenses, such as truancy, that would not be punishable if committed by an adult.

(3) States should remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups: For the same reasons I just mentioned, juveniles should not be held in adult jails and lockups, with very narrow exceptions and even then for very limited periods of time. And,

(4) States should address the problem of disproportionate minority confinement.

This last issue is one I want to talk briefly about today, because it is the area where I believe the bill before us most dramatically changes federal policy and clearly fails to uphold the longstanding principles of our juvenile justice system. Nearly seven out of ten juveniles held in secure facilities in this country are members of minority groups.

African-American juveniles are twice as likely to be arrested as white youth. There is, without question, a continuing need to address minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system. We should keep the incentives in current law that encourage states to do so. Unfortunately, the bill before us would replace those incentives with language that encourages states to reduce disproportionate representation of, quote, ''segments of the population,'' an ambiguous and unlimited phrase that could be interpreted to mean men, urban groups, or virtually any ''segment'' of the population. The effective result is that over-representation of minorities would no longer be the focus of our efforts, and one of the pillars of our federal juvenile justice policy would therefore be undermined. I was disappointed that the Senate yesterday failed to pass the Wellstone amendment to ensure that states continue to address disproportionate minority confinement issues. We have been making some progress in this area, and we need to continue that effort.

Another area where I think we can do much more is in the provision of mental health services for young people who come into contact with the juvenile justice system. My friend and fellow member of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, Senator WELLSTONE, spoke eloquently on this subject earlier this week. As he and I have discussed many times, you cannot have a meaningful discussion about juvenile justice without talking about mental health. The two are intimately intertwined.

Studies find that the rate of mental disorder is two to three times higher among the juvenile offender population than among youth in the general population. According to a 1994 Department of Justice study, 73% of juveniles in the juvenile justice system reported mental health problems, and 57% reported past treatment for those problems. In addition, over 60% of youth in the juvenile justice system may have substance abuse disorders, compared to 22% in the general population.

I have prepared legislation to authorize the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), in cooperation with the Department of Justice, to award grants to state or local juvenile justice agencies to provide mental health services for youth offenders with serious emotional disturbances who have been discharged from the juvenile justice system. I believe it is critical that we help local organizations to do several things to assist young offenders: (1) develop a plan of services for each youth offender; (2) provide a network of core or aftercare services for each youth offender, including mental health and substance abuse treatment, respite care, and foster care; and (3) provide planning and transition services to youth offenders while these youngsters are still incarcerated or detained. I hope that in the context of this bill or the SAMHSA reauthorization we can find room for this important program.

I believe that a community-based network of mental health services will reduce the likelihood that troubled youth will end up back in the juvenile justice system. By combining this innovative grant program with strong prevention programs to reach out to at-risk youth before they come into contact with the juvenile justice system in the first place, we can attack the problem of juvenile delinquency from both directions.

In closing, let me say that we all recognize that the problem of gun violence among our young people is caused by many factors, some of which we may not fully understand. We need more resources for prevention programs to reach at-risk youth before they come into contact with the juvenile justice system in the first place, and we have seen an increased willingness on the other side of aisle to provide those resources; we need a greater focus on mentoring and counseling for troubled youth, and we've seen some movement on that front as well; and yes, we need better enforcement of firearms laws and more effective prosecution of gun criminals, and there is no question that we will see more resources provided to make that happen.

But anyone who honestly considers the tragic events in Littleton one month ago, and the thirteen children who die every day in this country from gun violence, must concede that one of

the biggest problems of all is that our young people have far too easy and unlimited access to guns. We must do more to keep guns away from kids and criminals by making sure that Brady Law background checks are applied across the board, by reinstating the Brady waiting period, by passing a child access prevention law, by firmly closing the Internet gun sales loophole, by holding dealers responsible for illegal sales, and by applying to firearms the same consumer product safety regulations that apply to virtually every other product in this country.

Let's do the right thing and pass a juvenile justice bill that includes every means possible to protect our children and all of our citizens from youth violence.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, prior to being elected to the Senate, I served the people of Ohio for two terms as governor. Before that, I served for 10 years as the mayor of Cleveland. I have also been Lieutenant Governor, a County Commissioner, a County Auditor and a State Legislator.

I have 33 years of experience at every level of government, which I believe gives me wonderful insight into the relationship of the federal government with respect to state and local government.

It is the main reason why, over the length of my service to the people of Ohio, I have developed a passion for the issue of federalism—that is, assigning the appropriate role of the federal government in relation to state and local government.

That passion remains with me to this day, and I vowed when I got to the Senate that I would work to sort out the appropriate roles of the federal, state and local governments.

I have committed myself to find ways in which the federal government can be a better partner with our nation's state and local governments.

One of my concerns has been the overreaching nature of the federal government into areas I have always felt properly belong under the purview of state and local government. Another of my concerns has been the propensity of the federal government to pre-empt our state and local governments. In many cases, the federal government mandated responsibilities to state and local governments and forced them to pay for the mandates themselves.

In regard to unfunded mandates, I, and a number of other state and local elected officials finally got fed up enough to lobby Congress to do something about it, and in 1995, Congress passed the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. I was pleased to be at the Rose Garden representing our state and local governments at the signing ceremony by the President.

And while we now know the cost of what the federal government is imposing on the state and local governments, Congress has still got to do more to reverse the tide of ''command and control'' policies in areas intrusive which are the proper responsibility of state and local governments.

Indeed, as syndicated columnist David Broder pointed out in a January 11, 1995 article, ''the unfunded mandate bill is a worthy effort. But in the end, the real solution lies in sorting out more clearly what responsibilities should be financed and run by each level of government.''

I wholeheartedly agree.

It is imperative that we delineate the proper role of government at the federal, state and local level.

Our forefathers referred to this differentiation as federalism, and outlined this relationship in the 10th Amendment:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

The importance of the 10th Amendment was inherent to the framers of the Constitution, who sought to preserve for the states their ability to pass and uphold laws that were specific to each individual state. In this way, states would keep their sovereignty over what we consider the ''day to day'' running of society, reserving the more comprehensive functions of the nation to the federal government.

This was envisioned by James Madison, who defined the various roles of government in Federalist Paper #45. He wrote:

> The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce . . . The powers reserved to the several states will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and property of the people and the internal order, improvement and prosperity of the state.

In a speech before the Volunteers of the National Archives in 1986 regarding the relationship of the Constitution with America's cities and the evolution of federalism, I raised a concern about the trend in American government that I had witnessed since the 1960's. I said:

> We have seen the expansion of the federal government into new, non-traditional domestic policy areas. We have experienced a tremendous increase in the proclivity of Washington both to pre-empt state and local authority and to mandate actions on state and local governments. The cumulative effect of a series of actions by the Congress, the Executive Branch and the U.S. Supreme Court have caused some legal scholars to observe that while constitutional federalism is alive in scholarly treatises, it has expired as a practical political reality.

Mr. President, we have made progress since I spoke those words 13 years ago. Not to the level sought by Madison, but progress just the same. As I mentioned earlier, Congress has passed the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. We've also passed Safe Drinking Water Act reforms in 1996. In addition, states are making the difference in Medicaid reform and because of the efforts of state leaders working with Congress, we now have comprehensive welfare reform.

Also, just this year, we've seen the passage and signing into law of the ''Ed-Flex'' bill, which gives our states and school districts the freedom to use their federal funds for identified education priorities and today we passed legislation preventing the federal government from recouping the tobacco settlement funds back from the states.

But we must still do more.

Today, we are voting on juvenile justice legislation that would impose certain new federal laws on what is now and has traditionally been a jurisdiction of our state and local governments.

I have great respect for the managers of this legislation; they have worked incredibly hard to put together this bill which contains a number of good provisions meant to fight juvenile crime and a smorgasbord of other things that on the surface look very appealing.

Unfortunately most of them deal with things that are the proper responsibility of state and local government and violate in spirit and in substance my interpretation of the 10th Amendment and frankly, the interpretation of Alexander Hamilton.

Hamilton, who was the greatest proponent in his day of a strong national government, saw law enforcement as a state and local concern. If Hamilton were alive today, he would be appalled at the use of the police power by federal agencies.

And to emphasize Hamilton's view, we need only look at Federalist Paper #17:

> There is one transcendent advantage belonging to the province of the state governments, which alone suffices to place the matter in a clear and satisfactory light. I mean the ordinary administration of criminal and civil justice.

Crime control is a primary responsibility of local and state officials. They are on the front lines and they are best suited to tackle the specific problems in their jurisdictions.

Juvenile crime control measures are being enacted and carried out in the various states across the country. And sometimes it does take a tragedy such as the one that occurred in Littleton, Colorado or the shooting this morning in Atlanta to spur states on, but they fully recognize their responsibility to provide for the safety of their citizens.

The states understand their role and the need to prevent any further increase in juvenile crime. They are responding to that need.

Involvement by the federal government in this matter often duplicates the efforts of our state and local governments.

I'll never forget, in 1996, when I was Governor and I went to a crime control conference in Pennsylvania with then-Majority Leader Bob Dole. He was running for President at the time. The

head of the conference suggested 5 things the federal government should do to reduce juvenile crime. It made sense to me, but when I looked at the recommendations, I realized that in Ohio, we were already doing the things that were recommended.

In 1994, we instituted a program called ''RECLAIM Ohio'' which is an innovative approach to juvenile corrections. This program stresses local decision-making and the creation of more effective, less costly community-based correction alternatives to state incarceration.

Under ''RECLAIM Ohio,'' local juvenile court judges are given the flexibility to provide the most appropriate rehabilitation option. Since 1992, the population of juvenile offenders in Ohio's youth correction facilities has dropped 20% as a result of this and other innovative local and state programs.

Mr. President, the success we have had in Ohio might never have come about if we had to divert our resources towards a federally mandated program. We have seen results with ''RECLAIM Ohio;'' it is best suited for us.

In fact, our ''RECLAIM Ohio'' program was selected as one of the top ten innovative programs in government by the JFK School of Government at Harvard University—worthy of replicating elsewhere in the United States.

In 1995, Ohio crafted its own comprehensive juvenile crime bill. This bill imposed mandatory bind-over provisions for the most heinous crimes and longer minimum sentences.

I believe we should heed the words of Senator FRED THOMPSON, who gave an eloquent speech about this bill last Wednesday. He said ''Among other things, [this bill] makes it easier to prosecute juveniles in Federal criminal court. We have about 100 to 200 prosecutions a year of juveniles in Federal court. It is a minuscule part of our criminal justice system.'' To put that in perspective, Senator THOMPSON pointed out that in 1998, there were ''58,000 Federal criminal cases filed involving 79,000 defendants.''

Think about what Senator THOMPSON says—58,000 total federal criminal cases filed; some 200 prosecutions a year of juveniles in Federal court. Do we honestly think that we'll have an extraordinarily dramatic increase in juvenile prosecutions under this bill? I have to ask: why on earth are we doing this?

He further stated, ''[This bill] would allow juveniles as young as 14 years of age to be tried as an adult for violent crimes and drug offenses—drug offenses, again, that are of the street crime category, where we have laws on the books in every State of the Union.''

In a letter to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, the leaders of the National Governors' Association said ''the nation's governors are concerned that attempts to expand federal criminal law. . .into traditional state functions would have little effect in eliminating crime but could undermine state and local anti-crime efforts.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, the American Bar Association's Task Force on the Federalization of Criminal Law in its report issued at the end of last year stated that ''more than 40% of the federal criminal provisions enacted since the Civil War have been enacted since 1970.'' As a footnote, the report indicates that more than a quarter of the federal criminal provisions were enacted over the sixteen year period of 1980–1996.

Some change in the responsibility is legitimate, based upon the scope of particular offenses. However, many changes have simply evolved from current state and local laws that the federal government has either co-opted or the Congress has directed federal agencies to carry-out.

As we continue to assign a greater involvement for the federal government in law enforcement, the impact on other resources is also strained, primarily the federal court system.

And for those who understand the traditional role of state and local law enforcement, it becomes increasingly frustrating to see the shift in prosecuted crimes.

Earlier this month in testimony before the Governmental Affairs Committee, Federal Appeals Court Judge Gilbert S. Merritt said that his Court's docket and the case load of the U.S. Attorney's office for his jurisdiction consists of ''mainly drug and illegal possession of firearms cases and other cases that duplicate state crimes'' and that ''federal prosecution of drug and firearms crime is having a minimal effect on the distribution of drugs and illegal firearms.''

Most compelling, Judge Merritt said ''our law enforcement efforts would be much more effective if Congress repealed most duplicate federal crimes and tried to help local and state street police, detectives, prosecutors and judges do a more effective job.''

Judge Merritt suggested that before we federalize crime enforcement, we should ''concentrate federal criminal law enforcement in only the following core areas:

(1) Offenses against the United States itself;

(2) Multi-State or international criminal activity that is impossible for a single state or its courts to handle;

(3) Crimes that involve a matter of overriding federal interest, such as violation of civil rights by state actors;

(4) Widespread corruption at the state and local levels; and

(5) Crimes of such magnitude or complexity that federal resources are required.''

Mr. President, based on what I can see, this legislation does not meet these criteria.

So, if we are truly concerned about lowering the incidences of violent crime in America, I believe our focus should be not only on the symptoms of juvenile crime, but on the root causes as well. We have to act first, and not react later, if we wish to benefit our kids.

To be sure, there are just plain, bad juveniles who need to be locked up. And, we need better information about juvenile offenders, profiles that will help our courts deal with rough kids and get them off the streets.

But, I think part of the problem is youngsters aren't getting the moral and family and religious training at home, responsibilities that are falling more and more on our schools.

In Ohio, we established a mediation and dispute resolution program in our kindergartens and first grades to get kids to talk out their problems so they don't resort to violence.

We did this because I am concerned, Mr. President, about how we can reach our kids, to help make them become decent, productive members of society.

What we need to do is draw a line in the sand, and proclaim that we are not going to allow another generation of children to fall by the wayside. We have to say ''This is where it stops.''

We need to become a better partner with state and local government and invest in our children at the most critical juncture of their lives—pre-natal to three—the time when parents and young children are forming life-long attachments and when parents and other care-givers have an opportunity to construct lasting values.

I believe putting our efforts towards creating this powerful, enduring impact on a young child's physical, intellectual, emotional and social development will do more to end the cycle of crime and violence in America than anything else the Senate could do.

Mr. President, once more, I would like to congratulate the managers of this bill for the time and energy that they have put into this bill, but juvenile crime control is not the responsibility of the federal government.

Again, we need only look as far as the Constitution to determine which crimes fall within the purview of the federal government—

1. Article 1, Section 8—To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

2. Article 1, Section 8—To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations; and

3. Article 3, Section 3—To declare the punishment for treason.

For the remainder of crime that impacts our nation, the 10th Amendment spells out quite clearly how we should deal with it:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

Mr. President, we should follow the wisdom of our forefathers.

EXHIBIT 1

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 14, 1999.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND SENATOR LEAHY: As the Senate considers juvenile crime legislation, the nation's Governors believe that the federal government should improve its support of states in combating youth violence. This endeavor requires the development and implementation of programs and policies that strive to prevent delinquency, eliminate the presence of violence wherever children congregate, and ensure strong punishment for those responsible for exposing young people to delinquency, drugs, and violence. The first line of defense against youth violence is responsible parenting. Having recognized this fact, the states' priority in this area should be to establish comprehensive services and programs that prevent youth from committing crime. Prevention programs that build self-esteem through achievement of worthwhile goals and offer an alternative to violent and criminal activity are critical to the successful reduction of juvenile crime.

There should be a safe environment for children to grow and develop. This includes schools, parks, playgrounds, and any place youth congregate. The rise in handgun violence especially in and around schools is of concern to Governors. There should be swift and certain punishment for individuals who illegally provide a firearm to a minor, or knowingly provide a firearm to a minor for illegal use. Furthermore, there must be immediate seizure of guns illegally possessed by minors. Also, there should be strict penalties for children below the age of eighteen who illegally possess a firearm.

S. 254, the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999 will be among the legislative initiatives considered regarding juvenile crime. We would like to address some of the provisions in this legislation.

Federalization: The nation's Governors are concerned that attempts to expand federal criminal law (Title I of S. 254) into traditional state functions would have little effect in eliminating crime but could undermine state and local anticrime efforts. Further, the Governors are concerned that federal concurrent jurisdiction in criminal justice efforts can be used by the federal government as a means to impose undue mandates on state and local crime control and law enforcement officials.

Another federalism issue is raised by section 1802 the ''Juvenile Criminal History Grants.'' It needs language clarifying what information will be contained in the national data bases, who will have access to the data, how the data will be used, and to affirm states' right to ultimately control access to their own data under our federal system.

Waiver: The formula in the accountability block grant of S. 254 (Part R—Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, Subtitle B) requires states to pass-through money to local units of governments handling juvenile justice functions. In many states, including Utah and Vermont, the juvenile crime function is administered at the state level of government, working with the locals. S. 254 would allow the Attorney General to waive the pass-through requirement for these states. We support this provision.

Flexibility: The current language in S. 254 offers some discretion to Governors over appointments to state advisory boards overseeing implementation of state programs under the Juvenile Justice Act. Governors should have sole discretion over creation, make-up and appointments to state advisory boards. Some states have existing boards that can fulfill this requirement. Furthermore, states should be given maximum flexibility to implement the spirit and purposes of the statute for the goals of delinquency prevention, intervention, and protection of juveniles from harm. Also, S. 254 eases the monitoring requirements for state implementation of the Juvenile Justice program.

Program participation with core requirements: Governors believe that rules, regulations, definitions, responsibilities, and reporting requirements authorized in the legislation should be reasonable and not impede states' ability to effectively administer the programs promoted in the legislation. Further, the statute should be designed to encourage full participation in the program by all the states, but not penalize states that choose not to participate in some or all programs.

The recent tragic events in Colorado, Oregon, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Mississippi and other areas of the country have focused the nation's attention on the need for juvenile justice reform. We appreciate your taking our concerns under consideration as you debate S. 254.

Sincerely,

GOVERNOR THOMAS R. CARPER,
Chairman.

GOVERNOR MICHAEL O. LEAVITT,
Vice Chairman.

GOVERNOR JAMES B. HUNT, JR.,
Chairman, Human Resources Committee.

GOVERNOR MIKE HUCKABEE,
Vice Chairman, Human Resources Committee.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to S. 254, the Juvenile Justice Bill. I oppose this bill because it does far more harm than good to the fundamental interests of our nation's children.

The bill fails to do what the Littleton tragedy screams out loudly and clearly we should do: strive to prevent future schoolhouse tragedies and all juvenile violence. The bill is long on prosecution and detention but short on prevention.

During debate on this bill, I was glad to see that some of my concerns were resolved. After a contentious debate, the Senate finally closed the gun show loophole. The Lautenberg-Kerrey amendment is a sensible regulation on the sale of guns at gun shows. It does not prevent law-abiding citizens from selling and buying guns at gun shows.

The Senate's debate on guns in the last week had what I believe to be a sensible outcome. But I do want to point out one thing about the debate we have had on various amendments to this bill dealing with the topic of gun control. Obviously, there are very strong feelings about gun-related amendments on both sides, and the issues are complex. But the vast majority of campaign contributions from groups interested in these amendments to the Senators who are voting on them is coming from one side. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, gun rights groups, including the National Rifle Association, gave over $9 million to candidates, PACs, and parties from 1991 to 1998. The NRA gave $1.6 million in PAC contributions to federal candidates last year. Handgun Control, Inc. gave a total of $146,000.

With respect to Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment to close the gun show loophole last week, the Center found that those who voted against that amendment had received an average of over $10,478 from gun rights groups, while those who voted for it averaged only $297. I say this not to cast aspersions on any Senator's vote, but because I think the public record of our debate on these issues would be incomplete without this information.

There have been other improvements made in the bill as a result of the debate here on the floor and negotiations among Senators and the Managers. The final bill now reasonably protects the privacy of juvenile offender records. The amendment to ensure the separation of children from adult prisoners in mixed prison settings also was adopted.

This good work, however, is not enough to undo the harm that this bill will do to our nation's children.

We have strong evidence that prevention reduces crime. According to the Children's Defense Fund, in the first year after the Baltimore Police Department opened an after-school program in a high-crime area, crime in that neighborhood dropped 42%. Cincinnati's crime rate dropped 24% since it instituted violence prevention, education, social and recreation programs. And in Fort Worth, Texas, gang-related crime dropped by 26% as a result of a gang reduction program.

Now, the Hatch-Biden amendment takes us part of the way there by allowing 25% of funding for juvenile block grants to be allocated to prevention efforts. But frankly, that's not enough. We need to do more. Our children's future demands that we do more.

The Juvenile Justice bill emphasizes detention and intervention after juveniles have already gotten into trouble. The bill, however, does not provide sensible, adequate funding for prevention programs. Programs that will help to ensure that kids will not turn to crime and violence and will never have to experience handcuffs slapped on their wrists or the inside of a detention center.

This bill also deeply troubles me because it will put a halt to efforts to reduce discrimination in our juvenile justice system. The bill ignores reality: we are throwing African-American kids into jails at a higher rate than white kids who commit the exact same offense. This phenomenon is called disproportionate minority confinement.

Our Nation has come a long way toward achieving racial harmony and

equality, but we still have a long way to go. In nearly every state, children of minority racial and ethnic backgrounds are over-represented at every stage of the juvenile justice system and receive harsher treatment by the system. A California study has shown that black youths consistently receive harsher punishment and are more likely to receive jail time than white youths convicted of the same offenses. Current law requires states to identify disproportionate minority confinement in their states, to analyze why it exists and to develop strategies to address the causes of disproportionate minority confinement. The law does not require and has never resulted in the release of juveniles. Nor does the law provide for quotas. And no state's funding under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act has ever been reduced as a result of non-compliance.

In fact, the current law has been very effective. Forty states are implementing or developing intervention plans to address disproportionate minority confinement. This bill will bring to a halt this good work conducted by the states. These states have just begun to address the disturbing reality of disproportionate minority confinement. But under this Juvenile Justice bill, the law enforcement community will no longer be required to address the problem of discriminatory treatment of minority juvenile offenders. This is outrageous.

I am outraged, and this body should be outraged, that we are punishing black kids more harshly than white kids for the exact same offenses. The debate on this issue illustrated how much more work we still need to do on civil rights. Many of my colleagues would have you believe that there is no longer a race problem in this country. I beg to differ. To those colleagues, I ask you to look around this chamber and identify for me the Senator of African descent. You cannot because there is not one. I am troubled that on this and other important civil rights issues, we do not have a member of the African-American community as one of our colleagues. I cannot help but think that our debate would have been better informed if we had the voice of an African-American Senator speaking at one of our podiums. I cannot help but think that the vote on the Wellstone-Kennedy amendment would have had a different outcome if we had the vote of an African-American Senator cast on this floor.

We have come a long way toward ridding our nation of discrimination against African Americans and other minorities. But we need to keep forging ahead for the good of our children and the future of our country. Let us not turn back the clock.

The bill also does more harm than good by shifting the burden to the child to show why he or she should be tried in a juvenile court, not as an adult. Under current law, federal judges, not prosecutors, decide whether a child will be tried as an adult after a full hearing. If the prosecutor believes that a child should be charged as an adult, the prosecutor goes to court and puts on evidence to establish why the child should be tried as an adult. This is called a ''waiver'' hearing. The prosecutor must show reason for the judge to waive the child into adult court.

Now, under the Juvenile Justice bill, the prosecutor would be able to charge children as young as 14 as adults if they have allegedly committed a felony. The child—not the prosecutor—would request a hearing to prove to the judge that he or should be treated as a child.

There is great wisdom in the current law. The decision to prosecute a child as an adult is a serious one that will profoundly impact that child's life and the sentence that will follow conviction. It is better to leave that decision to an impartial judge, not the prosecutor.

Finally, I must cast my vote against this bill because it creates yet another federal death penalty. The Senate unfortunately passed the Hatch-Feinstein amendment, which will allow imposition of the death penalty against persons who cause the death of another person during an act of animal enterprise terrorism. I have been, and continue to be, a strong, steadfast opponent of the death penalty. In my view, the death penalty is unconstitutional under the Eighth Amendment, which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment. And it is morally wrong for a civilized society to continue to impose this penalty. We should lock up offenders for life, but we should not take their lives.

In sum, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to heed the advice of skilled professionals who work with our youth every day. Organizations like the Children's Defense Fund, the Youth Law Center, the National Network for Youth have expressed their serious opposition to the bill. These organizations represent the thousands of people who are conducting effective after-school programs, providing counseling to troubled youth and other necessary services to our children at risk. In other words, these organizations are the experts. The experts believe that, although the bill is much improved over last year's juvenile justice bill and corrects some problems in the original bill as it came to the floor last week, the final bill is still a regressive solution to juvenile crime.

Let us put aside our partisanship for the sake of our children's and our Nation's future. I must oppose this juvenile justice bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, Senate bill 254 does not, in my opinion, warrant passage. I will vote against the bill because it is fundamentally fraudulent. First, it wrongly assumes that Washington, DC has the answers to juvenile crime and the right to impose its will over that of state and local communities. Second, it is fraudulent because it promises billions of dollars for new programs that will not be implemented because the money is simply not available.

To hold out the false hope that the federal government can, through the passage of yet another law, offer an easy solution detracts from the important, and admittedly difficult, work that must continue in our homes, schools and communities.

As difficult as it may be for many of my colleagues to accept, the cure for the violence and disrespect for life that is prevalent in our society, particularly in our younger generations, will not be found in this body by passing another federal law. I wish it were that easy. The cure will be found after a great deal of soul-searching by our nation at all levels. Parents must re-engage in their children's lives. Schools must work harder to spot the warning signs displayed by our troubled youth and take action before tragedy occurs. And those who market gratuitous violence—whether it be through television, movies, video games or the Internet—must consider the responsibility they have to society, as well as to their bottom line. Most decisions should be made in our communities, not in the Congress. States should be allowed to experiment with a wide range of programs, not told what to do by Washington D.C.

I recognize some positive elements in this bill. The relaxation, for example, of the strict sight and sound separation requirements between juvenile and adult prisoners is a common sense change consistent with the views expressed by law enforcement officials in my state. Although I support the Ashcroft Amendment that gives local educators the flexibility to treat equally all students who bring guns to schools, the law it amends is fundamentally flawed and requires more thorough debate. I intend to have this debate later this year.

The positive elements in S. 254, however, are outweighed by the negative: the bill usurps state, local, and private sector authority, both in spirit and in practice. For example, although S. 254 makes federal juvenile adjudication and conviction records available to schools in certain circumstances, thus permitting school officials knowledge of the conceivable monstrous acts of a prospective student, it then prohibits all schools, once privy to that information, from using it in admissions decisions.

The bill makes promises we cannot keep and creates expectations we cannot meet.

S. 254 authorizes prodigious amounts of federal funds for numerous programs, and the promise of these monies has led to considerable fighting over their allocation, particularly over earmarking funds for crime prevention programs. While the debate between prevention and punishment is an important one, it is, unfortunately, also

hollow in this case: it is extremely unlikely that many of the programs authorized in S. 254 will be funded at anywhere near the levels authorized, if at all.

Much to my dismay and those of other appropriators, it is unclear whether we will be able this year to meet current commitments to juvenile justice and law enforcement. In the budget he sent to Congress, the President eliminated numerous federal grant programs and gutted others. The Byrne Grants that have been put to such good use in Washington state to, among other things establish multi-jurisdictional drug task forces, were reduced by more than 20% in the President's budget. Local law enforcement block grants, for which $523 million was appropriated in 1999, and which are used for a range of law enforcement needs, from putting more officers on the streets to improving law enforcement communications systems, were eliminated entirely. Grants to states for prison construction, a $720 million program in 1999, was reduced to $75 million in the President's FY2000 budget. Put another way: our first priority ought to be funding our current crime prevention programs, rather than adding a passel of new ones we frankly cannot afford.

Regrettably, many of the philosophical and practical concerns I have with this legislation simply were not addressed during the many long days it has been on the floor because we have spent so much time debating gun amendments. I firmly believe in common sense gun safety procedures as long as they do not infringe on the Second Amendment freedoms of law abiding adults. Several times this week I voted for amendments that would help to promote gun safety or keep guns out of the hands of criminals, and just as often I voted against amendments that infringed on second amendment rights that would not effectively do this. Never, however, did I vote on an amendment that I thought would have prevented the recent tragedies in Georgia and Colorado.

And so, with regret, I cannot join my colleagues in misleading the American people in promising that through this, or any other, bill, we will make their communities and schools safe again.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I am pleased that my amendment to the pending Juvenile Justice bill was included in a package of amendments cleared by the managers. I would like to talk briefly about why this provision is crucial to combatting school violence.

As I am sure many of my colleagues are aware, the Holland Woods Middle School in Port Huron, Michigan, made national news this past week. Four children, the youngest of them 12 years old, were arrested for plotting to do ''something worse'' than the tragedy that occurred in Littleton, Colorado. Police in Port Huron believe that the plot was more than a prank. They believe the students planned to rob a gun store for the weapons needed to carry out their plan.

Here we have yet another sign, Mr. President, of the epidemic in this country of violence and fear in our schools.

All across the country, schools are experiencing bomb threats and students and teachers are beginning to fear entering the classroom. The Detroit News front page headline from yesterday summed it up: ''Fear, threats invade Metro classrooms.'' The News went on to report that one-third of the 560 students at Holland Woods Middle School stayed home Monday, the first day of classes since police discovered the plot to massacre students there.

Mr. President, students should not fear for their lives when they enter the school building. Indeed, they have a right not to be put in this kind of fear, particularly on school grounds.

I believe we must do more to help schools deal with threats of violence. We must give schools more options to prevent the type of tragedy that occurred in Littleton and that also might have occurred in Port Huron.

Following the incident in Holland Woods Middle School, Assistant Superintendent Thomas Miller outlined the school system's response to increasing security at their schools. The school system's plan would include 24-hour security guard surveillance at all schools and a bomb-sniffing dog. Other proposed security measures could include metal detectors, the elimination of coats in classrooms and photo identification badges for pupils and teachers.

Mr. President, my provision would allow schools facing these serious security problems to access Safe and Drug Free School money to address their security needs and to truly keep their schools ''safe.''

In light of the growing number of violence in our schools and an increase in the number of threats, we must provide local school districts with further, effective options in combatting the proliferation of guns, explosives, and other weapons in our schools.

My provision will also help schools deal with the scourge of drugs, a scourge which not only ruins individual lives but also breeds the kinds of isolation, maladjustment and violence we have seen so often in recent years.

Currently, school districts may use funds allocated under the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act for a variety of programs aimed at reducing drug use and school violence. School districts need additional options. My amendment would allow local school districts to access funding under the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act for use in conducting locker searches for guns, explosives, other weapons, or drugs and for the drug testing of students.

Drug use constitutes a full-fledged epidemic in our schools, Mr. President. In a recent Luntz survey, three fourths of high school students said that their schools are not drug free. 41 percent reported seeing drugs sold on school grounds. And now the drug menace is moving into our middle schools. 46 percent, almost half of our middle school kids, go to schools that are not drug free.

With the explosion in drug use we also have seen a massive proliferation of guns in our schools. The Departments of Education and Justice report that 6,093 students were expelled for bringing guns to school during the 1996–97 school year alone.

This is the situation supposedly addressed by the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act. So, what is this act, written into law in 1986 and with current funding levels at $566 million, accomplishing? Tragically little, Mr. President.

Congress passed the Safe and Drug Free School Act allocating funds to fight drug use and the violence it breeds. But that money is not being spent wisely, on programs that actually succeed in reducing drug use and gun violence in our schools.

Instead, Mr. President, a report in the Los Angeles Times has found that grant money is being used to pay for questionable activities like motivational speakers, puppet shows, tickets to Disneyland, dunking booths and magic shows. Surely we can use this law for something more than what President Clinton's own drug Czar, General Barry McCaffrey, calls a program to ''mail out checks.''

Our children and their teachers deserve better. Indeed, Mr. President, they are demanding better. For three years running, teens in the Luntz survey have deemed drugs the most important problem they face. Most teens favor random locker searches and drug testing of all students.

And their teachers agree. Four out of five teachers favor locker searches and a zero tolerance policy on drugs. Two thirds favor at least some form of drug testing.

Mr. President, our teachers and our children have recognized the obvious: we must find those who are bringing guns and explosives into our schools if we are to stop gun and other forms of violence affecting our kids

By the same token, Mr. President, you must find those who are using and dealing drugs before you can effectively deal with the drug problem in our schools.

My amendment accepts the common sense logic expressed by our teachers and students.

My amendment does nothing to alter the availability of funds for other options in the fight against drugs and gun violence in our schools. It merely adds to the list the option of using these funds for locker searches and drug testing. It, rightly in my view, leaves the final decision on these issues to those who know the needs of their schools best—local authorities. But it adds an important option to the list from which they can choose.

I am pleased that this common sense proposal has been cleared by the managers.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, with the passage of the Juvenile Justice bill today the Senate took a positive step forward in addressing the youth violence that we have sadly seen far too much of in recent weeks.

One month ago today, we watched in horror as children turned violent against other children, and we asked ourselves why? Today, again, we've seen the horror of a high school student firing a weapon at his schoolmates. There is no one cause of this youth violence, the causes are many but the common denominator in all of these school shootings cannot be ignored or denied: the easy access our young people have to guns.

If there is one silver lining in what happened at Littleton it's that this event has become a catalyst for the Senate to finally begin to overcome the disproportionate influence of the gun lobby and to close a few of the gaping loopholes in our federal gun laws which give our youth such easy access to guns.

Over the last few weeks, with the Juvenile Justice bill on the floor of the Senate, we have taken important steps to strengthen our current laws. We have passed legislation to prohibit juveniles from owning semiautomatic weapons and large capacity ammunition devices. We have banned the importation of big ammunition clips, which have been flooding into the United States by the millions. The Senate passed an amendment requiring that handguns be sold with trigger locking devices to protect children. And just this morning, the Senate, by one vote, the deciding vote cast by Vice President GORE, passed legislation to regulate the sale of firearms at guns shows, ensuring juveniles and others cannot use these shows as a convenient way to circumvent the safeguards applied to normal sales through licensed gun dealers.

Mr. President, I believe it's clear that the American people support the actions we have taken. In fact, I am hopeful that we will build on these first steps, for example, to ban semiautomatic assault weapons and handguns for persons under 21 years of age. This may be one of our most important tasks yet. According the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms' Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative, the two most frequent ages at which crimes are committed with gun possession are 18 and 19. In 1997, 22% of those arrested for murder were 18, 19 or 20 years old.

This legislation clearly falls short of closing all of the loopholes which allow our youth easy access to deadly weapons. However, in the wake of the tragedy at Littleton, the Senate has taken critical steps forward. This is a victory for the good sense of the American people over the entrenched interests of NRA lobbyists in Washington.

Mr. President, in addition to preventing our youth from having access to deadly weapons, we must also ensure that schools have access to proven violence prevention programs designed to meet the particular needs of the students. The bill provides $250 million in grants for projects that allow schools to partner with the U.S. Department of Justice and police officers in crime prevention; $113 million for creative on-site school violence prevention programs and alcohol nd drug counseling; and amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to make funds available for training in school safety and violence prevention, crisis preparedness, mentoring and anti-violence programs.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the passage of this Juvenile Justice Bill represents an important step forward for those of us who have expressed concern for the safety and well-being of America's young people. I am pleased that in spite of the tensions and the controversies that have marked these past weeks in the United States Senate, we are, in the final analysis, able to come together as a Senate in support of certain principles that we know are absolutely essential if we are to reform our nation's juvenile justice policy to reflect modern life and the needs of all our children in this nation.

The aftermath of the tragic school shootings in Littleton and even the violence today in Atlanta underscored for all of us the importance of getting serious about juvenile justice. In this debate here in the Senate about juvenile justice, we heard a great deal about efforts to keep guns out of the hands of violent students, we heard about efforts to try juvenile offenders as adults, about stiffer sentences, about so many answers to the problem of kids who have run out of second and third chances—kids who are violent, kids who are committing crimes, children who are a danger to themselves and a danger to those around him. I was a prosecutor in Massachusetts before I entered elected office. I have seen these violent teenagers and young people come to court, and let me tell you, there is nothing more tragic than seeing these children who—in too many cases —have a jail cell in their future not far down the road, children who have done what is, at times, irreparable harm to their communities.

I am pleased we are passing a bill today which demonstrates we don't only begin to care about these kids at that point —after the violence, after the arrest, after the damage has been done, when it may be too late—when we could have started intervening in our kids' lives early on, before it was too late. We can say that we have had a real debate about juvenile justice because we are passing a bill that makes some critical investments in vital early childhood development efforts, but a great deal of work remains undone.

The truth is that early intervention can have a powerful effect on reducing government welfare, health, criminal justice, and education expenditures in the long run. By taking steps now we can reduce later destructive behavior such as dropping out of school, drug use, and criminal acts like the ones we have seen in Littleton and Jonesboro. We are doing that in this bill—but we should be doing far more.

A study of the High/Scope Foundation's Perry Preschool found that at-risk toddlers who received pre-schooling and a weekly home visit reduced the risk that these children would grow up to become chronic law breakers by a startling 80 percent. The Syracuse University Family Development Study showed that providing quality early-childhood programs to families until children reached age five reduces the children's risk of delinquency 10 years later by 90 percent. It is no wonder that a recent survey of police chiefs found that nine out of ten said that ''America could sharply reduce crime if government invested more'' in these early intervention programs.

I know it can work. I visited an incredible center, the Castle Square Early Childhood Development Center in Boston, and I saw kids getting the attention they need during the day while their parents work, children being held and read to, and cared for, children who aren't raising themselves, parents who come in and volunteer in the evening and take classes there so they can better take care of their kids when they're sick or when they need special attention. But you know what, for the sixty kids in that program, there are six hundred on a waiting list.

There is the Early Childhood Initiative in Allegheny County, PA—one of the first pilot programs in this country which gave life to the kind of legislation we're passing here today—an innovative program which helps low-income children from birth to age five become successful, productive adults by enrolling them in high quality, neighborhood-based early care and education programs ranging from Head Start, center-based child care, home-based child care, and school readiness programs. ECI draws on everything that's right about Allegheny County—the strengths of its communities—neighborhood decision-making, parent involvement, and quality measurement. Parents and community groups decide if they want to participate and they come together and develop a proposal tailored for the community. Regular review programs ensure quality programming and cost-effectiveness. We're talking about local control getting results locally: 19,000 pre-school aged children from low-income families, 10,000 of which were not enrolled in any child care or education program. By the year 2000, through funding supplied by ECI, approximately 75% of these under-served pre-schoolers will be reached. Early evaluations show that enrolled children are achieving at rates equivalent to their middle income peers. And as we know, without this leveling of the playing field, low-

income children are at a greater risk of encountering the juvenile justice system. That's a real difference.

These kinds of programs are successful because children's experiences during their early years of life lay the foundation for their future development. But in too many places in this country our failure to provide young children what they need during these crucial early years has long-term consequences and costs for America.

Recent Scientific evidence conclusively demonstrates that enhancing children's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development will result in tremendous benefits for children, families, and our nation. The electrical activity of brain cells actually changes the physical structure of the brain itself. Without a stimulating environment, the baby's brain suffers. At birth, a baby's brain contains 100 billion neurons, roughly as many nerve cells as there are stars in the Milky Way. But the wiring pattern between these neurons develops over time. Children who play very little or are rarely touched develop brains 20 to 30 percent smaller than normal for their age.

Reversing these problems later in life is far more difficult and costly. We know that—if it wasn't so much harder, we wouldn't be having this difficult debate in the Senate.

I think it is time we talked about giving our kids the right start in their lives they need to be healthy, to be successful, to mature in a way that doesn't lead to at-risk and disruptive behavior and violence down the road.

We should stop and consider what is really at stake here. Poverty seriously impairs young children's language development, math skills, IQ scores, and their later school completion. Poor young children also are at heightened risk of infant mortality, anemia, and stunted growth. Of the 12 million children under the age of 3 in the United States today, 3 million—25 percent—live in poverty. Three out of five mothers with children under three work, but one study found that 40 percent of the facilities at child care centers serving infants provided care of such poor quality as to actually jeopardize children's health, safety, or development. In more than half of the states, one out of every four children between 19 months and three years of age is not fully immunized against common childhood diseases. Children who are not immunized are more likely to contract preventable diseases, which can cause long-term harm. Children younger than three make up 27 percent of the one million children who are determined to be abused or neglected each year. Of the 1,200 children who died from abuse and neglect in 1995, 85 percent were younger than five and 45 percent were younger than one.

Unfortunately, our Government expenditure patterns have been inverse to the most important early development period for human beings. Although we know that early investment can dramatically reduce later remedial and social costs, our nation has spent no more than $35 billion over five years on federal programs for at-risk or delinquent youth and child welfare programs.

That is a course we are taking some steps to change today. We are starting to talk in a serious and a thoughtful way—through a bipartisan approach—about making a difference in the lives of our children before they're put at risk. We are starting to accept the truth that we can do a lot more to help our kids grow up healthy with promising futures in an early childhood development center, in a classroom, and in a doctor's office than we can in a courtroom or in a jail cell. But we could be doing much more.

These issues are now a part of this juvenile justice debate. But they need to be a bigger part of every debate we have about our kids' future. My colleague KIT BOND and I reintroduced yesterday our Early Childhood Development Act which we had previously introduced in the last Congress, and which had passed as part of the tobacco legislation last summer. That bill moves us forward in a bipartisan way towards a different kind of discussion about juvenile justice—and towards actions we can take to provide meaningful intervention in the lives of all of our children. I am appreciative of the deep support we've found for our approach in this legislation by Senator STEVENS, Senator JEFFORDS, Senator DODD, Senator KENNEDY and all of the cosponsors of the original Kerry Bond bill: Senator HOLLINGS, Senator JOHNSON, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator LEVIN, Senator MOYNIHAN, Senator WELLSTONE, and my colleague from New Jersey, Senator BOB TORRICELLI. I am pleased to join Senators STEVENS and KENNEDY in supporting parenting, but as we expressed in our sense-of-the-Senate amendment there is much more we need to be doing in terms of broader early childhood development efforts—we need a more comprehensive approach.

In this legislation we have taken an important step towards recognizing the importance of early childhood development programs for our children, as well as the responsibility of the Congress to make early childhood investments a priority in our budget process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 140 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Abraham	Edwards	Mack
Akaka	Feinstein	McConnell
Allard	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Frist	Moynihan
Baucus	Graham	Murkowski
Bayh	Grams	Murray
Bennett	Hagel	Reed
Biden	Harkin	Reid
Bingaman	Hatch	Robb
Bond	Inouye	Rockefeller
Boxer	Jeffords	Roth
Breaux	Johnson	Santorum
Bryan	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Byrd	Kerrey	Schumer
Chafee	Kerry	Sessions
Cleland	Kohl	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Kyl	Snowe
Collins	Landrieu	Specter
Conrad	Lautenberg	Stevens
Daschle	Leahy	Thurmond
DeWine	Levin	Torricelli
Dodd	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lincoln	Wyden
Dorgan	Lott	
Durbin	Lugar	

NAYS—25

Brownback	Gorton	Roberts
Bunning	Gramm	Shelby
Burns	Grassley	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Gregg	Thomas
Coverdell	Helms	Thompson
Craig	Hutchinson	Voinovich
Crapo	Hutchison	Wellstone
Enzi	Inhofe	
Feingold	Nickles	

NOT VOTING—2

Hollings	McCain

The bill (S. 254) was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. HATCH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent 5 minutes be given to myself and Senator LEAHY, in that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the past, time seemed to roll past school shootings and similar tragedies. The public was quickly distracted. Yet, Littleton was different. The need to do something about the serious problem of youth violence has always been apparent. The tragedy of a month ago gave us the ingenuity and dedication to follow through.

I have said since the outset of this debate that this issue is a complex problem and one which requires dedication and a spirit of cooperation. I felt that we needed to examine this and other acts of school violence and not single-out one politically attractive interest as a cause. In doing what's right for our children and in doing what's right for the public at large, our personal interests had to take a back seat. While I believe the cooperative spirit was lacking on occasion, I believe that the Senate has crafted a consensus product and one which I intend to support.

At the start of this debate, I along with several of my colleagues announced a comprehensive plan to respond to the problem of violent juvenile crime. Our Youth Violence Plan contains four main components:

1. Prevention and Enforcement Assistance to State and Local Government;
2. Parental Empowerment and Stemming the Influence of Cultural Violence;
3. Getting Tough on Violent Juveniles and Those Who Commit Violent Crimes with a Firearm; and
4. Providing for Safe and Secure Schools.

Each element of this plan—all of it—is included in S. 254 as amended.

I. Prevention & Enforcement Assistance to State and Local Government: The first tier of this plan involved passage of the underlying bill—S. 254, the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender and Accountability Act. We have provided a targeted infusion of funds to State and local authorities to combat juvenile crime. S. 254 provides over $1 billion a year to the States to fight juvenile crime and prevent juvenile delinquency. We need to reach out to young children early in life, insure that parents are empowered to do what they believe is best for their children, and take meaningful steps to give local education and enforcement officials the tools they need to hold violent juveniles accountable. S. 254 accomplishes this goal.

II. Parental Empowerment and Stemming the Influence of Cultural Violence: The second tier of our plan involved Congress taking steps to empower parents, educators and the entertainment industry to do more to limit the exposure of America's children to violence in our popular culture. We offered several amendments to the underlying bill which furthered this leg of our plan and all of them passed the Senate. For example, this bill gives parents the power to screen undesirable material from entering their homes over the Internet. We have given the entertainment industry the tools it needs to develop and enforce pre-existing ratings systems so that children are not exposed to material that the industry itself has deemed unsuitable for children. And we have established a National Commission on Youth Violence. It is time for us to hold Hollywood—and the rest of the entertainment industry—a bit more accountable.

III. Getting Tough on Violent Juveniles and Enforce Existing Law: A third tier of our plan insured that violent juveniles—teenagers who commit violent crimes—will be held accountable. Part of the solution is to insure that when a teenager brings a gun to school, he or she is held accountable by school authorities and the criminal justice system. We take care of this in the bill. We also extend the Youth Handgun Safety Act to semi-automatic assault rifles. The bill before the Senate contains reforms like the juvenile Brady provision—a measure which will prohibit firearms possession by violent juvenile offenders. We increase penalties for transferring a gun to a minor and other corrupting acts.

Most importantly, we respond to the biggest of gun law loopholes—the Clinton Administration's failure to enforce the gun laws already on the books. We insure that the Department of Justice will fulfill its obligation to enforce the law. Prosecuting violent gun offenders will be made a priority for this Administration whether they like it or not.

IV. Safe and Secure Schools: The fourth element of our plan revolves around the basic right that all students share—the right to receive the quality education they deserve. Our teachers and students need to know that their school is safe and that, should they take action to deal with a violent student, the teacher will be protected. Our bill promotes safe and secure schools, free of undue disruption and violence, so that our teachers can teach and our children can learn. We provide greater flexibility to local communities in how they use federal education funds. We also provide teachers with limited civil liability protection should they take action to remove a problem child from school.

These are just some of the many, many reforms contained in this bill. There has been a sense among many Americans that we are powerless to reverse the trend of violence. People believe we are powerless to deal with violent juvenile crime and that we are powerless to change our culture. It is this feeling of powerlessness which threatened our collective ambition for meaningful, penetrating solutions in the wake of the Littleton tragedy. I believe the Senate has taken a meaningful step towards shedding this defeatism.

Do I agree with everything in this bill? No. For example, I oppose to the gun show regulatory and taxing amendment. But addressing this gun show issue has been evolutionary. Both sides have moved on this and—perhaps—we can find common ground as the bill moves through the House and conference.

Given the seriousness of our youth violence problem—and the number of warning signs that tragedies will continue unless all of us come together—we must move forward. We should join together and pass this bill.

Finally, in closing I want to end this debate with a reminder. We have been on this bill for two weeks talking about violent juvenile crime, about the events in Littleton, about kids who use guns, and about kids influenced by violence in the media. Unfortunately, all of that is very true.

But let us not lose sight of the fact that there are millions of kids in this country, hundreds of thousands in Utah, who are really good young people. We give a lot of attention and this bill focuses even more of it on young people who get into trouble with the law. Let's not forget that about the kids who fly straight. As we wrap up consideration of this bill, let's thank the millions of young people across this land that work hard, study long hours, respect and love their parents and friends, and care for others around them.

Mr. President, I would like added as cosponsors of this bill and have their names appear as cosponsors immediately following my name: Senator LEAHY, Senator SESSIONS, Senator BIDEN and Senator FEINSTEIN. I am very proud to be able to be the prime sponsor with these wonderful cosponsors.

Senator BIDEN was one of the first cosponsors on this bill. I am more than pleased that my ranking member, Senator LEAHY is a cosponsor and a prime cosponsor.

S. 254 is a testament to those who worked on it and a product which, on the whole, will help our young people and do something significant about the problems of juvenile crime.

I want to thank a few of the people who have worked on this bill. Let me first acknowledge the Majority Leader who worked with me to keep this bill alive. Given the demanding Senate schedule, it would have been easier for him to have refused to take up the bill or pull it down. We have a bill passing the Senate because he wanted to do what's right.

Let me also acknowledge Ranking Member, Senator LEAHY. He and I reached agreement on this important bill after much discussion and he ably managed the bill for his side of the aisle.

I also want to commend Senator SESSIONS—the Chairman of the Youth Violence Subcommittee. S. 254 became the vehicle for quite of bit of politically charged legislation but it was Senator SESSIONS who stayed on me for more than two years and who never lost sight of the need to make the juvenile justice reforms we make in the underlying bill.

Also, let me commend Senator BIDEN who came on this bill as a cosponsor when others were unwilling. A leader on crime control issues, he was instrumental in setting a cooperative tone which helped get this bill moving.

Senator ALLARD, Senator CRAIG, Senator BROWNBACK, and Senator ASHCROFT are to be commended for their leadership and counsel. Senator FEINSTEIN should be applauded for her cooperation. There are many others but I will end it there.

At the staff level, I want to commend several people.

First, on the Judiciary Committee staff, let me acknowledge a few people who have worked very hard on this bill. Committee Counsels Rhett Dehart and Mike Kennedy are to be commended for their lead work on this important bill. When others were skeptical about its prospects they were there to make the substantive case for moving this bill.

They worked very hard, for several years, to get this bill introduced, reported, and passed. This bill's passage is a testament to their tireless efforts.

In addition, I want to acknowledge and thank Kristi Lee, the Chief Counsel of the Youth Violence subcommittee for her work.

I also want to commend a few others on the Committee Staff: Sharon Prost, Anna Cabral, Ed Haden, Craig Wolf, Catherine Campbell, David Muhlhausen, Leah Belaire, Makan Delrahim, Jeanne Lopatto, Alison Vinson, Joelle Scott, Elle Parker, Krista Redd, and Luke Austin. They all worked around the clock on this bill. The amount of preparation that goes into these bills is significant and they were given little time to prepare for the floor. They are a great staff and I thank them for their efforts. Thanks as well should be given to the Committee's Chief Counsel and Staff Director, Manus Cooney. He is one of the first staff directors in the committee's history.

On Senator LEAHY's committee staff I want to acknowledge the Minority Chief Counsel—Bruce Cohen for his cooperative efforts and leadership. Beryl Howell, Senator LEAHY's General Counsel should also be commended for her substantive work on the underlying Hatch-Leahy substitute and managers' package. Ed Barron is a true gentleman and an able lawyer.

Let me also acknowledge the Youth Violence Subcommittee's Minority Chief Counsel, Sheryl Walter and Glen Shor with the Criminal Justice Overight Subcommittee.

Others I would be remiss in not mentioning include:

Dave Hoppie, Robert Wilkie, and Jim Hecht of the Majority Leader's staff;

Stewart Verdery and Eric Euland of the Whip's office;

Ken Foss, Candi Wolff, and Jade West of the Policy Committee;

Mike Bennett, Karen Knutson, Kris Ardizzone, David Crane, and Paul Clement.

Let me acknowledge the hard work of Mary Kay MacMillan, Tony Coe, Bill Jensen, and Tim Trushel of the Senate Legislative Counsel's office, who all put in extraordinary effort in preparing this bill and many amendments.

And finally, I would be remiss if I did not express thanks to our wonderful floor and cloakroom staff: Elizabeth Letchworth, Dave Schiappa, Tripp Baird, Malloy McDaniel, Marshall Hiton, Dan Dukes, Laura Martin, and Myra Baron. These folks keep things running during our hectic debates, and we appreciate them.

I am very grateful to finally have this ordeal over. It has been a very, very difficult bill, as all of these crime bills usually are. I think if anybody tries to make this just a gun bill, they have missed the point of what we have accomplished here.

Sure, there have been some amendments on guns that are very crucial and very important in the eyes of many people on the floor, but this bill is so much more—ranging from accountability, calling on youth to be responsible for their actions, to prevention moneys. For the first time in years, we have balanced prevention and accountability and law enforcement. The law enforcement aspect will help bring the law down on violent juveniles and others who aid them in committing these crimes. We have made real inroads and we have taken a number of very important steps with regard to changing the culture of violence in our society. That is important. Yes, we faced some tough amendments on guns. I don't like all of the results on this bill. But the fact of the matter is, they were votes, they were voted up and down, the Senate has spoken, and we need to recognize that for what it is.

At this point I again express my appreciation to my friend, Senator LEAHY, for the patience he has had with me, the patience he has had on the floor, the assistance he has been. It has been a real privilege to work for him. I respect and admire him and hope to do a lot of constructive things with him in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Utah for his kind remarks. We have worked very closely together on this. We have seen a bill go through a major evolution on the floor. Frankly, that is what the Senate should do in working its will through a bill. But I must say to my friend from Utah, I do not think that would have been possible if he and I had not been able to work together, if we had not been in constant contact, day by day, hour by hour and, perhaps to his regret at times, minute by minute.

I once said Senators are merely constitutional impediments to their staff—maybe I said it more than once. If we had not had superb staffs working on this, I do not know what we could have done.

We had Senators who came together, even though they normally seem politically far apart. The distinguished Senator from Alabama, Senator SESSIONS, an original cosponsor of this bill; the distinguished Senator from Delaware, Senator BIDEN; myself and Senator HATCH—coming together, bringing so many other Senators together.

One need only look at the major managers' package we passed. I say to my friend from Utah, I think when we introduced our managers' amendment that, as much as anything, broke the logjam and made passage of this bill possible. We tried to accommodate many Senators on both sides of the aisle who had legitimate matter of concern. In that process we came together to shape a bill. The managers' amendment agreement was more than just saying what is good for one Senator or another Senator. This is a juvenile justice bill and the managers' amendment helped shape the contours of that collective product.

As a parent, I think back to the time when my children were going to school. I thought what a happy and wonderful time in their life it was. I knew it was one place where they were safe. We did not have to worry about anything more than, did they study enough for their geometry test or history test or did they get their English assignment in on time? The worst injury you might worry about was if somebody in the playground was to slip and fall and bruise an arm or a leg.

Parents should not have to worry about their children going to school. But even today as we debated this—as we talked about Columbine, where the President and the First Lady were traveling today—we saw, again, on the TV, pictures of another school shooting by another juvenile in Georgia, leaving children injured and being flown to a hospital. Every parent in this country is reminded, again, that often today our children are not safe, even when we send them off to a place where they should be. That is not the way it should be.

We have worked tirelessly on this bill. I think it is a better bill than when it began. The intentions were always the same: To make sure our juveniles are safe, our people are safe, that we choose the right course for juveniles when they do commit crimes.

The Senate has improved this bill. It is more comprehensive and more respectful of the core protections in the Federal juvenile legislation that served us well in past decades. It is more respectful of the primary role of the States in prosecuting these matters. We do recognize that no legislation is perfect, legislation alone is not enough to stop youth violence.

I hope parents, teachers, and juveniles themselves will stop and say: Can we not do better? Can we not have time together? Can we not love our children as we should? Can we not love each other as we should? Can we not look at some of the principles I knew so well when I was growing up, given to me by my parents, principles I hope my wife and I passed on to our children?

Can we not go to those basic principles and understand, even in a country of a quarter of a billion people, that we do not need the violence we see in this country?

It is not just a question of gun control. It is not just a question of more courts or more police. It is not just a question of more laws. But it is a question of, what do we want to be as a nation? We are blessed in this nation. We are the most powerful, wealthiest nation history has ever known. We live better than anybody ever could have imagined. We have so much going for us. Should not we stop and say, when it comes to our children, the most precious resource we have, that we must do all that we can to protect them and nurture them and teach them to be responsible?

Since we began consideration of this important legislation last week, we

have gotten both good news and bad news on the crime front. We got the good news at the beginning of this week when the FBI released the latest crime rate statistics showing a decline in serious crime for the seventh consecutive year. Preliminary reports indicate that the rate of serious violent and property crime in this country went down another 7 percent in 1998, with robbery down 11 percent, murders down 8 percent, car thefts down 10 percent, and declines in other crime categories as well.

But we are all acutely aware that we also got bad news today. Yet another school shooting by a juvenile—this time in Georgia—with children injured and being flown to hospitals. Every parent in this country is reminded again that our children are not safe, even when we send them off to a place where they should be. The only thing parents should have to worry about when they wave good-bye to their children in the morning is whether their child remembered his or her homework and lunch money. They should not have to worry about whether they will get shot.

The growing list of schoolyard shootings by children in Arkansas, Washington, Oregon, Tennessee, California, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Mississippi, last month in Littleton, Colorado, and today in Georgia, is simply unacceptable and intolerable.

Each one of us wants to do something to stop this violence. We have before us a bill that reflects hard work and committed effort on both sides of the aisle to address the juvenile crime problem. Senator HATCH and Senator SESSIONS have worked tirelessly for several years now to make a difference. While we have strongly disagreed in the past on the right approach to juvenile crime, I have always respected their good intentions. I am glad that this year we have continued the progress we made in the last Congress to find common ground on this important legislation.

In light of the significant improvements we have been able to make to the bill here on the Senate floor over the last eight days, the bill is a better, stronger and better balanced bill. It is more comprehensive and more respectful of the core protections in federal juvenile justice legislation that have served us so well over the last three decades. At the same time it is more respectful of the primary role of the states in prosecuting these matters. I greatly appreciate the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee adding me as a principal cosponsor of our bill.

I recognize, as we all do, that no legislation is perfect and that legislation alone is not enough to stop youth violence. We can pass an assortment of new laws and still turn on the news to find out that some child somewhere in the country has turned violent and turned on other children and teachers, with a gun or other weapon, with terrible results.

All of us—whether we are parents, grandparents, teachers, psychologists, or policy-makers—are puzzling over the causes of kids turning violent in our country. The root causes are likely multi-faceted. We can all point to inadequate parental involvement or supervision, over-crowded classrooms and over-sized schools that add to students' alienation, the easy accessibility of guns, the violence depicted on television, in movies and video games, or inappropriate content available on the Internet. There is no single cause and no single legislative solution that will cure the ill of youth violence in our schools or in our streets. Nevertheless, this legislation is a firm and significant step in the right direction.

I have said before that a good proposal that works should get the support of all of us. Our first question should be whether a program or proposal will help our children effectively, not whether it is a Democratic or Republican proposal. The Managers' amendment and package of amendments that the Chairman and I were able to put together for adoption yesterday reflects that philosophy. It shows that when this body rolls up its sleeves and gets to work, we can make significant progress. I commend the Chairman for his leadership in this effort and I am glad we were able to work together constructively to improve this bill.

This bill, S. 254, started out as a much-improved bill from the one reported by the Judiciary Committee in the last Congress. In fact, as I looked through this bill I was pleasantly surprised to see that proposals that the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee specifically voted down in 1997 were incorporated at the outset into this bill. These are changes that I and other Democrats have been urging on our Republican colleagues for the past few years, and that they have resisted until they quietly incorporated them into this bill.

Federalism. For example, I tried in July 1997 to amend S. 10 to protect the State's traditional prerogative in handling juvenile offenders and avoid the unnecessary federalization of juvenile crime that so concerns the Chief Justice and the Federal judiciary. Specifically, my 1997 amendment would have limited the federal trial as an adult of juveniles charged with nonviolent felonies to circumstances when the State is unwilling or unable to exercise jurisdiction. This amendment was defeated, with all the Republicans voting against it.

This bill, S. 254, contained a new provision designed to address these federalism concerns that would direct federal prosecutors to ''exercise a presumption in favor of referral'' of juvenile cases to the appropriate State or tribal authorities, where there is ''concurrent jurisdiction,'' unless the State declines jurisdiction and there is a substantial federal interest in the case. Yet, concerns remained that this bill would undermine a State's traditionally prerogative to handle juvenile offenders.

The changes we make to the underlying bill in the Hatch-Leahy Managers' amendment satisfy my concerns. For example, S. 254 as introduced would repeal the very first section of the Federal Criminal Code dealing with ''Correction of Youthful Offenders.'' This is the section that establishes a clear presumption that the States—not the federal government—should handle most juvenile offenders [18 U.S.C. section 5001]. While the original S. 254 would repeal that provision, the Managers' amendment retains it in slightly modified form.

In addition, the original S. 254 would require Federal prosecutors to refer most juvenile cases to the State in cases of ''concurrent jurisdiction . . . over both the offense and the juvenile.'' This language created a recipe for sharp lawyering. Federal prosecutors could avoid referral by simply claiming there was no ''concurrent'' jurisdiction over the ''offense'' due to linguistic or other differences between the federal and state crimes. Even if the juvenile's conduct violated both Federal and State law, any difference in how those criminal laws were written could be used to argue they were different offenses altogether. This was a huge loophole that could have allowed federal prosecutors to end-run the presumption of referral to the State.

We fix this in the Managers' Amendment, and clarify that whenever the federal government or the State have criminal laws that punish the same conduct and both have jurisdiction over the juvenile, federal prosecutors should refer the juvenile to the State in most instances.

Finally, I was concerned that, contrary to current law, a federal prosecutor's decision to proceed against a juvenile in federal court would not be subject to any judicial review. The Managers' Amendment would permit such judicial review, except in cases involving serious violent or serious drug offenses.

Federal Trial of Juveniles as Adults. Another area of concern has been the ease with which S. 254 would allow federal prosecutors to prosecute juveniles 14 years and older as adults for any felony. While I have long favored simplifying and streamlining current federal procedures for trying juveniles, I believe that judicial review is an important check in the system, particularly when you are dealing with children.

This bill, S. 254, included a ''reverse waiver'' proposal allowing for judicial review of most cases in which a juvenile is charged as an adult in federal court. I had suggested a similar proposal in July 1997, when I tried to amend S. 10 before the Judiciary Committee to permit limited judicial review of a federal prosecutor's decision to try certain juveniles as adults. S. 10 granted sole, non-reviewable authority to federal prosecutors to try juveniles

as adults for any federal felony, removing federal judges from that decision altogether. My 1997 amendment would have granted federal judges authority in appropriate cases to review a prosecutor's decision and to handle the juvenile case in a delinquency proceeding rather than try the juvenile as an adult.

Only three States in the country granted prosecutors the extraordinary authority over juvenile cases that S. 10 proposed, including Florida. Earlier this year, we saw the consequences of that kind of authority, when a local prosecutor in that State charged as an adult a 15-year-old mildly retarded boy with no prior record who stole $2 from a school classmate to buy lunch. The local prosecutor charged him as an adult and locked him up in an adult jail for weeks before national press coverage forced a review of the charging decision in the case.

This was not the kind of incident I wanted happening on the federal level. Unfortunately, my proposal for a ''reverse waiver'' procedure providing judicial review of a prosecutor's decision was voted down in Committee, with no Republican on the Committee voting for it.

I was pleased that S. 254 contained a ''reverse waiver'' provision, despite the Committee's rejection of this proposal two years ago. Though made belated, this was a welcome change in the bill. The Managers' amendment makes important improvements to that provision.

First, S. 254 gives a juvenile defendant only 20 days to file a reverse waiver motion after the date of the juvenile's first appearance. This time is too short, and could lapse before the juvenile is indicted and is aware of the actual charges. The Managers' amendment extends the time to make a reverse waiver motion to 30 days, which begins at the time the juvenile defendant appears to answer an indictment.

Second, S. 254 requires the juvenile defendant to show by ''clear and convincing'' evidence that he or she should be tried as a juvenile rather than an adult. This is a very difficult standard to meet, particularly under strict time limits. Thus, the Managers' amendment changes this standard to a ''preponderance'' of the evidence.

Juvenile Records. As initially introduced, S. 254 would require juvenile criminal records for any federal offense, no matter how petty, to be sent to the FBI. This criminal record would haunt the juvenile as he grew into an adult, with no possibility of expungement from the FBI's database.

The Managers' amendment makes important changes to this record requirement. The juvenile records sent to the FBI will be limited to acts that would be felonies if committed by an adult. In addition, under the Managers' amendment, a juvenile would be able after 5 years to petition the court to have the criminal record removed from the FBI database, if the juvenile can show by clear and convincing evidence that he or she is no longer a danger to the community. Expungement of records from the FBI's database does not apply to juveniles convicted of rape, murder or certain other serious felonies.

Increasing Witness Tampering Penalties. This bill, S. 254, also contains a provision to increase penalties for witness tampering that I first suggested and included in the ''Youth Violence, Crime and Drug Abuse Control Act of 1997,'' S. 15, which was introduced in the first weeks of the 105th Congress, at the end of the last Congress in the ''Safe Schools, Safe Streets and Secure Borders Act of 1998,'' S. 2484, and again in S. 9, the comprehensive package of crime proposals introduced with Senator DASCHLE at the beginning of this Congress. This provision would increase the penalty for using or threatening physical force against any person with intent to tamper with a witness, victim or informant from a maximum of ten to twenty years' imprisonment. In addition, the provision adds a conspiracy penalty for obstruction of justice offenses involving witnesses, victims and informants.

I have long been concerned about the undermining of our criminal justice system by criminal efforts to threaten or harm witnesses, victims and informants, to stop them from cooperating with and providing assistance to law enforcement. I tried to include this provision, along with several other law enforcement initiatives, by amendment to S. 10 during Committee mark-up on July 11, 1997, but this amendment was voted down by all the Republicans on the Committee. At the end of the mark-up, however, this witness tampering provision was quietly accepted to S. 10 and I am pleased that it is also included in S. 254.

Eligibility Requirements for Accountability Block Grant. This bill, S. 254, substantially relaxes the eligibility requirements for the new juvenile accountability block grant. By contrast, S. 10 in the last Congress would have required States to comply with a host of new federal mandates to qualify for the first cent of grant money, such as permitting juveniles 14 years and older to be prosecuted as adults for violent felonies, establishing graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders, implementing drug testing programs for juveniles upon arrest, and nine new juvenile record-keeping requirements. These record-keeping mandates would have required, for example, that States fingerprint and photograph juveniles arrested for any felony act and send those records to the FBI, plus make all juvenile delinquency records available to law enforcement agencies and to schools, including colleges and universities. We could find no State that would have qualified for this grant money without agreeing to change their laws in some fashion to satisfy the twelve new mandates.

In 1997, I tried to get the Judiciary Committee to relax the new juvenile record-keeping mandates under the accountability grant program during the mark-up of S. 10. My 1997 amendment would have limited the record-keeping requirements to crimes of violence or felony acts committed by juveniles, rather than to all juvenile offenses no matter how petty. But my amendment was voted down on July 23, 1997, by the Republicans on the Committee. Finally, two years later, S. 254 reflects the criticism I and others Democrats on the Judiciary Committee leveled at the strict eligibility and record-keeping requirements in S. 10.

Indeed, the Senate decisively rejected this approach when it defeated an amendment by a Republican Senator that would have revived those straight-jacket eligibility requirements. Specifically, his amendment would have required States to try as adults juveniles 14 years or older who committed certain crimes. As I pointed out during floor debate on this amendment, only two States would have qualified for grant funds unless they agreed to change their laws.

Moreover, the current bill removes the record-keeping requirements altogether from the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant. Instead, S. 254 sets up an entirely new Juvenile Criminal History Block Grant, funded at $75 million per year. To qualify for a criminal history grant, States would have to promise within three years to keep fingerprint supported records of delinquency adjudications of juveniles who committed a felony act. No more photographs required. No more records of mere arrests required. No more dissemination of petty juvenile offense records to schools required. Instead, only juvenile delinquency adjudications for murder, armed robbery, rape or sexual molestation must be disseminated in the same manner as adult records; other juvenile delinquency adjudications records may only be used for criminal justice purposes. These limitations are welcome changes to the burdensome, over-broad record-keeping requirements in the prior version of the Republican juvenile crime bill.

The eligibility requirements for the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant now number only three, including that the State have in place a policy of drug testing for appropriate categories of juveniles upon arrest.

Core Protections for Children. Much of the debate over reforming our juvenile justice system has focused on how we treat juvenile offenders who are held in State custody. Republican efforts to roll back protections for children in custody failed in the last Congress. These protections were originally put in place when Congress enacted the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to create a formula grant program for States to improve their juvenile justice systems. This Act addressed the horrific conditions in which children were being detained by State authorities in close proximity to adult inmates—conditions

that too often resulted in tragic assaults, rapes and suicides of children.

As the JJDPA has evolved, four core protections have been adopted—and are working—to protect children from adult inmates and to ensure development of alternative placements to adult jails. These four core protections for juvenile delinquents are:

Separation of juvenile offenders from adult inmates in custody (known as sight and sound separation);

Removal of juveniles from adult jails or lockups, with a 24-hour exception in rural areas and other exceptions for travel and weather related conditions;

Deinstitutionalizaton of status offenders; and to study and direct prevention efforts toward reducing the disproportionate confinement of minority youth in the juvenile justice system.

Over strong objection by most of the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee in the last Congress, S. 10 eliminated three of the four core protections and substantially weakened the ''sight and sound'' separation standard for juveniles in State custody. At the same time the Committee appeared to acknowledge the wisdom and necessity of such requirements when it adopted an amendment requiring separation of juveniles and adult inmates in Federal custody.

This bill, S. 254, as introduced was an improvement over S. 10 in its retention of modified versions of three out of the four core protections. Specifically, S. 254 included the sight and sound standard for juveniles in Federal custody reflected in a 1997 amendment to S. 10. The same standard is used to apply to juveniles delinquents in State custody.

Legitimate concerns were raised that the prohibition on physical contact in S. 254 would still allow supervised proximity between juveniles and adult inmates that is ''brief and incidental or accidental,'' since this could be interpreted to allow routine and regular—though brief—exposure of children to adult inmates. For example, guards could routinely escort children past open adult cells multiple times a day on their way to a dining area.

The Hatch-Leahy managers' Amendment makes significant progress on the ''sight and sound separation'' protection and the ''jail removal'' protection. Specifically, our Managers' amendment makes clear that when parents in rural areas give their consent to have their children detained in adult jails after an arrest, the parents may revoke their consent at any time. In addition, the judge who approves the juvenile's detention must determine it is in the best interests of the juvenile, and may review that detention—as the judge must periodically—in the presence of the juvenile.

The managers' amendment also clarifies that juvenile offenders in rural areas may be detained in an adult jail for up to 48 hours while awaiting a court appearance, but only when no alternative facilities are available and appropriate juvenile facilities are too far away to make the court appearance or travel is unsafe to undertake.

The Hatch-Leahy managers' amendment also significantly improves the sight and sound separation requirement for juvenile offenders in both Federal and State custody. The amendment incorporates the guidance in current regulations for keeping juveniles separated from adult prisoners. Specifically, the Managers' amendment would require separation of juveniles and adult inmates and excuse only ''brief and inadvertent or accidental'' proximity in non-residential areas, which may include dining, recreational, educational, vocational, health care, entry areas, and passageways.

I am pleased we were able to make this progress. I appreciate that a number of Members remain seriously concerned, as do I, about how S. 254 changes the disproportionate minority confinement protection in current law. This bill, S. 254, removes any reference to minorities and requires only that efforts be made to reduce over-representation of any segment of the population. I am disappointed that Senators WELLSTONE and KENNEDY's amendment to restore this protection did not succeed yesterday, but will continue to fight in conference to restore this protection.

Prevention. S. 254 includes a $200 million per year Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Challenge Grant to fund both primary prevention and intervention uses after juveniles have had contact with the juvenile justice system. I and a number of other members were concerned that in the competition for grant dollars, the primary prevention uses would lose out to intervention uses in crucial decisions on how this grant money would be spent. With the help of Senator KOHL, we have included in the Hatch-Leahy Managers' amendment a clear earmark that eighty percent of the money, or $160 million per year if the program is fully funded, is to be used for primary prevention uses and the other twenty percent is to be used for intervention uses. Together with the 25 percent earmark, or about $112 million per year if that program is fully funded, for primary prevention in the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant that was passed by the Senate in the Hatch-Biden-Sessions amendment, this bill now reflects a substantial amount of solid funding for primary prevention uses.

Prosecutors' Grants. I expressed some concern when the Senate passed the Hatch-Biden-Sessions amendment authorizing $50 million per year for prosecutors and different kinds of assistance to prosecutors to speed up prosecution of juvenile offenders. I pointed out that this amendment did not authorize any additional money for judges, public defenders, counselors, or corrections officers. The consequence would be to only exacerbate the backlog in juvenile justice systems rather than helping it.

The Managers' amendment fixes that by authorizing $50 million per year in grants to State juvenile court systems to be used for increased resources to State juvenile court judges, juvenile prosecutors, juvenile public defenders, and other juvenile court system personnel.

Sense of Senate. I mentioned before that S. 254 includes a Sense of the Senate resolution urging States to try juveniles 10 to 14 years old as adults for crimes, such as murder, that would carry the death penalty if committed by an adult—the resolution does not urge the death penalty for such children. While Vermont is probably one of the few States that expressly allows for the trial of juveniles 10 years and older as adults for certain crimes, I do not believe that this is a matter on which the Senate must or should opine. The Managers' amendment correctly deletes that Sense of the Senate from the bill.

State Advisory Groups. S. 254 incorporates changes I recommended to S. 10 in the last Congress to ensure the continued existence and role of State Advisory Groups, or SAGs, in the development of State plans for addressing juvenile crime and delinquency, and the use of grant funds under the JJDPA. As originally introduced, S. 10 had abolished the role of SAGs. The Judiciary Committee in 1997 adopted my amendment to preserve SAGs and require representation from a broad range of juvenile justice experts from both the public and private sectors.

While, as introduced, S. 254 preserved SAGs, it eliminated the requirement in current law that gives SAGs the opportunity to review and comment on a grant award to allow these experts to provide input on how best to spend the money. In addition, while the bill authorizes the use of grant funds to support the SAG, the bill does require States to commit any funds to ensure these groups can function effectively. I am pleased that the Chairman and I were able to accept an amendment sponsored by Senators KERREY, ROBERTS, and others, to ensure appropriate funding of SAGs at the State level and to support their annual meetings.

Protecting Children From Guns. Significantly, we have amended this bill with important gun control measures that we all hope will help make this country safer for our children. The bill as now been amended: bans the transfer to and possession by juveniles of assault weapons and high capacity ammunition clips; increases criminal penalties for transfers of handguns, assault weapons, and high capacity ammunition clips to juveniles; bans prospective gun sales to juveniles with violent crime records; expands the youth crime gun interdiction initiative to up to 250 cities by 2003 for tracing of guns used in youth crime; and increases federal resources dedicated to enforcement of firearms laws by $50 million a year. These common-sense initiatives were first included in the

comprehensive Leahy law enforcement amendment that was tabled by the majority, but were later included in successful amendments sponsored by Republican Senators. No matter how these provisions were finally included in the bill, they will help keep guns out of hands of children and criminals, while protecting the rights of law abiding adults to use firearms.

In addition, through the efforts of Senators LAUTENBERG, SCHUMER, KERREY and others, we were able to require background checks for all firearm purchases at all gun shows. After three Republican amendments failed to close the gun show loophole in the Brady law, and, in fact, created many new loopholes in the law, we finally prevailed. With the help of Vice President GORE's tie-breaking vote, a majority in the U.S. Senate stood up to the gun lobby and did the right thing. This is real progress. Conclusion.

I said at the outset of the debate on this bill that I would like nothing better than to pass responsible and effective juvenile justice legislation. I want to pass juvenile justice legislation that will be helpful to the youngest citizens in this country—not harm them. I want to pass juvenile justice legislation that assists States and local governments in handling juvenile offenders—not impose a ''one-size-fits-all'' Washington solution on them. I want to prevent juveniles from committing crimes, and not just narrowly focus on punishing children. I want to keep children who may harm others away from guns. This bill would make important contributions in each of these areas, and I am pleased to support its passage.

I thank the Republican manager of this important measure for his work and dedication to this effort. I commend the Minority Leader and the Minority Whip for their assistance and attention to this debate. There would not be a juvenile justice bill without them. I thank Senator KENNEDY, Senator SCHUMER, Senator KOHL and all the Democratic Members of the Judiciary Committee for helping manage this effort. Senators BINGAMAN, ROBB, BOXER, WELLSTONE and LAUTENBERG should also be singled out for their consistent efforts to improve this bill. And I would like to thank the staff of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Republican and Democrat, including Manus Cooney, Sharon Prost, Rhett DeHart, Michael Kennedy and Anna Cabral from Chairman HATCH's staff and Bruce Cohen, Beryl Howell, Ed Pagano, Ed Barron, J.P. Dowd, Julie Katzman and Michael Carrasco from my own. In addition Michael Myers, Stephaine Robinson, Melody Barnes and Angela Williams from Senator KENNEDY's staff and Sheryl Walter, Jon Leibowitz, Brian Lee, Neil Quinter, David Hantman, Bob Schiff, Jennifer Leach and Glen Shor, Sander Lurie and Tony Orza were exceptional in staffing these matters. I thank them all for their dedication and public service.

I thank Senators on both side of the aisle who worked with us, but I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman and thank him for his help.

Mr. HATCH. I likewise congratulate the ranking member.

Mr. President, I ask 5 minutes be accorded to the subcommittee chairman of the Judiciary Committee who did more than any other single person to bring the good parts of this bill to the floor. He deserves a lot of recognition. This is his first term in the Senate. To have such a significant role on a bill of this magnitude I think is a great star in Senator SESSIONS' crown. I certainly recognize that and tell him what a pleasure it has been to work with him and with his staff in doing this.

Let me just add one last thing. The Senator is right, the Senator from Vermont. We are here trying to save our children. We are here trying to make this a better world for them. We are here trying to make it clear to people in this country there is such a thing as discipline and we have to abide by certain rules in society. This bill will help a lot of young kids out there to realize there are rules and they are worthy rules; if they will abide by them, we will continue to have a great society for the next 200-plus years. To the extent this bill has come through, as extensive and good as it is, we owe a lot to the Senator from Georgia.

I want to end this debate with a reminder. We have been on this bill for 2 weeks talking about violent juvenile crime, about the events in Littleton, about kids who use guns and about kids influenced by violence in the media. Unfortunately for all of us, that is true. But let us not lose sight of the millions of kids in this country, hundreds of thousands in Utah, who are really good young people.

We give a lot of attention, and the bill focuses even more, on young people who get into trouble with the law. Let us not forget that about the kids who fly straight. As we wrap up consideration of this bill, let's thank the millions of young people across this land who work hard, study long hours, respect and love their parents and friends, and care for others around them. There are millions and millions of good kids in this country. What we are trying to make sure is the kids who were led astray, the kids who we think may not be so good, they are going to get a break—or at least they are going to understand what the law is with regard to violence. This bill, I think, will go a long way to solving these problems.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah, who is a master legislator, who took this bill through storms none of us expected would occur. This was an emotional time in America. It has generated an awful lot of amendments and ideas, some of which are good and some of which I frankly think are not healthy.

I believe we need to focus on prosecuting criminals who use guns. It always galled me as a former Federal prosecutor myself that here this administration blamed the Congress for not passing more laws when their own Department of Justice had allowed prosecutions of gun cases to drop 40 percent. You wonder why we are passing laws if they are not using them.

Those were some of the matters that came up. My vision for this bill from the beginning was to create a Federal program to assist the local juvenile justice systems in America. We put money where these judges and prosecutors and probation officers are overwhelmed by the huge crush of juvenile cases. We have increased funding dramatically for adult programs for crimefighting but we have not done the same for juveniles. Those juveniles, then, come on and become adult criminals.

I hope everybody in America who cares about what is happening will ask how their juvenile court system is doing. Does the judge in their town have an option when a child is arrested to send them to prison, detention, boot camp, alternative schools, drug treatment, mental health, family counseling? Can the judge impose that? Can he impose a probation order and then have the resources to make sure that youngster is at home at night at 7 like he ordered, or do we do like most courts in America, because they do not have enough resources, so orders are written but nobody enforces them?

If we love these children, if we care about these children, when they are arrested, we will drug test them, because if they are using drugs, they are going to continue in the life of crime. Sixty-seven to 70 percent of the people in America who are arrested for a felony test positive for an illegal drug. It is an accelerant to crime. This legislation does that kind of thing.

It provides money for drug testing. It provides money for recordkeeping. We hope every juvenile court system in America will input criminal history records into the Federal NCIC, National Crime Information Center, that the FBI manages. They want these records because these children move around and some of them are very violent. Those records need to be maintained. This bill provides for that.

It provides for research on which programs are working. Many of them are not successful, according to the Department of Justice, and we need to make sure these prevention programs are working well. It provides for research for that.

I am of a belief that this legislation—and it can use some work in conference, and I know Senator HATCH and others will try to improve it—can help us create a better juvenile justice system so we can intervene effectively at the first arrest. We can make that youngster's first brush with the law their last because we deal with them seriously and not as a revolving door.

Sometimes we have to use some form of detention because some of these kids just will not mind otherwise. We know that. They have multiple arrests.

I believe we have made some progress. I am honored to have worked with Senator LEAHY, Senator BIDEN, and certainly Senator HATCH, the chairman of our committee. He is an outstanding legislator, a man of integrity and principle, and an outstanding constitutional lawyer who cares about his country and serves it well every day.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUYING FLOOD DAMAGED VEHICLES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, consumers, motor vehicle administrators, law enforcement, and the automotive and insurance industries anxiously await Congressional action on appropriate and workable title branding legislation. Legislation that provides used car purchasers with much needed pre-purchase disclosure information for severely damaged vehicles.

As a result of varying state approaches, consumers are not always advised of a vehicle's damage history. The National Salvage Motor Vehicle Consumer Protection Act, S. 655, that I introduced back in March, would help correct this problem. It provides grant funds to states to encourage their adoption of uniform terms and procedures for salvage and other severely damaged vehicles. While a mandatory federal scheme was suggested during the last Congress, there were serious Constitutional concerns and the real potential that Congress would create an expensive unfunded mandate on states. The approach taken in S.655 overcomes these problems and provides states with offsetting funding.

Mr. President, it is clear that any title branding legislation Congress adopts must contain a rational definition for vehicles that sustain significant water damage.

The Congressionally chartered Motor Vehicle Titling, Registration and Salvage Advisory Committee, whose recommendations for curtailing title fraud and automobile theft spurred my sponsorship of S.655, came to the reasoned conclusion that water damage was so potentially insidious in nature that a separate and distinct consumer disclosure category needed to be created. One that distinguished flood vehicles from salvage and nonrepairable vehicles.

S. 655, which is similar to the bipartisan measure I coauthored with Senator Ford during the last Congress, adopts a distinct flood vehicle category and improves upon the definition initially proposed by the task force.

Mr. President, I am sure my colleagues are aware that the State of Illinois, which initially adopted the task force's recommended flood definition, subsequently revised it based on anti-consumer results. Illinois found that branding ''any vehicle that has been submerged in water to the point that rising water has reached over the door sill or has entered the passenger or truck compartment'' caused too many vehicles to be unnecessarily branded as ''flood'' vehicles. Vehicles that were significantly devalued and lost their manufacturers warranty when the only damage the vehicle suffered was wet carpets or wet floor mats.

S.655 is a good example of the need to balance competing consumer interests when establishing uniform titling definitions. Instead of unnecessarily and inappropriately branding vehicles with mere cosmetic damage, this legislation rightly brands as ''flood'' those vehicles which sustain water damage that impairs a car or truck's electrical, mechanical, or computerized functions. It also requires the ''flood'' designation for vehicles acquired by an insurer as part of a water damage settlement. This measure also includes an independent flood inspection as recommended by a working group of the National Association of Attorney's General.

Mr. President, I ask my collegues to heed the call of used-car buyers and provide them with a reasonable and workable title branding measure. One that includes all of the minimal definitions needed to protect them from title fraud and automobile theft.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, May 19, 1999, the federal debt stood at $5,593,797,968,334.37 (Five trillion, five hundred ninety-three billion, seven hundred ninety-seven million, nine hundred sixty-eight thousand, three hundred thirty-four dollars and thirty-seven cents).

Five years ago, May 19, 1994, the federal debt stood at $4,588,987,000,000 (Four trillion, five hundred eighty-eight billion, nine hundred eighty-seven million).

Ten years ago, May 19, 1989, the federal debt stood at $2,780,326,000,000 (Two trillion, seven hundred eighty billion, three hundred twenty-six million) which reflects a doubling of the debt—an increase of almost $3 trillion—$2,813,471,968,334.37 (Two trillion, eight hundred thirteen billion, four hundred seventy-one million, nine hundred sixty-eight thousand, three hundred thirty-four dollars and thirty-seven cents) during the past 10 years.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to recognize that today is National Maritime Day, when the Nation pays tribute to the American Merchant Mariners who have given their lives in the service of their country. Throughout the history of the United States, our U.S.-flag Merchant Marine has always been there, providing the support that time and again has proven to be essential to victory. It is with the most profound gratitude for the service and sacrifice of America's Merchant Marine veterans that we reflect upon the importance of our U.S.-flag fleet on this day.

On April 29, 1999, I was privileged to be given a very special momento by a group of Merchant Marine Veterans of World War II. It was a patch, of the kind worn by Merchant Mariners during World War II, and it was designed in 1944 by Walt Disney Studios. Walt Disney's people created a mascot for the Merchant Marine, called ''Battlin' Pete,'' and the patch shows Pete knocking out an Axis torpedo.

The presentation was made to express the veterans' gratitude for a very important piece of legislation that the Senate passed last year. Last year's veterans' benefits bill ensures that those American Merchant Marine veterans who served our country in World War II between August 16, 1945—the day that hostilities were officially declared at an end by President Truman—and December 31, 1946—the cut-off day for World War II service for all other service branches—receive honorable discharges for their service and are eligible for veterans' burial and cemetery benefits. This is the least we can do for these deserving veterans. I was privileged to introduce legislation during the 105th Congress seeking that change, and it was later incorporated into the veterans' benefits bill.

The overwhelming majority of World War II Merchant Mariners were previously awarded veterans status. Now, those who served in harm's way through the war's final days are also being recognized. Although Japan officially surrendered in August of 1945, harbors in Japan, Germany, Italy, France—indeed, across the world—still were mined. Twenty-two U.S.-government-owned vessels, carrying military cargoes, were damaged or sunk by mines after V-J Day. At least four U.S. Merchant Mariners were killed and 28 injured aboard these vessels. Even as Americans at home were celebrating victory, American Merchant Mariners carried on as they have always done—bravely serving their country with pride and professionalism.

I am proud that, at that April ceremony, the first honorable discharges for this previously forgotten group went to two Merchant Marine veterans from my home state of Mississippi: Mr. Robert Hoomes and Mr. Louis Breaux. Also, I was pleased that Mr. Joseph Katusa, National Chairman, Merchant Marine Fairness Committee, received

his honorable discharge. The ceremony was attended by my good friend and colleague, Congressman BOB STUMP, Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee; Mr. Rudy de Leon, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness; Admiral Jim Loy, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard; and Mr. George Searle, National President, American Merchant Marine Veterans. I would like to thank them for participating in the ceremony and acknowledging the service of Mr. Breaux, Mr. Hoomes, and Mr. Katusa, and the role that these, and all, Merchant Marine veterans played in preserving freedom.

As we mark National Maritime Day, it is important to note that our country's Merchant Mariners continue to stand ready to serve. In fact, the leaders of the major maritime labor unions—the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; the International Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots; the National Maritime Union of America; the American Maritime Officers; and the Seafarers International Union of North America—recently expressed their readiness to support America's military effort in the Balkans. Recent reports that Greek seamen are refusing to support that effort is a reminder of why the United States requires its own highly capable Merchant Marine.

Mr. President, I will treasure that patch of ''Battlin' Pete'' from the Merchant Marine Veterans of World War II. It will always remind me of the importance of National Maritime Day, and of the sacrifices that America's Merchant Mariner veterans have made in the service of their country. For those who braved the Murmansk run; for those who served through the conflicts in Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf; for those who today stand ready to sail into harm's way with our Armed Forces; we salute you on this day.

EXPRESSION ON VOTES

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I regret that due to family business which took me out of the country, I was unable to cast several recorded votes during yesterday's session. While my vote would not have altered the outcome of any of the motions, I would like to express how I would have voted had I been able:

On vote No. 120, a Cloture Motion regarding the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 96, Y2K liability legislation. I would have voted ''AYE.'' It is high time we move to consideration of this important legislation. The turn of the millennium is fast approaching and we must work to protect our citizens and businesses against harmful litigation that benefits no one.

On vote No. 121, amendment numbered 351 to S. 254 offered by Senator ALLARD regarding memorials in public schools, I would have voted ''AYE.'' This amendment will allow students and faculty members to grieve for classmates and colleagues killed on school property in a way that makes them most comfortable.

On vote No. 122, an amendment numbered 352 to S. 254 offered by Senators KOHL and HATCH regarding mandatory safety locks on guns, I would have voted ''AYE.'' This amendment was an example of the importance of bipartisan compromise. The Kohl-Hatch amendment requires all handguns sold or transferred by a licensed dealer to be sold with a locking device. In addition, this amendment provides important liability protections for gun owners who use these safety devices.

On vote No. 13, an amendment numbered 353 to S. 254 offered by Senators HATCH and FEINSTEIN I would have voted ''AYE.'' This important amendment increased penalties for participating in a crime as a gang member; makes it illegal to travel or use the mail for gang business; makes it illegal to transfer firearms to children to commit a crime; makes it illegal to clone pagers; prohibits the distribution of certain information relating to explosives or destructive devices; makes it illegal to wear body armor in the commission of a crime and donates surplus body armor to local Law enforcement agencies; and strengthens penalties for Eco-terrorism.

On vote No. 124, an amendment to S. 254 offered by Senator BYRD I would have voted ''AYE.'' This amendment allows states to enforce their own alcoholic beverage control laws by allowing state prosecutors to bring an injunction in Federal Court if interstate shippers violate State laws.

HEALTH AND THE AMERICAN CHILD

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday I met with former Secretary of Health and Human Services Louis Sullivan, who now chairs the prestigious Public Health Policy Advisory Board (PHPAB). Dr. Sullivan presented to me their new report entitled ''Health and the American Child: A Focus on the Mortality Among Children.''

I was immediately struck by the fact that the findings of the PHPAB report underscore both the need for the legislation we are debating here today and the tremendous importance we must place on prevention efforts so that we can reduce unnecessary deaths of our Nation's youth.

According to ''Health and the American Child,'' in the past two decades, two causes of child death have dramatically increased—homicide and suicide, which account for 14% and 7% respectively of all deaths for children under age 19. In teenage black males, the levels are so striking that the report uses the term ''epidemic'' to describe an eight-fold increase in homicide rates among African American youth, now their number one cause of death.

''Homicide and suicide, the greatest new risks to children's health today, require both heightened preventive action as well as research into children's mental health and the social fabric in which they grow and develop.'' And that is precisely what we have been talking about during our debate on S. 254.

The PHPAB report goes on to define the contributing risk factors associated with mortality in children. Homicide and suicide, as the major killers of our children, are most closely associated with firearms, drug and alcohol use, and motor vehicles. These significant increases in both morbidity and mortality among our youth must be addressed and demand aggressive preventive action on our part.

I commend ''Health and the American Child'' to my colleagues and would be glad to make it available to any Senators who care to have the benefit of its considerable findings. ''Health and the American Child'' is really a call to action. It shows so dramatically why this bill we are debating today is important, and why we must set partisan rhetoric aside to get this legislation passed and enacted.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE ACT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, on March 17, of this year the Senate passed S. 257, the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, by a vote of 97–3. Subsequently, the House adopted as H.R. 4 a different version of the legislation, and today the House has agreed to the substance of the Senate bill. No further action is required on the bill, and it now goes to the President for his signature.

After many years of debate, Congress has passed legislation stating the national policy to be that the United States will deploy a national missile defense as soon as technologically possible.

Section 2 of the bill notes that, like all discretionary programs, national missile defense is subject to the authorization and appropriation of funds.

Section 3 states that we support the continued reductions in Russian nuclear force levels. There is no linkage between Russian nuclear force levels, or any arms control agreement, and the national missile defense deployment policy of the bill.

I urge the President to sign this bill and put to rest the concerns of many that our country would continue its vulnerability to ballistic missile attack. With the signing of this bill, a new era of commitment to missile defense will begin.

TRADE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today to address an issue of critical importance to the domestic lamb industry and to producers in my home state of Wyoming. In September 1998, a coalition of individuals from all segments of the U.S. lamb industry filed a Section 201 trade petition with the U.S. International Trade Commission under laws

embedded in the Trade Act of 1974 and every trade act this nation has agreed to since that time.

Our domestic industry filed this trade case in response to the surging, record-setting levels of imported lamb meat from Australia and New Zealand. These individuals, although representing different sectors of the U.S. lamb industry, collectively signed onto this legal battle because each entity has witnessed a drastic impact from lamb imports—imports that increased nearly 50 percent between 1993 and 1997 and continue at an aggressive rate still today.

Under a Section 201 petition, the International Trade Commission is required to conduct an investigation to confirm or dispel the claims asserted within the trade case. Twice the Commissioners heard arguments from both the domestic industry and the importers. Twice the Commissioners rejected the importers arguments. In both instances, the Commissioners voted unanimously—during the injury phase in February and again in March, when they recommended that the President impose some form of trade relief. The Commission's report, and the industry's trade case, now await a final determination by President Clinton.

According to the Commission's report, wholesale imported lamb cuts consistently undercut the price of identical domestic cuts. Evidence of importers underselling domestically produced lamb was found in 79 percent of the product-to-product comparisons with margins of 20 percent to 40 percent. Other comparisons have found margin disparities reaching as high as 70 percent. It is evident that our domestic industry is suffering from the flood of cheap, imported lamb that has swamped the U.S. market and forced prices below break-even levels.

Time is of the essence in this matter as President Clinton has until June 4, 1999, to render his decision on what trade relief, if any, to implement. It is important to remember that under our own trade laws, the requirement of demonstrating that imports are threatening serious injury to the domestic industry has been met. As a result, I urge the President to impose strong, effective and temporary trade relief. More importantly, I urge the President to act on behalf of our producers by seriously considering the undisputed facts outlined in the Commission's report.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of all those who serve their fellow citizens through their active participation in the nation's emergency care system to make my remarks on the introduction of S. 9–1–1, the ''Emergency Medical Services Act of 1999.''

Mr. President, as a Senator who is deeply concerned about the every-expanding size and scope of the federal government, I've long believed Washington is too big, too clumsy and too removed to deal effectively with many of the issues in which it already meddles. However, I also believe there's an overriding public health interest in ensuring a viable and seamless EMS system across the country. By designating this week as national EMS Week, our nation recognizes those individuals who make the EMS system work.

There's no more appropriate time to reaffirm our commitment to EMS by addressing some of the problems the system is presented with daily.

I've often said that Congress has a tendency to wait until there's a crisis before it acts, but Congress cannot wait until there's a crisis in the EMS system before we take steps to improve it. There's simply too much at stake.

Whether we realize it or not, we all depend on and expect the constant readiness of emergency medical services. To ensure that readiness, we need to make efforts to secure the stability of the system. This has been my focus in drafting the EMSEA.

The most important thing we can do to maintain the vitality of the EMS system is to compel the government to reimburse for the services it says it will pay for under Medicare.

In the meetings I've had with ambulance providers, emergency medical technicians, emergency physicians, nurses, and other EMS-related personnel, their most common request is to base reimbursement on a ''prudent layperson'' standard, rather than the ultimate diagnosis reached in the emergency room.

While the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 [BBA] contained a provision basing reimbursement for emergency room services on the prudent layperson standard, I find it troubling HCFA refuses to include ambulance transportation in its regulations as a service covered by the patient protections enacted as part of Medicare Plus Choice. I also believe it is unacceptable that beneficiaries participating in fee-for-service are not granted the protections afforded to those in Medicare Plus Choice.

There has been a great debate in the Senate for the last year regarding protections for consumers against HMOs. Many of my colleagues would be startled to learn of the treatment many seniors have experienced at the hands of their own government through the Medicare fee-for-service program. The federal government would do better to lead by example rather than usurping powers from state insurance commissioners by imposing federal mandates on health insurance plans already governed by the states.

To illustrate how prevalent the problem of the federal government denying needed care to Medicare beneficiaries is, I want to share with you a case my staff worked on relating to Medicare reimbursement for ambulance services. I mentioned this case last year, but it is worth repeating. Please keep in mind that this is the fee-for-service Medicare program.

In 1994, Andrew Bernecker of Braham, Minnesota was mowing with a power scythe and tractor when he fell. The rotating blades of the scythe severely cut his upper arm. Mr. Bernecker tried to walk toward his home but was too faint from the blood loss, so he crawled the rest of the way. Afraid that his wife, who was 86 years old at the time, would panic—or worse, have a heart attack—he crawled to the pump and washed as much blood and dirt off as he could. His wife saw him and immediately called 911 for an ambulance.

He was rushed to the hospital where Mr. Bernecker ultimately spent some time in the intensive care unit and had orthopedic surgery. A tragic story.

In response to the bills submitted to Medicare, the government sent this reply with respect to the ambulance billing: ''Medicare Regulations Provide that certain conditions must be met in order for ambulance services to be covered. Medicare pays for ambulance services only when the use of any other method of transportation would endanger your health.'' The government denied payment, claiming the ambulance wasn't medically necessary.

Apparently, Medicare believed the man's wife—who was, remember, 86 years old—should have been able to drive him to the hospital for treatment. Mr. and Mrs. Bernecker appealed, but were denied and began paying what they could afford each month for the ambulance bill.

After several years of paying $20 a month, the Berneckers finally paid off the ambulance bill. Medicare later reopened the case and reimbursed the Berneckers, but unfortunately, Mr. Bernecker is no longer with us.

I have a few more examples I'd like to share with my colleagues to assure them this is not an isolated incident. In fact, I encourage all of my colleagues to meet and speak with their EMS providers to see first-hand how the lack of consistent reimbursement policy impacts their ability to provide services. This one provision of the Emergency Medical Services Efficiency Act will bring fairness and clarity for both the beneficiary and the EMS provider trying to help those in need.

In Austin, Minnesota, a 66-year-old male was found in a shopping center parking lot slumped over the steering column of his car. The car was in drive, up against a light pole with the wheels spinning and the tread burning off the tires. An Austin policeman at the scene requested an ambulance and the driver was transported to the emergency room. Ambulance transportation reimbursement was denied based on the assumption that the driver could have used other means to get to the emergency room. Apparently, since he was already in the car, he was supposed to drive himself to the hospital despite being unresponsive.

Another case in Minnesota involved a 74-year-old male who was complaining

to his family about an upset stomach when he collapsed. The frightened family began CPR and summoned an ambulance via 9–1–1. The city's fire department was the first on scene and applied an automatic external defibrillator, which advised against shock. Paramedics arrived and continued CPR en route to the emergency room. The patient ultimately died of cardiac arrest. Again, Medicare fee-for-service denied payment for the ambulance because it was deemed unnecessary.

Finally, Mr. President, a 74-year-old female complained of flu-like symptoms. Her family checked on her and found she was acting confused and strange. They summoned emergency medical services. Paramedics arrived to find the woman awake but confused as to time and events. They discovered she had a history of cardiac disease and diabetes. The paramedics tested her blood-sugar level and found it below 40. For those of you unfamiliar with diabetes, a blood sugar level below 70 is dangerous and could lead to seizure. But once again, Medicare denied payment.

Mr. President, I have a stack of actual run tickets from EMS providers in Minnesota, with names and other identifiers deleted, all demonstrating what a problem this is for Medicare beneficiaries and EMS providers. Again, I urge all of my colleagues to meet with their EMS providers and ask how these denials affect them.

Title II of the Emergency Medical Services Efficiency Act creates a Federal Commission on Emergency Medical Services which will make recommendations and provide input on how federal regulatory actions affect all types of EMS providers.

EMS needs a seat at the table when health care and other regulatory policy is made. Few things are more frustrating for ambulance services than trying to navigate and comply with the tangled mess of laws and regulations from the federal level on down, only to receive either a reimbursement that doesn't cover the costs of providing the service or a flat denial of payment.

Mr. President, I came across this chart two years ago which demonstrates how a Medicare claim moves from submittal to payment, denial, or write-off by the ambulance provider. Look at this chart and tell me how a rural ambulance provider who depends on volunteers has the manpower or expertise to navigate this mess. And, in the event it is navigated successfully, ambulance services are regularly reimbursed at a level that doesn't even cover their costs.

Mr. President, I have heard complaints from many individuals about the cost of ambulance care. In fact, some within this very body criticize ambulance providers for the high prices they charge for their services. While I do not doubt there are cases of abuse, I know for a fact an overwhelming majority of EMTs, Paramedics, Emergency Nurses and EMS providers are trying to provide the best possible care for their patients at a reasonable price.

Let's talk about how much it costs to run just one ambulance. There's the cost of the dispatcher who remains on the line to give pre-arrival assistance. The ambulance itself, which costs from $85,000 to $100,000. The radios, beepers, and cellular telephones used to communicate between the dispatcher, ambulance, and hospital. The supplies and equipment in the ambulance, including everything from defibrillators to bandages. The two Emergency Medical Technicians or Paramedics who both drive the ambulance and provide care to the patient. The vehicle repair, maintenance, and insurance costs. The liability insurance for the paramedics. And the list goes on.

Yes, the costs can be high, but it's clear to me that, with the uncertainty ambulance providers face out in the field each day, they need to be prepared for very type of injury or condition. Mr. President, that's expensive.

I'm convinced those who complain about the high costs of emergency care would be the first to complain if the ambulance that arrived to care for them in an emergency didn't have the life-saving equipment needed for treatment.

Let's be honest with ourselves: we want the quickest and best service when we face an emergency—and that costs money.

Mr. President, many of our political debates in Washington center around how to better prepare for the 21st century. I've always supported research and efforts to expand the limits of technology and continue to believe technological innovations and advances in biomedical and basic scientific research hold tremendous promise.

Under the new EMSEA, federal grant programs will be clarified to ensure EMS agencies are eligible for programs that relate to highway safety, rural development, and tele-health technology.

Emergency Medical Services have come a long way since the first ambulance services began in Cleveland and New York City during the 1860s.

Indeed, the scientific and technological advances have created a new practice of medicine in two short decades, and have dramatically improved the prospects of surviving serious trauma. There's reason to believe further advances will have equally meaningful results.

Innovations like tele-health technology may soon allow EMTs, nurses, and paramedics to perform more sophisticated procedures under a physician's supervision via real-time, ambulance-mounted monitors and cameras networked to emergency departments in specific service areas. By not considering EMS agencies for federal grant dollars, we may cause significant delays in the application of current technologies. That would be a mistake.

In August of 1996, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration and the Health Resources and Services Administration, Maternal and Child Health Bureau issued a report, ''Emergency Medical Services: Agenda for the Future.'' The report outlined specific ways EMS can be improved, and one of the stated goals was the authorization of a ''lead federal agency.''

After consultation with those in the EMS field throughout the country, I believe the most appropriate action is to take our time and get it right by conducting a study to determine which current or new office would best coordinate federal EMS efforts.

Those are the major provisions of the legislation I introduce today.

Mr. President, in 1995, there were approximately 100 million visits to emergency departments across this nation. Roughly 20 percent of those visits started with a call for an ambulance. Each one of those calls is important, especially to those seeking assistance and to the responding EMS personnel. While EMS represents a small portion of health care spending overall, it is critically important. It serves as the access point for the sickest among us and it would be tragic for Congress to deny its role in improving the system.

Over the past several years, I've been privileged to get to know the men and women who dedicate their talents to serving others in an emergency.

The nation owes a great deal to the EMS personnel who have dedicated themselves to their profession because they care about people and want to help those who are suffering. Nobody gets rich as a professional paramedic, and there's no monetary compensation at all as a volunteer. The field of emergency medical services presents many challenges—but offers the reward of knowing you helped someone in need of assistance.

Every year, the American Ambulance Association recognizes EMS personnel across the country for their contributions to the profession, and bestows upon them the Stars of Life Award.

This year, 94 individuals have been chosen by their peers to be honored for demonstrating exceptional kindness and selflessness in performing their duties.

Mr. President, Minnesota suffered a tremendous loss this year. On January 14, while extricating a victim of an automobile accident, two EMTs were hit by a car. Brenda HagE, an EMT and Registered Nurse, was transported in traumatic arrest to a nearby hospital where she was pronounced dead. Ms. HagE is survived by her husband Darby and two children.

I ask that the Senate observe a moment of silence for Ms. HagE and all EMS personnel who have died in the line of duty.

Mr. President, I've talked with many professional EMTs, paramedics, and emergency nurses, and most tell me they wouldn't think of doing anything else for their chosen career. Similarly, volunteer EMS personnel tell me of the indescribable satisfaction they feel when they help those in their community get the care they need.

So, in honoring them during this National EMS Week, I can think of no better way to recognize their service than through legislation that will help them help others.

I ask my colleagues to support them by supporting S. 9–1–1, the ''Emergency Medical Services Act.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the 1999 American Ambulance Association Stars of Life honorees be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1999 STARS OF LIFE

AZ—Theresa J. Pareja, Rural/Metro Fire Department;

AR—Rae Meyer, Rural/Metro Ambulance and John C. Warren, Columbia County Ambulance Service;

CA—Marti Aho-Fazio, American Medical Response—Sonoma Division, Dean B. Anderson, American Medical Response—Sonoma Division, Chris S. Babler, Rural/Metro Ambulance, Carlos Flores, American Medical Response, May Anne Godfrey-Jones, Hall Ambulance Service, Inc., Randy Kappe, American Medical Response, Frank Minitello, American Medical Response, and Penny Vest, Hall Ambulance Service, Inc.;

CO—Doug Jones, American Medical Response;

CT—Todd Beaton, American Medical Response, Michael Case, Hunter's Ambulance Service, and John M. Gopoian, Hunter's Ambulance Service;

FL—Clara DeSue, Rural/Metro Ambulance, Leroy Funderburk, American Medical Response—West Florida, Andrea Hays, Rural/Metro Ambulance, and Keith A. Lund, American Medical Response;

GA—Deborah Lighton, American Medical Response—Georgia and Kelly J. Potts, Mid Georgia Ambulance Service;

IL—Carolyn Gray, Consolidated Medical Transport, Inc., James Gray, Consolidated Medical Transport, Inc. and Cristen Miller MEDIC EMS;

IA—Paul Andorf, MEDIC EMS, Dennis L. Cosby, Lee County EMS Ambulance, Inc., and Danny Eversmeyer, Henry County Health Center EMS;

KS—Tom Collins, Metropolitan Ambulance Services Trust and Bill D. Witmer, American Medical Response;

LA—Pattie Desoto, Med Express Ambulance Service, Inc., Michael Noel, Priority Mobile Health, John Richard, Med Express Ambulance Service, Inc., Scott Saunier, Acadian Ambulance & Air Med Services, and Pete Thomas, Priority Mobile Health;

MD—Lily Puletti, Rural/Metro Ambulance and Michael Zeiler, Rural/Metro Ambulance;

MA—Daniel Doucette, Lyons Ambulance Service, Leonard Gallego, American Medical Response, Mark Lennon, Action Ambulance Service, Inc. and Edward McLaughlin, Lyons Ambulance Service;

MI—Steve Champagne, Huron Valley Ambulance, Edgar ''Butch'' R. Dusette Jr., Medstar Ambulance, Mary Elsen, Medstar Ambulance, Steven J. Frisbie, LifeCare Ambulance Service, Richard Landis, American Medical Response, Tony L. Sorensen, LIFE EMS, and Norma Weaver, Huron Valley Ambulance;

MN—Barbara Erickson, Life Link III and Jesse Simkins, Gold Cross Ambulance;

MS—Carlos J. Redmon, American Medical Response (South Mississippi);

MO—Michelle D. Endicott, Newton County Ambulance District and Lynette Lindholm, Metropolitan Ambulance Services Trust;

NH—David Deacon, Rockingham Regional Ambulance, Inc., Jason Preston, Rockingham Regional Ambulance Inc., Joseph Simone, Action Ambulance Service, Inc., Joanna Umenhoffer, Rockingham Regional Ambulance, Inc., and Roland Vaillancourt, Rockingham Regional Ambulance, Inc.;

NJ—Laurie Rovan, Med Alert Ambulance and Roberta Winters, Rural/Metro Corp.;

NM—LeeAnn J. Phillips, American Medical Response;

NY—Susan Bull, Rural/Metro Medical Services, Nicholas Cecci, Rural/Metro Medical Services Southern Tier, Daniel Connors, Rural/Metro Medical Services, Scott Crewell, Rural/Metro Medical Services—Intermountain, Frank D'Ambra, Rural/Metro Corp., Doug Einsfeld, American Medical Response—Long Island, Kevin Jones, Rural/Metro Medical Services—Intermountain, Patty Palmeri, Rural/Metro Corp., Carl Sharak, Rural/Metro, Samuel Stetter, Rural/Metro Medical Services Southern Tier, and Jean Zambrano, Rural/Metro Medical Services;

NC—Chris Murdock, Mecklenburg EMS Agency, Corinne Rust, Mecklenburg EMS Agency, and John Sepski, Mecklenburg EMS Agency;

OH—Duane J. Wolf, Stofcheck Ambulance Service, Inc. and Eric Wrask, Rural/Metro;

OR—Larry B. Hornaday, Metro West Ambulance, Tony D. Mooney, Pacific West Ambulance, and Mark C. Webster, American Medical Response—Oregon;

PA—Jerry Munley, Rural/Metro Medical Services;

SD—Travis H. Spier, Rural/Metro Medical Services—South Dakota;

TN—Brian C. Qualls, Rural/Metro and Rodney B. Ward, Rural/Metro—Memphis;

TX—Robert Moya, American Medical Response, Luis Salazar, Life Ambulance Service, and Mike Sebastian, Life Ambulance Service;

UT—Monica Masterson, Gold Cross Services and Robert Torgerson, Gold Cross Services;

VT—John G. Potter, Regional Ambulance Service, Inc.;

VA—Beverly Leigh, American Medical Response—Richmond;

WA—Jack N. Erickson, Olympic Ambulance, Gary D. McVay, American Medical Response—Washington, Aaron J. Schmidt, Olympic Ambulance Service, and Rand P. Whitney, Rural/Metro Ambulance.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 6:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hanrahan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 883. An act to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands.

H.R. 1553. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1654. An act to authorization appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate of the bill (S. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

At 6:56 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hanrahan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 114. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 883. An act to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1553. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–3118. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3119. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13–58, ''Insurance Demutualization Amendment Act of 1999,'' adopted by the Council on April 13, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3120. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 13–59, ''Petition Circulation Requirements Temporary Amendment Act of 1999'', adopted by the Council on April 13, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3121. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13–65, ''Closing of Public Alleys in Square 51, S.O. 98–145, Act of 1999'', adopted by the Council on April 13, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3122. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13–66, ''Chief Technology Officer Year 2000 Remediation Procurement Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 1999'', adopted by the Council on April 13, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3123. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13–64, ''Solid Waste Facility Permit Amendment Act of 1999'', adopted by the Council on April 13, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3124. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3125. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3126. A communication from the Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Accountability Report for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3127. A communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period October 1, 1998 through March 31, 1999; ordered to lie on the table.

EC–3128. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget/Chief Financial Officer, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Accountability Report for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3129. A communication from the Federal Co-Chairman, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an evaluation of the system of internal accounting and administrative control; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3130. A communication from the Chairperson, Cost Accounting Standards Board, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar years 1997 and 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3131. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 30, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3132. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the list of General Accounting Office reports for March 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3133. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Federal Employees Health Benefits Children's Equity Act of 1999''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3134. A communication from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severly Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to additions and deletions from the Procurement List, received May 12, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3135. A communication from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severly Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to additions to the Procurement List, received May 18, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3136. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A for the Period October 1, 1993 through June 30, 1998''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3137. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 4B for the Period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1998''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3138. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals dated May 13, 1999; transmitted jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3139. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of fifty-five rules relative to Safety/Security Zone Regulations (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0014), received April 9, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3140. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Florida (CGD07–98–083)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0007), received April 2, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3141. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Ward Cove, Tongass Narrows, Ketchikan, AK (COTP Southeast Alaska 99–001)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0013), received April 2, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3142. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Bergen County United Way Fireworks, Hudson River, Manhattan, New York (CGD01–99–018)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0012), received April 2, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3143. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Dignitary Arrival/Departure New York (CGD01–98–006)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0016), received May 10, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3144. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR; St. Croix International Triathlon, St. Croix, USVI (CGD07–99–016)'' (RIN2115–AE46) (1999–0007), received April 9, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3145. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR; Air and Sea Show, Fort Lauderdale, Florida (CGD07–99–017)'' (RIN2115–AE46) (1999–0008), received April 9, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3146. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR; Empire State Regatta, Albany, New York (CGD01–98–162)'' (RIN2115–AE46) (1999–0012), received April 22, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3147. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Connecticut River, CT (CGD01–99–032)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0009), received May 10, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3148. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Anchorage Areas/Anchorage Grounds Regulations; Port Everglades, Florida (CGD07–99–003)'' (RIN2115–AA98) (1999–0002), received April 22, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–122. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1993; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 490

Whereas, prior to 1993, federal Medicaid regulations allowed states flexibility in the treatment of assets in determining eligibility; and

Whereas, Connecticut, New York, Indiana, and California were able to establish public/private long-term care partnerships to provide incentives for the purchase of long-term care insurance; and

Whereas, under these partnership programs, if a policyholder requires long-term care and eventually exhausts his private insurance benefits, the policyholder is permitted to keep more of his assets while still qualifying for Medicaid coverage; and

Whereas, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 included a provision, §13612 (a) (C), that discourages additional states from implementing such partnerships; and

Whereas, this provision requires states to make recovery from the estates of persons who had enjoyed enhanced Medicaid asset protection, thereby making the asset protection provided by the public/private partnerships only temporary; and

Whereas, the General Assembly, pursuant to Senate Joint Resolution No. 365 (1997), urged Congress to repeal §13612 (a) (C) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993; and

Whereas, the Governor has requested that Congress remove §13612 (a) (C) and allow additional states to establish asset protection programs for individuals who purchase qualified long-term care insurance policies without requiring that states recover such assets upon a beneficiary's death; and

Whereas, the removal of §13612 (a) (C) would make such partnerships much more attractive to potential participants, especially if they are motivated by a desire to pass some of their assets on to their children; and

Whereas, having long-term care insurance reduces the possibility that individuals will spend down to Medicaid eligibility levels; and

Whereas, long-term care insurance, by reducing the Medicaid expenditures for policyholders, helps states control Medicaid costs; and

Whereas, Congress has not yet acted to repeal §13612 (a) (C) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate the House of Delegates concurring, That the Congress of the United States be urged to establish a limited pilot program which exempts the Commonwealth of Virginia from the provisions of §13612 (a) (C) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 requiring states to make recovery from the estates of persons who had enjoyed enhanced Medicaid asset protection; and, be it

Resolved Further, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Congressional Delegation of Virginia in order that they may be apprised of the sense of the General Assembly of Virginia in this matter.

POM–123. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine relative to the interstate truck weight limits; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

JOINT RESOLUTION

We, your Memorialists, the Members of the One Hundred and Nineteenth Legislature of the State of Maine, now assembled in the First Regular Session, most respectfully present and petition the President of the United States and the United States Congress, as follows:

Whereas, the issue of interstate truck weight limits is of great concern for a number of reasons; and

Whereas, economic development interests in northern and central Maine are increasingly frustrated at their loss of transportation productivity due to the disparity in weight limits between the state highways and the Interstate Highway System; and

Whereas, this disparity has resulted in the diversion of heavy through trucks from the Interstate Highway System to more congested State highways, raising safety concerns in the Legislature and in municipal groups. A fatal crash on Route 9 in Dixmont and a fuel truck crash in Augusta have further raised concern; and

Whereas, an increase in the interstate gross vehicle weight limit for 6-axle combination vehicles, from 80,000 pounds to between 90,000 and 95,000 pounds, is supported by an engineering review that was recently conducted by the Maine Department of Transportation; and

Whereas, a recommendation to increase interstate weight limits is also supported by the Maine State Police, the Maine Department of Economic and Community Development, the Maine Turnpike Authority, the Maine Better Transportation Association, the Maine Chamber and Business Alliance and the Maine Motor Transportation Association, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress amend federal law to increase the interstate gross vehicle weight limits for 6-axle combination vehicles to between 90,000 and 95,000 pounds and maintain the current freeze on longer combination vehicles; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and each member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 303. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to enhance the ability of direct broadcast satellite and other multichannel video providers to compete effectively with cable television systems, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–51).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. THOMPSON, for the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

John T. Spotila, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Lorraine Pratte Lewis, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, Department of Education.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

Hiram E. Puig-Lugo, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Stephen H. Glickman, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the term of fifteen years.

Eric T. Washington, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the term of fifteen years.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HELMS, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the income inclusion on a distribution from an individual retirement account to the extent that the distribution is contributed for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

S. 1087. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to add bronchioloalveolar carcinoma to the list of diseases presumed to be service-connected for certain radiation-exposed veterans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

S. 1088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain administrative sites in national forests in the State of Arizona, to convey certain land to the City of Sedona, Arizona for a wastewater treatment facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 1089. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. LOTT):

S. 1090. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Liability, and Compensation Act of 1980; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BOND):

S. 1091. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a pediatric research initiative; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO:

S. 1092. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to regulation of pharmacists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1093. A bill to establish the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Sites, to provide for the protection of archaeological sites in the Galisteo Basin of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1094. A bill to require a school to forward certain information regarding transferring students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1095. A bill to amend section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the placed in service date for biomass and coal facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 1096. A bill to preserve and protect archaeological sites and historical resources of

the central Mississippi Valley through the establishment of the Mississippi Valley National Historical Park as a unit of the National Park System on former Eaker Air Force Base in Blytheville, Arkansas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. SANTORUM):

S. 1097. A bill to offset the spending contained in the fiscal year 1999 emergency supplemental appropriations bill in order to protect the surpluses of the social security trust funds; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee have thirty days to report or be discharged.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1098. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to modify service requirements relating to creditable service with congressional campaign committees; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KERREY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 1099. A bill to establish a mechanism for using the duties imposed on products of countries that fail to comply with WTO dispute resolution decision to provide relief to injured domestic producers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 1100. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that the designation of critical habitat for endangered and threatened species be required as part of the development of recovery plans for those species; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1101. A bill to provide for tort liability of firearms dealers who transfer firearms in violation of Federal firearms law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 104. A resolution to authorize testimony, production of documents, and legal representation in United States v. Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., et al; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HELMS, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the income inclusion on a distribution from an individual retirement account to the extent that the distribution is contributed for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

IRA ROLLOVER TO CHARITY ACT

• Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to introduce, along with Senator DURBIN, the IRA Rollover to Charity Act of 1999. This legislation has the support of numerous charitable organizations across the United States. The effect of this bill would be to unlock billions of dollars in savings Americans hold and make them available to charity.

Mr. President, the legislation will allow individuals to roll assets from an Individual Retirement Account (IRA) into a charity or a deferred charitable gift plan without incurring any income tax consequences. Thus, the donation would be made to charity without ever withdrawing it as income and paying tax on it.

Americans hold well over $1 trillion in assets in IRAs. Nearly half of America's families have IRAs. Recent studies show that assets of qualified retirement plans comprise a substantial part of the net worth of many persons. Many individuals would like to give a portion of these assets to charity.

Under current law, if an IRA is transferred into a charitable remainder trust, donors are required to recognize all such income. Therefore, absent the changes called for in the legislation, the donor will have taxable income in the year the gift is funded. The IRA Rollover to Charity Act lifts the disincentives contained in our complicated and burdensome tax code and will unleash a critical source of funding for our nation's charities. This is a common sense way to remove obstacles to private charitable giving.

Under the legislation, upon reaching age 59½, an individual could move assets penalty-free from an IRA directly to charity or into a qualifying deferred charitable gift plan—e.g. charitable reminder trusts, pooled income funds and gift annuities. In the latter case the donor would be able to receive an income stream from the retirement plan assets, which would be taxed according to normal rules. Upon the death of the individual, the remainder would be transferred to charity.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will join in this effort to provide a valuable new source of philanthropy for our nation's charities. This legislation has the support of numerous universities and charitable groups, including the Charitable Accord, an umbrella organization representing more than 1,000 organizations and associations.

Mr. President, I have just returned from the Balkans. I have seen first hand the wonderful work that is being done by charitable groups in dealing with the massive refugee crisis that has occurred there. As terrible as this crisis has been, it would be worse if not for the great work that is being done by charitable groups. Our bill will help direct additional resources to those charities and thousands of others. I urge my colleagues to co-sponsor this legislation.•

By Mr. KYL:

S. 1088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain administrative sites in national forests in the State of Arizona, to convey certain land to the City of Sedona, Arizona for a wastewater treatment facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE ARIZONA NATIONAL FOREST IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the U.S. Forest Service is interested in exchanging or selling six unmanageable, undesirable and/or excess parcels of land in the Prescott, Tonto, Kaibab and Coconino National Forests. In addition, the Forest Service has agreed to sell land to the City of Sedona for use as an effluent disposal system. If the parcels are sold, the Forest Service wants to use the proceeds from five of these sales to either fund new construction or upgrade current administrative facilities at these national forests. Funds generated from the sale of the other parcels could be used to fund acquisition of sites, or construction of administrative facilities at any national forest in Arizona. Transfers of land completed under this bill will be done in accordance with all other applicable laws, including environmental laws.

Mr. President, this bill will enhance customer and administrative services by allowing the Forest Service to consolidate and update facilities and/or relocate facilities to more convenient locations. It offers a simple and commonsense way to enhance services for national forest users in Arizona, and to facilitate the disposal of unmanageable, undesirable and/or excess parcels of national forest lands. This bill will also facilitate the construction of a much needed wastewater treatment plant for the City of Sedona.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1088

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 ''Arizona National Forest Improvement Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Sedona, Arizona.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. SALE OR EXCHANGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, sell or exchange any and all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following National Forest System land and administrative sites:

(1) The Camp Verde Administrative Site, comprising approximately 213.60 acres, as depicted on the map entitled ''Camp Verde Administrative Site'', dated April 12, 1997.

(2) A portion of the Cave Creek Administrative Site, comprising approximately 16 acres, as depicted on the map entitled ''Cave Creek Administrative Site'', dated May 1, 1997.

(3) The Fredonia Duplex Housing Site, comprising approximately 1.40 acres, and the Fredonia Housing Site, comprising approximately 1.58 acres, as depicted on the map entitled ''Fredonia Duplex Dwelling, Fredonia Ranger Dwelling'', dated August 28, 1997.

(4) The Groom Creek Administrative Site, comprising approximately 7.88 acres, as depicted on the map entitled ''Groom Creek Administrative Site'', dated April 29, 1997.

(5) The Payson Administrative Site, comprising approximately 296.43 acres, as depicted on the map entitled ''Payson Administrative Site'', dated May 1, 1997.

(6) The Sedona Administrative Site, comprising approximately 21.41 acres, as depicted on the map entitled ''Sedona Administrative Site'', dated April 12, 1997.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration for a sale or exchange of land under subsection (a) may include the acquisition of land, existing improvements, and improvements constructed to the specifications of the Secretary.

(c) APPLICABLE LAW.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, any sale or exchange of land under subsection (a) shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the conveyance and acquisition of land for the National Forest System.

(d) CASH EQUALIZATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept a cash equalization payment in excess of 25 percent of the value of any land or administrative site exchanged under subsection (a).

(e) SOLICITATION OF OFFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may solicit offers for the sale or exchange of land under this section on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

(2) REJECTION OF OFFERS.—The Secretary may reject any offer made under this section if the Secretary determines that the offer is not adequate or not in the public interest.

(f) REVOCATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on conveyance of land by the Secretary under this section, any public order withdrawing the land from any form of appropriation under the public land laws is revoked.

SEC. 4. CONVEYANCE TO CITY OF SEDONA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may sell to the city of Sedona, Arizona, by quitclaim deed in fee simple, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 300 acres of land as depicted on the map in the environmental assessment entitled ''Sedona Effluent Management Plan'', dated August 1998, for construction of an effluent disposal system in Yavapai County, Arizona.

(b) DESCRIPTION.—A legal description of the land conveyed under subsection (a) shall be available for public inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Washington, District of Columbia.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—As consideration for the conveyance of land under subsection (a), the City shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the land as determined by an appraisal acceptable to the Secretary and prepared in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions.

(2) COST OF APPRAISAL.—The City shall pay the cost of the appraisal of the land.

(3) PAYMENT.—Payment of the amount determined under paragraph (1) (including any interest payable under paragraph (4)) shall be paid, at the option of the City—

(A) in full not later than 180 days after the date of the conveyance of the land; or

(B) in 7 equal annual installments commencing not later than January 1 of the first year following the date of the conveyance and annually thereafter until the total amount has been paid.

(4) INTEREST RATE.—Any payment due for the conveyance of land under this section shall accrue, beginning on the date of the conveyance, interest at a rate equal to the current (as of the date of the conveyance) market yield on outstanding, marketable obligations of the United States with maturities of 1 year.

(d) RELEASE.—Subject to compliance with all Federal environmental laws by the Secretary before the date of conveyance of land under this section, on conveyance of the land, the City shall agree in writing to hold the United States harmless from any and all claims to the land, including all claims resulting from hazardous materials on the conveyed land.

(e) RIGHT OF REENTRY.—At any time before full payment is made for the conveyance of land under this section, the conveyance shall be subject to a right of reentry in the United States if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the City has not complied with the requirements of this section or the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in the deed of conveyance; or

(2) the conveyed land is not used for disposal of treated effluent or other purposes related to the construction of an effluent disposal system in Yavapai County, Arizona.

SEC. 5. DISPOSITION OF FUNDS.

(a) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—The Secretary shall deposit the proceeds of a sale or exchange under this Act in the fund established under Public Law 90–171 (16 U.S.C. 484a) (commonly known as the ''Sisk Act'').

(b) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Funds deposited under subsection (a) shall be available to the Secretary, without further Act of appropriation, for—

(1) the acquisition, construction, or improvement of administrative facilities for the Coconino National Forest, Kaibab National Forest, Prescott National Forest, and Tonto National Forest; or

(2) the acquisition of land and or an interest in land in the State of Arizona.

By Ms. SNOW (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 1089. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999.

The Coast Guard provides many critical services for our nation. Dedicated Coast Guard personnel save an average of more than 5,000 lives, $2.5 billion in property, and assist more than 100,000 other mariners in distress. Through boater safety programs and maintenance of an extensive network of aids to navigation, the Coast Guard protects thousands of additional people engaged in coastwise trade, commercial fishing activities, or simply enjoying a day of recreation out on our bays, oceans, and waterways.

The Coast Guard enforces all federal laws and treaties related to the high seas and U.S. waters. This includes marine resource protection and pollution control. As one of the five armed forces, it provides a critical component of the nation's defense strategy, something weighing heavily on all of our minds lately.

Last year, Congress enacted the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998, which authorized the Coast Guard through Fiscal Year 1999. The bill I am introducing today reauthorizes the Coast Guard for the next two years—Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001.

It authorizes both appropriations and personnel levels for these two years. It also contains various provisions that are designed to provide greater flexibility to the Coast Guard on personnel administration; strengthen marine safety provisions; includes sufficient funding to allow for a 4.4 percent pay raise; and other provisions.

One provision that deserves particular mention relates to icebreaking services. The President's FY 2000 budget request includes a proposal to decomission 11 WYTL-class harbor tugs. These tugs provide vital icebreaking services throughout the northern states, including my home state of Maine. While I understand that the age of this vessel class may require some action by the agency, I feel it would be premature to decommission these vessels before the Coast Guard has identified a means to rectify any potentially harmful degradation of services. The Coast Guard has identified seven waterways within Maine that would suffer a meaningful degradation of service should these tugs be brought offline now. These waterways provide necessary transport routes for oil tankers, commercial fishing vessels, and cargo ships. The costs would be excessive to the local communities should that means of transport be cut off. As such, the bill I am introducing today includes a measure that would require the Coast Guard to submit a report to Congress before removing these tugs from service that will include an analysis of the use of this class of harbor tugs to perform icebreaking services; the degree to which the decommissioning of each such vessel would result in a degradation of current services; and recommendations to remediate such degradation.

As part of its law enforcement mission in 1998, the Coast Guard seized 75 vessels transporting more than 100,000 pounds of illegal narcotics headed for our shores. This bill provides funding to maintain many of the new drug interdiction initiatives of the past few years. The Coast Guard has proven time and again its ability to stem the tide of drugs entering our nation through water routes.

Finally, the Coast Guard is the lead federal agency for preventing and responding to major pollution incidents in the coastal zone. It responds to more than 17,000 pollution incidents in the average year. This bill includes a provision that provides the Coast Guard with emergency borrowing authority from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. The measure would enhance the

Coast Guard's ability to effectively respond to major oil spills.

Mr. President, this is a good bill that enjoys bipartisan support on the Commerce Committee. I look forward to moving this bill to the Senate floor at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1089

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''.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(a) AUTHROIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2000 as follows:

(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, $2,941,039,000, of which $334,000,000 shall be available for defense-related activities and of which $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

(2) For the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, $350,326,000, to remain available until expended, of which $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.

(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, $21,709,000, to remain available until expended,of which $3,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

(4) For retired pay (including the payment of obligation 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, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

(5) For environmental compliance and restoration at Coast Guard facilities (other than parts and equipment associated with operations and maintenance), $19,500,000, to remain available until expended.

(6) 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, $26,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—funds are authorized to be appropriated for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2001, as follows:

(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, $2,941,039,000, of which $25,000,000 shall be derived form the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

(2) For the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, $350,326,000, to remain available until expended, of which $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.

(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, $21,709,000, to remain available until expended, of which $3,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

(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, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

(5) For environmental compliance and restoration at Coast Guard facilities (other than parts and equipment associated with operations and maintenance), $19,500,000, to remain available until expended.

(6) 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, $26,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZED LEVELS OF MILITARY STRENGTH AND TRAINING.

(a) END-OF-YEAR STRENGTH FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—The Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength for active duty personnel of 36,350 as of September 30, 2000.

(b) TRAINING STUDENT LOADS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—For fiscal year 2000, the Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads as follows:

(1) For recruit and special training, 1,500 student years.

(2) For flight training, 100 student years.

(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions, 300 student years.

(4) For officer acquisition, 1,000 student years.

(c) END-OF-YEAR STRENGTH FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—The Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength for active duty personnel of 36,350 as of September 30, 2001.

(d) TRAINING STUDENT LOADS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—For fiscal year 2001, the Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads as follows:

(1) For recruit and special training, 1,500 student years.

(2) For flight training, 100 student years.

(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions, 300 student years.

(4) For officer acquisition, 1,000 student years.

TITLE II—PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SEC. 201. COAST GUARD BAND DIRECTOR RANK.

Section 336(d) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''commander'' and inserting ''captain''.

SEC. 202. COAST GUARD RESERVE SPECIAL PAY.

Section 308d(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating'' after ''Secretary of Defense''.

SEC. 203. COAST GUARD MEMBERSHIP ON THE USO BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

Section 1305(b) of title 36, United States Code, is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) The Secretary of Transportation, or the Secretary's designee, when the Coast Guard is not operating under the Department of the Navy.''.

SEC. 204. COMPENSATORY ABSENCE FOR ISOLATED DUTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 511 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''Sec. 511. Compensatory absence from duty for military personnel at isolated duty stations

''The Secretary may prescribe regulations to grant compensatory absence from duty to military personnel of the Coast Guard serving at isolated duty stations of the Coast Guard when conditions of duty result in confinement because of isolation or in long periods of continuous duty.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''511. Compensatory absence from duty for military personnel at isolated duty stations''.

SEC. 205. ACCELERATED PROMOTION OF CERTAIN COAST GUARD OFFICERS.

Title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 259, by adding at the end a new subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) After selecting the officers to be recommended for promotion, a selection board may recommend officers of particular merit, from among those officers chosen for promotion to be placed at the top of the list of selectees promulgated by the Secretary under section 271(a) of this title. The number of officers that a board may recommend to be placed at the top of the top of the list of selectees promulgated by the Secretary under section 271(a) of this title. The number of officers that a board may recommend to be placed at the top of the list of selectees may not exceed the percentages set forth in subsection (b) unless such a percentage is a number less than one, in which case the board may recommend one officer for such placement. No officer may be recommended to be placed at the top of the list of selectees unless he or she receives the recommendation of at least a majority of the members of a board composed of five members, or at least two-thirds of the members of a board composed of more than five members.'';

(2) in section 260(a), by inserting ''and the names of those officers recommended to be advanced to the top of the list of selectees established by the Secretary under section 271(a) of this title'' after ''promotion''; and

(3) in section 271(a), by inserting at the end therefore the following: ''The names of all officers approved by the President and recommended by the board to be placed at the top of the list of selectees shall be placed at the top of the list of selectees in the order of seniority on the active duty promotion list.''

TITLE III—MARINE SAFETY

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF TERRITORIAL SEA FOR VESSEL BRIDGE-TO-BRIDGE RADIO-TELEPHONE ACT.

Section 4(b) of the Vessel Bridge-to-Bridge Radio-telephone Act (33 U.S.C. 1203(b)), is amended by striking ''United States inside the lines established pursuant to section 2 of the Act of February 19, 1895 (28 Stat. 672), as amended.'' and inserting ''United States, which includes all waters of the territorial sea of the United States as described in Presidential Proclamation 5928 of December 27, 1988.''.

SEC. 302. REPORT ON ICEBREAKING SERVICES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 9 months afer the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House, a report on the use of WYTL-class harbor tugs. The report shall include an analyis of the use of such vessels to perform icebreaking services; the degree to which, if any, the decommissioning of each such vessel would result in a degradation of current icebreaking services; and in the event that the decommissioning of any such vessel would result in a significant degradation of icebreaking services, recommendations to remediate such degradation.

(b) 9–MONTH WAITING PERIOD.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall not plan, implement or finalize any regulation or take any other action which would result in the decommissioning of any WYTL-class harbor tugs until 9 months after the date of the submission of the report required by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 303. OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The report regarding the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund required by the Conference Report (House Report 101–892) accompanying the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991, as that requirement was amended by section 1122 of the Federal Reports Elmination and Sunset Act of 1995 (26 U.S.C. 9509 note), shall no longer be submitted to Congress.

(b) REPEAL.—Section 1122 of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (26 U.S.C. 9509 note) is amended by—

(1) striking subsection (a); and

(2) striking ''(b) REPORT ON JOINT FEDERAL AND STATE MOTOR FUEL TAX COMPLIANCE PROJECT.—''.

SEC. 304. OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND; EMERGENCY FUND BORROWING AUTHORITY.

Section 6002(b) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2752(b)) is amended after the first sentence by inserting ''To the extent that such amount is not adequate for removal of a discharge or the mitigation or prevention of a substantial threat of a discharge, the Coast Guard may borrow from the Fund such sums as may be necessary, up to a maximum of $100,000,000, and within 30 days shall notify Congress of the amount borrowed and the facts and circumstances necessitating the loan. Amounts borrowed shall be repaid to the Fund when, and to the extent that removal costs are recovered by the Coast Guard from responsible parties for the discharge or substantial threat of discharge.''.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I want to express my strong support for the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999. I would like to commend Senator SNOWE, the Chair of the Commerce Subcommittee on Oceans and Fisheries, for her leadership on Coast Guard issues. Earlier in the year, Senator SNOWE convened a hearing on the Coast Guard's fiscal year 2000 budget request. The Commandant of the Coast Guard testified at the hearing and explained the priorities and challenges that the Coast Guard will face in the coming years and the ways that the agency will handle them.

The Coast Guard is a branch of the armed forces and a multi-mission agency. The Coast Guard is responsible for our national defense, search and rescue services on our nation's waterways, maritime law enforcement, including drug interdiction and environmental protection, marine inspection, licensing, port safety and security, aids to navigation, waterways management, and boating safety. This bill will furnish the Coast Guard with funding authority to continue to provide the United States with high quality performance of its diverse duties through fiscal year 2001. I commend the men and women of the Coast Guard who serve their country with honor and distinction.

I believe the bill that we have introduced today is an important first step in providing authorizing legislation for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2000–2001. The funding levels are currently based on the Administration's transmitted legislative proposal. However, I am particularly concerned about the Coast Guard's ability to continue to fight the war on drugs. The vast majority of drugs enter our country illegally after being transported over our waterways. As the primary maritime law enforcement agency, the Coast Guard has proven that it can effectively stop drugs from reaching our streets. In fiscal year 1998, the Coast Guard seized 82,623 pounds of cocaine and 31,365 pounds of marijuana. Campaign STEEL WEB, the comprehensive, multi-year strategy to fight the war on drugs deserves full support and funding from both the Administration and the Congress. Before the Commerce Committee concludes its consideration of this bill, I intend to determine whether the Administration's bill will provide an adequate level of funding for the Coast Guard's drug interdiction activities. I will also seek to ensure that funding is spent on the most effective drug interdiction programs.

The bill also incorporates several non-controversial provisions included in the Administration's bill which would provide for a variety of improvements for the day-to-day operation of the Coast Guard. I look forward to working with Senator SNOWE and other members of the Commerce Committee during the Senate's consideration of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. LOTT):

S. 1090. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Liability, and Compensation Act of 1980; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE SUPERFUND PROGRAM COMPLETION ACT OF 1999

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Superfund Program Completion Act of 1999. This bill represents our efforts to focus on the areas where bipartisan consensus is achievable this year. The bill provides liability relief for many parties trapped in Superfund—in fact, it exempts or limits the liability of the vast bulk of all parties involved in Superfund litigation. The bill includes very strong provisions to facilitate the redevelopment of Brownfields, and it starts to wind down the Federal role in site cleanup, while enhancing the role of the states.

The bill includes many provisions that have enjoyed widespread bipartisan support in the Senate. The Brownfields title will provide $100 million in grants for state, tribal and local governments to identify, assess and redevelop Brownfields sites. It protects prospective purchasers of contaminated sites, innocent owners of properties adjacent to the source of contamination, and innocent property owners who exercised due diligence upon purchase. These provisions have been included in past bills supported by Democrats and Republicans over the last six years.

The bill exempts a number of parties from Superfund liability and incorporates provisions of S. 2180, the Superfund Recycling Equity Act of 1998, cosponsored last year by Senators LOTT and DASCHLE, as well as 64 other members of the Senate. Our bill exempts small businesses, contributors of very small amounts of hazardous waste, and contributors of small amounts of municipal solid waste. The bill limits the liability of larger generators or transporters of municipal solid waste, as well as owners or operators of co-disposal landfills where municipal solid waste is disposed. The bill limits the liability of so-called de minimis parties—generally one percent contributors or less—as well as municipalities and small businesses with a limited ability to pay.

It is well known that Superfund liability—retroactive, strict, joint and several liability—often can be terribly unfair. It does not make any sense to make Superfund liability even more unfair to the parties who do not receive liability relief in this bill by merely shifting the share of the exempt or limited parties onto those that remain liable. This bill does not do that. Instead, where we grant liability relief, we direct EPA to use the taxes already collected from industry to pay the cost of the exemptions. This seems only fair.

The bill also requires EPA to perform an impartial fair-share allocation at Superfund NPL sites and to give all parties an opportunity to settle for their allocated amount. In performing the allocation, EPA is directed to use the factors first proposed by Vice President GORE when he was serving in the House. EPA is given discretion to design the process, and parties that do not participate or settle remain liable to Superfund's underlying liability provisions, which remain unchanged except for those fortunate parties provided the new protections noted above.

As EPA proudly boasts, cleanup is complete or underway at over 90 percent of the sites on the current NPL. While it is cleaning up the sites at a rate of 85 per year, it has listed only an average of about 26 per year. Last year, the General Accounting Office surveyed the states and EPA about the approximately 3,000 sites identified as

possible National Priority List sites, but not yet listed. Only 232 of these sites were identified by either EPA, a state, or both, as likely to be listed on the NPL. Clearly, this program is much closer to the end than in the beginning.

This bill requires EPA to plan how it will proceed at those 3,000 sites still awaiting a decision regarding listing. Everyone knows that the vast bulk of these sites will not be listed on the Superfund List, they will be cleaned up by the states, as the GAO report confirms. Under our bill, new listings on the National Priority List must be requested by the Governor of the affected state, and EPA is limited to listing 30 sites per year.

The bill provides finality at sites cleaned up in state cleanup programs unless a state asks for help, fails to take action, or a true emergency is present. This will give greater confidence to prospective developers that state cleanup decisions will not be second-guessed by EPA. The bill strengthens state programs and starts to bring Superfund to an end.

The bill makes EPA's authorization and appropriation process more transparent. There are separate line items for EPA's cleanup program—the heart of the program—and all other activities such as Brownfields, support for research and development, Department of Justice enforcement, et cetera. No longer will increases in popular programs such as Brownfields come at the expense of the cleanup program. Authorization levels for the cleanup recognize that the program's workload is decreasing and will ramp down over time.

The bill allows the program to be funded from either general revenues or the Trust Fund. It is my view that the Superfund taxes should not be reimposed, and I will strongly oppose their reimposition absent comprehensive Superfund reform that includes needed improvements to provisions governing natural resource damages, liability, and the cleanup process. To the extent that EPA improves its cost recovery performance and the Trust Fund balance exceeds levels needed to fund the liability relief provided in this bill, then that balance, instead of general revenues, can be used for Superfund cleanup.

It is possible that EPA can recover enough past cleanup expenditures to pay for the full 5-year reauthorization program. Since the program's inception, EPA has spent approximately $15.9 billion on cleanup, the vast majority of it from industry-paid Superfund taxes deposited in the Trust Fund. Unfortunately, EPA has only recovered $2.4 billion of this total. Even discounting nearly $6.9 billion in expenditures that have been written-off by EPA or are no longer considered recoverable, there is approximately $6.6 billion that EPA could recover for the Trust Fund.

It is well known that Senator SMITH and I have long advocated comprehensive reform of the Superfund program. We have not abandoned that goal. However, in many ways, the bill we introduce today is more far-reaching than our efforts in the last two Congresses. Except for the liability provisions described above, the major focus of this bill is how to address sites not yet in the federal Superfund program. The Superfund Program Completion Act addresses the future of the Superfund program.

The major reforms included in our previous efforts are not a part of the new bill. This bill does not address liability for damages to natural resources. The bill does not include liability relief for large responsible parties, such as federal funding of the fair shares attributed to bankrupt, defunct and insolvent parties. The bill does not make changes to Superfund's provisions regarding the conduct of cleanups.

I still believe reforms are needed for natural resource damages, liability for large responsible parties, and the cleanup process. Unfortunately, the administration no longer supports legislative reform in these areas. Even in previous years, when the administration claimed to support such reforms, agreement was not possible. Given the remote prospects for concurrence on these issues, Senator SMITH and I decided to set the issues aside for now and move forward with an agenda that we believe can generate bipartisan support.

I cannot understand why anyone would fail to support this bill. It will accelerate Brownfields redevelopment. It will strengthen state programs in anticipation of the day we all know is coming—the day when the Superfund program becomes the small emergency program that was originally intended. It limits or eliminates the liability of many parties who were caught in Superfund's incredibly broad liability net, and it does so in a manner that is fair to those that are left. It does not undermine the so-called ''polluter pays'' principle, but in fact strengthens it by creating an incentive for EPA to improve its cost recovery performance.

The committee will move forward quickly on this bill. The committee will hold hearings on the bill next week. We will work through the Memorial Day recess to address Members' concerns, then hold a markup within 10 days of returning from the recess. The bill will be ready for floor action prior to the July Fourth recess.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1090

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Superfund Program Completion Act of 1999''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—BROWNFIELDS REVITALIZATION

Sec. 101. Brownfields.
Sec. 102. Contiguous properties.
Sec. 103. Prospective purchasers and windfall liens.
Sec. 104. Safe harbor innocent landholders.

TITLE II—STATE RESPONSE PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. State response programs.
Sec. 202. National priorities list completion.
Sec. 203. Federal emergency removal authority.
Sec. 204. State cost share.

TITLE III—FAIR SHARE LIABILITY ALLOCATIONS AND PROTECTIONS

Sec. 301. Liability exemptions and limitations.
Sec. 302. Expedited settlement for certain parties.
Sec. 303. Fair share settlements and statutory orphan shares.

TITLE IV—FUNDING

Sec. 401. Uses of Hazardous Substance Superfund.

TITLE I—BROWNFIELDS REVITALIZATION

SEC. 101. BROWNFIELDS.

Title I of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 127. BROWNFIELDS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) BROWNFIELD FACILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'brownfield facility' means real property, the expansion or redevelopment of which is complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'brownfield facility' does not include—

''(i) any portion of real property that, as of the date of submission of an application for assistance under this section, is the subject of an ongoing removal under title I;

''(ii) any portion of real property that has been listed on the National Priorities List or is proposed for listing as of the date of the submission of an application for assistance under this section;

''(iii) any portion of real property with respect to which cleanup work is proceeding in substantial compliance with the requirements of an administrative order on consent, or judicial consent decree that has been entered into, or a permit issued by, the United States or a duly authorized State under this Act, the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), section 311 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321), the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.), or the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

''(iv) a land disposal unit with respect to which—

''(I) a closure notification under subtitle C of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921 et seq.) has been submitted; and

''(II) closure requirements have been specified in a closure plan or permit;

''(v) a facility that is owned or operated by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States; or

''(vi) a portion of a facility, for which portion, assistance for response activity has been obtained under subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6991 et seq.) from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund established under section 9508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(C) FACILITIES OTHER THAN BROWNFIELD FACILITIES.—That a facility may not be a brownfield facility within the meaning of

subparagraph (A) has no effect on the eligibility of the facility for assistance under any provision of Federal law other than this section.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'eligible entity' means—

''(i) a general purpose unit of local government;

''(ii) a land clearance authority or other quasi-governmental entity that operates under the supervision and control of or as an agent of a general purpose unit of local government;

''(iii) a government entity created by a State legislature;

''(iv) a regional council or group of general purpose units of local government;

''(v) a redevelopment agency that is chartered or otherwise sanctioned by a State;

''(vi) a State; and

''(vii) an Indian Tribe.

''(B) EXCLUSION.—The term 'eligible entity' does not include any entity that is not in substantial compliance with the requirements of an administrative order on consent, judicial consent decree that has been entered into, or a permit issued by, the United States or a duly authorized State under this Act, the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.), or the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.) with respect to any portion of real property that is the subject of the administrative order on consent, judicial consent decree, or permit.

''(3) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

''(b) BROWNFIELD SITE CHARACTERIZATION AND ASSESSMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall establish a program to provide grants for the site characterization and assessment of brownfield facilities.

''(2) ASSISTANCE FOR SITE CHARACTERIZATION AND ASSESSMENT AND RESPONSE ACTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—On approval of an application made by an eligible entity, the Administrator may make grants to the eligible entity to be used for the site characterization and assessment of 1 or more brownfield facilities.

''(B) SITE CHARACTERIZATION AND ASSESSMENT.—A site characterization and assessment carried out with the use of a grant under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) shall be performed in accordance with section 101(35)(B); and

''(ii) may include a process to identify and inventory potential brownfield facilities.

''(c) BROWNFIELD REMEDIATION GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—In consultation with the Secretary, the Administrator shall establish a program to provide grants to be used for response actions (excluding site characterization and assessment) at 1 or more brownfield facilities.

''(2) ASSISTANCE FOR RESPONSE ACTIONS.—On approval of an application made by an eligible entity, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, may make grants to the eligible entity to be used for response actions (excluding site characterization and assessment) at 1 or more brownfield facilities.

''(d) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

''(1) MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The total of all grants under subsections (b) and (c) shall not exceed, with respect to any individual brownfield facility covered by the grants, $350,000.

''(B) WAIVER.—The Administrator may waive the $350,000 limitation under subparagraph (A) based on the anticipated level of contamination, size, or status of ownership of the facility.

''(2) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No part of a grant under this section may be used for payment of penalties, fines, or administrative costs.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—For the purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'administrative cost' does not include the cost of—

''(i) investigation and identification of the extent of contamination;

''(ii) design and performance of a response action; or

''(iii) monitoring of natural resources.

''(3) AUDITS.—The Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct such reviews or audits of grants under this section as the Inspector General considers necessary to carry out the objectives of this section. Audits shall be conducted in accordance with the auditing procedures of the General Accounting Office, including chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code.

''(4) LEVERAGING.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may use the funds for part of a project at a brownfield facility for which funding is received from other sources, but the grant shall be used only for the purposes described in subsection (b) or (c).

''(5) AGREEMENTS.—Each grant made under this section shall be subject to an agreement that—

''(A) requires the eligible entity to comply with all applicable State laws (including regulations);

''(B) requires that the eligible entity shall use the grant exclusively for purposes specified in subsection (b) or (c);

''(C) in the case of an application by an eligible entity under subsection (c), requires payment by the eligible entity of a matching share (which may be in the form of a contribution of labor, material, or services) of at least 20 percent of the costs of the response action for which the grant is made, is from non-Federal sources of funding.

''(D) contains such other terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to carry out this section.

''(e) GRANT APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) SUBMISSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any eligible entity may submit an application to the Administrator, through a regional office of the Environmental Protection Agency and in such form as the Administrator may require, for a grant under this section for 1 or more brownfield facilities.

''(B) COORDINATION.—In developing application requirements, the Administrator shall coordinate with the Secretary and other Federal agencies and departments, such that eligible entities under this section are made aware of other available Federal resources.

''(C) GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall publish guidance to assist eligible entities in obtaining grants under this section.

''(2) APPROVAL.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, shall make an annual evaluation of each application received during the prior fiscal year and make grants under this section to eligible entities that submit applications during the prior year and that the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, determines have the highest rankings under the ranking criteria established under paragraph (3).

''(3) RANKING CRITERIA.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish a system for ranking grant applications that includes the following criteria:

''(A) The extent to which a grant will stimulate the availability of other funds for environmental remediation and subsequent redevelopment of the area in which the brownfield facilities are located.

''(B) The potential of the development plan for the area in which the brownfield facilities are located to stimulate economic development of the area on completion of the cleanup, such as the following:

''(i) The relative increase in the estimated fair market value of the area as a result of any necessary response action.

''(ii) The demonstration by applicants of the intent and ability to create new or expand existing business, employment, recreation, or conservation opportunities on completion of any necessary response action.

''(iii) If commercial redevelopment is planned, the estimated additional full-time employment opportunities and tax revenues expected to be generated by economic redevelopment in the area in which a brownfield facility is located.

''(iv) The estimated extent to which a grant would facilitate the identification of or facilitate a reduction of health and environmental risks.

''(v) The financial involvement of the State and local government in any response action planned for a brownfield facility and the extent to which the response action and the proposed redevelopment is consistent with any applicable State or local community economic development plan.

''(vi) The extent to which the site characterization and assessment or response action and subsequent development of a brownfield facility involves the active participation and support of the local community.

''(vii) Such other factors as the Administrator considers appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

''(C) The extent to which a grant will enable the creation of or addition to parks, greenways, or other recreational property.

''(D) The extent to which a grant will meet the needs of a community that has an inability to draw on other sources of funding for environmental remediation and subsequent redevelopment of the area in which a brownfield facility is located because of the small population or low income of the community.''.

SEC. 102. CONTIGUOUS PROPERTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(o) CONTIGUOUS PROPERTIES.—

''(1) NOT CONSIDERED TO BE AN OWNER OR OPERATOR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A person that owns or operates real property that is contiguous to or otherwise similarly situated with respect to real property on which there has been a release or threatened release of a hazardous substance and that is or may be contaminated by the release shall not be considered to be an owner or operator of a vessel or facility under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) solely by reason of the contamination if—

''(i) the person did not cause, contribute, or consent to the release or threatened release;

''(ii) the person is not affiliated through any familial or corporate relationship with any person that is or was a party potentially responsible for response costs at the facility; and

''(iii) the person exercised appropriate care with respect to each hazardous substance found at the facility by taking reasonable steps to stop any continuing release, prevent any threatened future release and prevent or limit human or natural resource exposure to any previously released hazardous substance.

''(B) GROUND WATER.—With respect to hazardous substances in ground water beneath a

person's property solely as a result of subsurface migration in an aquifer from a source or sources outside the property, appropriate care shall not require the person to conduct ground water investigations or to install ground water remediation systems.

''(2) COOPERATION, ASSISTANCE, AND ACCESS.—A party described in paragraph (1) may be considered an owner or operator of a vessel or facility under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) if the party has failed to substantially comply with the requirement stated in section 122(p)(2)(H) with respect to the facility.

''(3) ASSURANCES.—The Administrator may—

''(A) issue an assurance that no enforcement action under this Act will be initiated against a person described in paragraph (1); and

''(B) grant a person described in paragraph (1) protection against a cost recovery or contribution action under section 113(f).''.

(b) NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(8)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon at the end; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) provision that in listing a facility on the National Priorities List, the Administrator shall not include any parcel of real property at which no release has actually occurred, but to which a released hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant has migrated in ground water that has moved through subsurface strata from another parcel of real estate at which the release actually occurred, unless—

''(i) the ground water is in use as a public drinking water supply or was in such use at the time of the release; and

''(ii) the owner or operator of the facility is liable, or is affiliated with any other person that is liable, for any response costs at the facility, through any direct or indirect familial relationship, or any contractual, corporate, or financial relationship other than that created by the instruments by which title to the facility is conveyed or financed.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) LISTING OF PARTICULAR PARCELS.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In subsection (a)(8)(C) and paragraph (2) of this subsection, the term 'parcel of real property' means a parcel, lot, or tract of land that has a separate legal description from that of any other parcel, lot, or tract of land the legal description and ownership of which has been recorded in accordance with the law of the State in which it is located.

''(2) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a)(8)(C) limits the Administrator's authority under section 104 to obtain access to and undertake response actions at any parcel of real property to which a released hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant has migrated in the ground water.''.

(2) REVISION OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall revise the National Priorities List to conform with the amendments made by paragraph (1).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 107(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607) is amended by striking ''of this section'' and inserting ''and the exemptions and limitations stated in this section''.

SEC. 103. PROSPECTIVE PURCHASERS AND WINDFALL LIENS.

(a) DEFINITION OF BONA FIDE PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER.—Section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(39) BONA FIDE PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER.—The term 'bona fide prospective purchaser' means a person that acquires ownership of a facility after the date of enactment of this paragraph, or a tenant of such a person, that establishes each of the following by a preponderance of the evidence:

''(A) DISPOSAL PRIOR TO ACQUISITION.—All deposition of hazardous substances at the facility occurred before the person acquired the facility.

''(B) INQUIRIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The person made all appropriate inquiries into the previous ownership and uses of the facility and the facility's real property in accordance with generally accepted good commercial and customary standards and practices.

''(ii) STANDARDS AND PRACTICES.—The standards and practices referred to in paragraph (35)(B)(ii) or those issued or adopted by the Administrator under that paragraph shall be considered to satisfy the requirements of this subparagraph.

''(iii) RESIDENTIAL USE.—In the case of property for residential or other similar use purchased by a nongovernmental or noncommercial entity, a facility inspection and title search that reveal no basis for further investigation shall be considered to satisfy the requirements of this subparagraph.

''(C) NOTICES.—The person provided all legally required notices with respect to the discovery or release of any hazardous substances at the facility.

''(D) CARE.—The person exercised appropriate care with respect to each hazardous substance found at the facility by taking reasonable steps to stop any continuing release, prevent any threatened future release and prevent or limit human or natural resource exposure to any previously released hazardous substance.

''(E) COOPERATION, ASSISTANCE, AND ACCESS.—The person has not failed to substantially comply with the requirement stated in section 122(p)(2)(H) with respect to the facility.

''(F) NO AFFILIATION.—The person is not affiliated through any familial or corporate relationship with any person that is or was a party potentially responsible for response costs at the facility.''.

(b) AMENDMENT.—Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607) (as amended by section 102) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(p) PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER AND WINDFALL LIEN.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a bona fide prospective purchaser whose potential liability for a release or threatened release is based solely on the purchaser's being considered to be an owner or operator of a facility shall not be liable as long as the bona fide prospective purchaser does not impede the performance of a response action or natural resource restoration.

''(2) LIEN.—If there are unrecovered response costs at a facility for which an owner of the facility is not liable by reason of subsection (n)(1) and each of the conditions described in paragraph (3) is met, the United States shall have a lien on the facility, or may obtain from appropriate responsible party a lien on any other property or other assurances of payment satisfactory to the Administrator, for such unrecovered costs.

''(3) CONDITIONS.—The conditions referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

''(A) RESPONSE ACTION.—A response action for which there are unrecovered costs is carried out at the facility.

''(B) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The response action increases the fair market value of the facility above the fair market value of the facility that existed 180 days before the response action was initiated.

''(C) SALE.—A sale or other disposition of all or a portion of the facility has occurred.

''(4) AMOUNT.—A lien under paragraph (2)—

''(A) shall not exceed the increase in fair market value of the property attributable to the response action at the time of a subsequent sale or other disposition of the property;

''(B) shall arise at the time at which costs are first incurred by the United States with respect to a response action at the facility;

''(C) shall be subject to the requirements of subsection (l)(3); and

''(D) shall continue until the earlier of satisfaction of the lien or recovery of all response costs incurred at the facility.''.

SEC. 104. SAFE HARBOR INNOCENT LANDHOLDERS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 101(35) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(35)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the matter that precedes clause (i), by striking ''deeds or'' and inserting ''deeds, easements, leases, or''; and

(B) in the matter that follows clause (iii)—

(i) by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the defendant''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting '', has provided full cooperation, assistance, and facility access to the persons that are responsible for response actions at the facility, including the cooperation and access necessary for the installation, integrity, operation, and maintenance of any complete or partial response action at the facility, and has taken no action that impeded the effectiveness or integrity of any institutional control employed under section 121 at the facility.''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) REASON TO KNOW.—

''(i) ALL APPROPRIATE INQUIRIES.—To establish that the defendant had no reason to know of the matter described in subparagraph (A)(i), the defendant must show that—

''(I) at or prior to the date on which the defendant acquired the facility, the defendant undertook all appropriate inquiries into the previous ownership and uses of the facility in accordance with generally accepted good commercial and customary standards and practices; and

''(II) the defendant exercised appropriate care with respect to each hazardous substance found at the facility by taking reasonable steps to stop any continuing release, prevent any threatened future release and prevent or limit human or natural resource exposure to any previously released hazardous substance.

''(ii) STANDARDS AND PRACTICES.—The Administrator shall by regulation establish as standards and practices for the purpose of clause (i)—

''(I) the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E1527–94, entitled 'Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process'; or

''(II) alternative standards and practices under clause (iii).

''(iii) ALTERNATIVE STANDARDS AND PRACTICES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may by regulation issue alternative standards

and practices or designate standards developed by other organizations than the American Society for Testing and Materials after conducting a study of commercial and industrial practices concerning the transfer of real property in the United States.

''(II) CONSIDERATIONS.—In issuing or designating alternative standards and practices under subclause (I), the Administrator shall consider including each of the following:

''(aa) The results of an inquiry by an environmental professional.

''(bb) Interviews with past and present owners, operators, and occupants of the facility and the facility's real property for the purpose of gathering information regarding the potential for contamination at the facility and the facility's real property.

''(cc) Reviews of historical sources, such as chain of title documents, aerial photographs, building department records, and land use records to determine previous uses and occupancies of the real property since the property was first developed.

''(dd) Searches for recorded environmental cleanup liens, filed under Federal, State, or local law, against the facility or the facility's real property.

''(ee) Reviews of Federal, State, and local government records (such as waste disposal records), underground storage tank records, and hazardous waste handling, generation, treatment, disposal, and spill records, concerning contamination at or near the facility or the facility's real property.

''(ff) Visual inspections of the facility and facility's real property and of adjoining properties.

''(gg) Specialized knowledge or experience on the part of the defendant.

''(hh) The relationship of the purchase price to the value of the property if the property was uncontaminated.

''(ii) Commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information about the property.

''(jj) The degree of obviousness of the presence or likely presence of contamination at the property, and the ability to detect such contamination by appropriate investigation.

''(iv) SITE INSPECTION AND TITLE SEARCH.—In the case of property for residential use or other similar use purchased by a nongovernmental or noncommercial entity, a facility inspection and title search that reveal no basis for further investigation shall be considered to satisfy the requirements of this subparagraph.''.

(b) STANDARDS AND PRACTICES.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT BY REGULATION.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue the regulation required by section 101(35)(B)(ii) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (as added by subsection (a)) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) INTERIM STANDARDS AND PRACTICES.—Until the Administrator issues the regulation described in paragraph (1), in making a determination under section 101(35)(B)(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (as added by subsection (a)), there shall be taken into account—

(A) any specialized knowledge or experience on the part of the defendant;

(B) the relationship of the purchase price to the value of the property if the property was uncontaminated;

(C) commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information about the property;

(D) the degree of obviousness of the presence or likely presence of contamination at the property; and

(E) the ability to detect the contamination by appropriate investigation.

TITLE II—STATE RESPONSE PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. STATE RESPONSE PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601) (as amended by section 103(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(40) FACILITY SUBJECT TO STATE CLEANUP.—The term 'facility subject to State cleanup' means a facility that—

''(A) is not listed or proposed for listing on the National Priorities List; and

''(B)(i) has been archived from the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System;

''(ii) was included on the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System before the date of enactment of this section and is not listed or proposed for listing on the National Priorities List within 2 years after the date of enactment of this section; or

''(iii) is added to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System after the date of enactment of this section, if at least 2 years have elapsed since the earlier of—

''(I) inclusion of the facility on the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System; or

''(II) issuance at the facility of an order under section 106(a).

''(41) QUALIFYING STATE RESPONSE PROGRAM.—The term 'qualifying State response program' means a State program that includes the elements described in section 128(b).''.

(b) QUALIFYING STATE RESPONSE PROGRAMS.—Title I of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) (as amended by section 101(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 128. QUALIFYING STATE RESPONSE PROGRAMS.

''(a) ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—The Administrator shall provide grants to States to establish and expand qualifying State response programs that include the elements listed in subsection (b).

''(b) ELEMENTS.—The elements of a qualifying State response program are the following:

''(1) Oversight and enforcement authorities or other mechanisms that are adequate to ensure that—

''(A) response actions will protect human health and the environment and be conducted in accordance with applicable Federal and State law; and

''(B) in the case of a voluntary response action, if the person conducting the voluntary response action fails to complete the necessary response activities, including operation and maintenance or long-term monitoring activities, the necessary response activities are completed.

''(2) Adequate opportunities for public participation, including prior notice and opportunity for comment in appropriate circumstances, in selecting response actions.

''(3) Mechanisms for approval of a response action plan, or a requirement for certification or similar documentation from the State to the person conducting a response action indicating that the response is complete.

''(c) ENFORCEMENT IN CASES OF A RELEASE SUBJECT TO A STATE PLAN.—

''(1) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in the case of a release or threatened release of a hazardous substance at a facility subject to State cleanup, neither the President nor any other person may use any authority under this Act to take an enforcement action against any person regarding any matter that is within the scope of a response action that is being conducted or has been completed under State law.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The President may bring an enforcement action under this Act with respect to a facility described in subparagraph (A) if—

''(i) the enforcement action is authorized under section 104;

''(ii) the State requests that the President provide assistance in the performance of a response action and that the enforcement bar in subparagraph (A) be lifted;

''(iii) at a facility at which response activities are ongoing the Administrator—

''(I) makes a written determination that the State is unwilling or unable to take appropriate action, after the Administrator has provided the Governor notice and an opportunity to cure; and

''(II) the Administrator determines that the release or threat of release constitutes a public health or environmental emergency under section 104(a)(4);

''(iv) the Administrator determines that contamination has migrated across a State line, resulting in the need for further response action to protect human health or the environment; or

''(v) in the case of a facility at which all response actions have been completed, the Administrator—

''(I) makes a written determination that the State is unwilling or unable to take appropriate action, after the Administrator has provided the Governor notice and an opportunity to cure; and

''(II) makes a written determination that the facility presents a substantial risk that requires further remediation to protect human health or the environment, as evidenced by—

''(aa) newly discovered information regarding contamination at the facility;

''(bb) the discovery that fraud was committed in demonstrating attainment of standards at the facility; or

''(cc) a failure of the remedy under the State remedial action plan or a change in land use giving rise to a clear threat of exposure.

''(C) EPA NOTIFICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a facility at which there is a release or threatened release of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant and for which the Administrator intends to undertake an administrative or enforcement action, the Administrator, prior to taking the administrative or enforcement action, shall notify the State of the action the Administrator intends to take and wait for an acknowledgment from the State under clause (ii).

''(ii) STATE RESPONSE.—Not later than 48 hours after receiving a notice from the Administrator under clause (i), the State shall notify the Administrator if the facility is currently or has been subject to a State remedial action plan.

''(iii) PUBLIC HEALTH OR ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCY.—If the Administrator finds that a release or threatened release constitutes a public health or environmental emergency under section 104(a)(4), the Administrator may take appropriate action immediately after giving notification under clause (i) without waiting for State acknowledgment.

''(2) COST OR DAMAGE RECOVERY ACTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an action brought by a State, Indian Tribe, or general purpose unit of local government for the recovery of costs or damages under this Act.

''(3) SAVINGS PROVISION.—

''(A) EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—A memorandum of agreement, memorandum of understanding, or similar agreement between

the President and a State or Indian tribe defining Federal and State or tribal response action responsibilities that was in effect as of the date of enactment of this section with respect to a facility to which paragraph (1)(C) does not apply shall remain effective until the agreement expires in accordance with the terms of the agreement.

''(B) NEW AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this subsection precludes the President from entering into an agreement with a State or Indian tribe regarding responsibility at a facility to which paragraph (1)(C) does not apply.''.

SEC. 202. NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST COMPLETION.

Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST COMPLETION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the President shall complete the evaluation of all facilities classified as awaiting a National Priorities List decision to determine the risk or danger to public health or welfare or the environment posed by each facility as compared with the other facilities.

''(2) MAXIMUM NUMBER.—For fiscal years 2000 through 2004, the President shall add a maximum of 30 facilities to the National Priorities List on an annual basis.

''(3) REQUIREMENT OF REQUEST BY THE GOVERNOR OF A STATE.—No facility shall be added to the National Priorities List without the President having first received a written communication from the Governor of the State in which the facility is located requesting that the facility be added.''.

SEC. 203. FEDERAL EMERGENCY REMOVAL AUTHORITY.

Section 104(c)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''consistent with the remedial action to be taken'' and inserting ''not inconsistent with any remedial action that has been selected or is anticipated at the time of any removal action at a facility,'';

(2) by striking ''$2,000,000'' and inserting ''$5,000,000''; and

(3) by striking ''12 months'' and inserting ''3 years''.

SEC. 204. STATE COST SHARE.

Section 104(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(c)(1) Unless'' and inserting the following:

''(c) MISCELLANEOUS LIMITATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) CONTINUANCE OF OBLIGATIONS FROM FUND.—Unless'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking ''taken obligations'' and inserting ''taken, obligations'';

(3) by striking ''(2) The President'' and inserting the following:

''(2) CONSULTATION.—The President''; and

(4) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) STATE COST SHARE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall not provide any funding for remedial action under this section unless the State in which the release occurs first enters into a contract or cooperative agreement with the Administrator that provides assurances that the State will pay, in cash or through in-kind contributions, 10 percent of the costs of—

''(i) the remedial action; and

''(ii) operation and maintenance costs.

''(B) ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO WHICH STATE COST SHARE IS REQUIRED.—No State cost share shall be required except for remedial actions under this section.

''(C) INDIAN TRIBES.—The requirements of this paragraph shall not apply in the case of remedial action to be taken on land or water—

''(i) held by an Indian Tribe;

''(ii) held by the United States in trust for an Indian Tribe;

''(iii) held by a member of an Indian Tribe (if the land or water is subject to a trust restriction on alienation); or

''(iv) within the borders of an Indian reservation.

TITLE III—FAIR SHARE LIABILITY ALLOCATIONS AND PROTECTIONS

SEC. 301. LIABILITY EXEMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Liability, and Compensation Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601) (as amended by section 201(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(42) CODISPOSAL LANDFILL.—The term 'codisposal landfill' means a landfill that—

''(A) was listed on the National Priorities List as of the date of enactment of this paragraph;

''(B) received for disposal municipal solid waste or sewage sludge; and

''(C) may also have received, before the effective date of requirements under subtitle C of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921 et seq.), any hazardous waste, if the landfill contains predominantly municipal solid waste or sewage sludge that was transported to the landfill from outside the facility.

''(43) MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'municipal solid waste' means waste material generated by—

''(i) a household (such as a single- or multifamily residence) or a public lodging (such as a hotel or motel); or

''(ii) a commercial, institutional, or industrial source, to the extent that—

''(I) the waste material is substantially similar to waste normally generated by a household or public lodging (without regard to differences in volume); or

''(II) the waste material is collected and disposed of with other municipal solid waste or sewage sludge and, regardless of when generated, would be conditionally exempt small quantity generator waste under the regulation issued under section 3001(d) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921(d)).

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'municipal solid waste' includes food and yard waste, paper, clothing, appliances, consumer product packaging, disposable diapers, office supplies, cosmetics, glass and metal food containers, elementary or secondary school science laboratory waste, and household hazardous waste.

''(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'municipal solid waste' does not include combustion ash generated by resource recovery facilities or municipal incinerators or waste from manufacturing or processing (including pollution control) operations that is not described in subclause (I) or (II).

''(44) MUNICIPALITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'municipality' means a political subdivision of a State (including a city, county, village, town, township, borough, parish, school district, sanitation district, water district, or other public entity performing local governmental functions).

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'municipality' includes a natural person acting in the capacity of an official, employee, or agent of any entity described in subparagraph (A) in the performance of a governmental function.

''(45) SEWAGE SLUDGE.—The term 'sewage sludge' means solid, semisolid, or liquid residue removed during the treatment of municipal waste water, domestic sewage, or other waste water at or by publicly owned treatment works.''.

(b) EXEMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607) (as amended by section 103(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(q) LIABILITY EXEMPTION FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND SEWAGE SLUDGE.—No person shall be liable to the United States or to any other person (including liability for contribution) under this section for any response costs at a facility listed on the National Priorities List to the extent that—

''(1) the person is liable solely under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (a); and

''(2) the person is—

''(A) an owner, operator, or lessee of residential property from which all of the person's municipal solid waste was generated;

''(B) a business entity that, during the tax year preceding the date of transmittal of written notification that the business is potentially liable, employs not more than 100 individuals; or

''(C) a nonprofit organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that employs not more than 100 individuals, from which all of the person's municipal solid waste was generated.

''(r) DE MICROMIS CONTRIBUTOR EXEMPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a vessel or facility listed on the National Priorities List, no person described in paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (a) shall be liable to the United States or to any other person (including liability for contribution) for any response costs under this section if the activity specifically attributable to the person resulted in the disposal or treatment of not more than 200 pounds or 110 gallons of material containing a hazardous substance at the vessel or facility before the date of enactment of this subsection, or such greater amount as the Administrator may determine by regulation.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in a case in which the Administrator determines that material described in paragraph (1) has contributed or may contribute significantly, individually, to the amount of response costs at the facility.

''(s) SMALL BUSINESS EXEMPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No person shall be liable to the United States or to any person (including liability for contribution) under this section for any response costs at a facility listed on the National Priorities List if—

''(A) the person is a business that—

''(i) during the taxable year preceding the date of transmittal of notification that the business is a potentially responsible party, had full- and part-time employees whose combined time was equivalent to 75 or fewer full-time employees; or

''(ii) for that taxable year reported $3,000,000 or less in gross revenue;

''(B) the activity specifically attributable to the person resulted in the disposal or treatment of material containing a hazardous substance at the vessel or facility before the date of enactment of this subsection; and

''(C) the person is not affiliated through any familial or corporate relationship with any person that is or was a party potentially responsible for response costs at the facility.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in a case in which the material containing a hazardous substance referred to in subparagraph (A) contributed significantly or could contribute significantly to the cost of the response action with respect to the facility.

''(t) MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND SEWAGE SLUDGE EXEMPTION AND LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) CONTRIBUTION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND MUNICIPAL SEWAGE SLUDGE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The condition stated in this subparagraph is that the liability of the potentially responsible party is for response costs based on paragraph (3) or (4) of section 107(a) and on the potentially responsible party's having arranged for disposal or treatment of, arranged with a transporter for transport for disposal or treatment of, or accepted for transport for disposal or treatment of, municipal solid waste or municipal sewage sludge at a facility listed on the National Priorities List.

''(B) SETTLEMENT AMOUNT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The President shall offer a settlement to a party referred to in clause (i) with respect to liability under paragraph (3) or (4) of section 107(a) on the basis of a payment of $5.30 per ton of municipal solid waste or municipal sewage sludge that the President estimates is attributable to the party.

''(ii) REVISION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The President may revise the settlement amount under clause (i) by regulation.

''(II) BASIS.—A revised settlement amount under subclause (I) shall reflect the estimated per-ton cost of closure and post-closure activities at a representative facility containing only municipal solid waste.

''(C) CONDITIONS.—The provisions for settlement described in this subparagraph shall not apply with respect to a facility where there is no waste except municipal solid waste or municipal sewage sludge.

''(D) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—The Administrator may by guidance periodically adjust the settlement amount under subparagraph (B) to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (or other appropriate index, as determined by the Administrator).

''(2) MUNICIPAL OWNERS AND OPERATORS.—

''(A) AGGREGATE LIABILITY OF LARGE MUNICIPALITIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a codisposal landfill that is owned or operated in whole or in part by municipalities with a population of 100,000 or more (according to the 1990 census), and that is not subject to the criteria for solid waste landfills published under subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.) at part 258 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), the aggregate amount of liability of such municipal owners and operators for response costs under this section shall be not greater than 20 percent of such costs.

''(ii) INCREASED AMOUNT.—The President may increase the percentage under clause (i) to not more than 35 percent with respect to a municipality if the President determines that the municipality committed specific acts that exacerbated environmental contamination or exposure with respect to the facility.

''(iii) DECREASED AMOUNT.—The President may decrease the percentage under clause (i) with respect to a municipality to not less than 10 percent if the President determines that the municipality took specific acts of mitigation during the operation of the facility to avoid environmental contamination or exposure with respect to the facility.

''(B) AGGREGATE LIABILITY OF SMALL MUNICIPALITIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a codisposal landfill that is owned or operated in whole or in part by municipalities with a population of less than 100,000 (according to the 1990 census), that is not subject to the criteria for solid waste landfills published under subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.) at part 258 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), the aggregate amount of liability of such municipal owners and operators for response costs under this section shall be not greater than 10 percent of such costs.

''(ii) INCREASED AMOUNT.—The President may increase the percentage under clause (i) to not more than 20 percent with respect to a municipality if the President determines that the municipality committed specific acts that exacerbated environmental contamination or exposure with respect to the facility.

''(iii) DECREASED AMOUNT.—The President may decrease the percentage under clause (i) with respect to a municipality to not less than 5 percent if the President determines that the municipality took specific acts of mitigation during the operation of the facility to avoid environmental contamination or exposure with respect to the facility.

''(3) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection shall not apply to—

''(A) a person that acted in violation of subtitle C of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921 et seq.) at a facility that is subject to a response action under this title, if the violation pertains to a hazardous substance the release of threat of release of which caused the incurrence of response costs at the facility;

''(B) a person that owned or operated a codisposal landfill in violation of the applicable requirements for municipal solid waste landfill units under subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.) after October 9, 1991, if the violation pertains to a hazardous substance the release of threat of release of which caused the incurrence of response costs at the facility; or

''(C) a person under section 122(p)(2)(G).

''(4) PERFORMANCE OF RESPONSE ACTIONS.—As a condition of a settlement with a municipality under this subsection, the President may require that the municipality perform or participate in the performance of the response actions at the facility.

''(5) NOTICE OF APPLICABILITY.—The President shall provide a potentially responsible party with notice of the potential applicability of this section in each written communication with the party concerning the potential liability of the party.

''(u) RECYCLING TRANSACTIONS.—

''(1) LIABILITY CLARIFICATION.—As provided in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), a person who arranged for recycling of recyclable material shall not be liable under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (a) with respect to the material.

''(2) RECYCLABLE MATERIAL DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'recyclable material' means scrap paper, scrap plastic, scrap glass, scrap textiles, scrap rubber (other than whole tires), scrap metal, or spent lead-acid, spent nickel-cadmium, and other spent batteries, as well as minor amounts of material incident to or adhering to the scrap material as a result of its normal and customary use prior to becoming scrap; except that such term shall not include shipping containers of a capacity from 30 liters to 3,000 liters, whether intact or not, having any hazardous substance (but not metal bits and pieces or hazardous substance that form an integral part of the container) contained in or adhering thereto.

''(3) TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING SCRAP PAPER, PLASTIC, GLASS, TEXTILES, OR RUBBER.—Transactions involving scrap paper, scrap plastic, scrap glass, scrap textiles, or scrap rubber (other than whole tires) shall be deemed to be arranging for recycling if the person who arranged for the transaction (by selling recyclable material or otherwise arranging for the recycling of recyclable material) can demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that all of the following criteria were met at the time of the transaction:

''(A) The recyclable material met a commercial specification grade.

''(B) A market existed for the recyclable material.

''(C) A substantial portion of the recyclable material was made available for use as feedstock for the manufacture of a new saleable product.

''(D) The recyclable material could have been a replacement or substitute for a virgin raw material, or the product to be made from the recyclable material could have been a replacement or substitute for a product made, in whole or in part, from a virgin raw material.

''(E) For transactions occurring 90 days or more after the date of enactment of this subsection, the person exercised reasonable care to determine that the facility where the recyclable material was handled, processed, reclaimed, or otherwise managed by another person (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as a 'consuming facility') was in compliance with substantive (not procedural or administrative) provisions of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, or compliance order or decree issued pursuant thereto, applicable to the handling, processing, reclamation, storage, or other management activities associated with recyclable material.

''(F) For purposes of this paragraph, 'reasonable care' shall be determined using criteria that include (but are not limited to)—

''(i) the price paid in the recycling transaction;

''(ii) the ability of the person to detect the nature of the consuming facility's operations concerning its handling, processing, reclamation, or other management activities associated with recyclable material; and

''(iii) the result of inquiries made to the appropriate Federal, State, or local environmental agency (or agencies) regarding the consuming facility's past and current compliance with substantive (not procedural or administrative) provisions of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, or compliance order or decree issued pursuant thereto, applicable to the handling, processing, reclamation, storage, or other management activities associated with the recyclable material. For the purposes of this subparagraph, a requirement to obtain a permit applicable to the handling, processing, reclamation, or other management activity associated with the recyclable materials shall be deemed to be a substantive provision.

''(4) TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING SCRAP METAL.—

''(A) Transactions involving scrap metal shall be deemed to be arranging for recycling if the person who arranged for the transaction (by selling recyclable material or otherwise arranging for the recycling of recyclable material) can demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that at the time of the transaction—

''(i) the person met the criteria set forth in paragraph (3) with respect to the scrap metal;

''(ii) the person was in compliance with any applicable regulations or standards regarding the storage, transport, management, or other activities associated with the recycling of scrap metal that the Administrator promulgates under the Solid Waste Disposal

Act subsequent to the enactment of this subsection and with regard to transactions occurring after the effective date of such regulations or standards; and

''(iii) the person did not melt the scrap metal prior to the transaction.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), melting of scrap metal does not include the thermal separation of 2 or more materials due to differences in their melting points (referred to as 'sweating').

''(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'scrap metal' means—

''(i) bits and pieces of metal parts (e.g., bars, turnings, rods, sheets, wire) or metal pieces that may be combined together with bolts or soldering (e.g., radiators, scrap automobiles, railroad box cars), which when worn or superfluous can be recycled; and

''(ii) notwithstanding subparagraph (A)(iii), metal byproducts from copper and copper-based alloys that—

''(I) are not 1 of the primary products of a secondary production process;

''(II) are not solely or separately produced by the production process;

''(III) are not stored in a pile or surface impoundment; and

''(IV) are sold to another recycler that is not speculatively accumulating such metal byproducts;

except for scrap metals that the Administrator excludes from this definition by regulation.

''(5) TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING BATTERIES.—Transactions involving spent lead-acid batteries, spent nickel-cadmium batteries, or other spent batteries shall be deemed to be arranging for recycling if the person who arranged for the transaction (by selling recyclable material or otherwise arranging for the recycling of recyclable material) can demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that at the time of the transaction—

''(A) the person met the criteria set forth in paragraph (3) with respect to the spent lead-acid batteries, spent nickel-cadmium batteries, or other spent batteries, but the person did not recover the valuable components of such batteries; and

''(B)(i) with respect to transactions involving lead-acid batteries, the person was in compliance with applicable Federal environmental regulations or standards, and any amendments thereto, regarding the storage, transport, management, or other activities associated with the recycling of spent lead-acid batteries;

''(ii) with respect to transactions involving nickel-cadmium batteries, Federal environmental regulations or standards are in effect regarding the storage, transport, management, or other activities associated with the recycling of spent nickel-cadmium batteries, and the person was in compliance with applicable regulations or standards or any amendments thereto; or

''(iii) with respect to transactions involving other spent batteries, Federal environmental regulations or standards are in effect regarding the storage, transport, management, or other activities associated with the recycling of such batteries, and the person was in compliance with applicable regulations or standards or any amendments thereto.

''(6) EXCLUSIONS.—

''(A) The exemptions set forth in paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) shall not apply if—

''(i) the person had an objectively reasonable basis to believe at the time of the recycling transaction—

''(I) that the recyclable material would not be recycled;

''(II) that the recyclable material would be burned as fuel, or for energy recovery or incineration; or

''(III) for transactions occurring before 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, that the consuming facility was not in compliance with a substantive (not procedural or administrative) provision of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, or compliance order or decree issued pursuant thereto, applicable to the handling, processing, reclamation, or other management activities associated with the recyclable material;

''(ii) the person had reason to believe that hazardous substances had been added to the recyclable material for purposes other than processing for recycling;

''(iii) the person failed to exercise reasonable care with respect to the management and handling of the recyclable material (including adhering to customary industry practices current at the time of the recycling transaction designed to minimize, through source control, contamination of the recyclable material by hazardous substances); or

''(iv) with respect to any item of a recyclable material, the item contained polychlorinated biphenyls at a concentration in excess of 50 parts per million or any new standard promulgated pursuant to applicable Federal laws.

''(B) For purposes of this paragraph, an objectively reasonable basis for belief shall be determined using criteria that include (but are not limited to) the size of the person's business, customary industry practices (including customary industry practices current at the time of the recycling transaction designed to minimize, through source control, contamination of the recyclable material by hazardous substances), the price paid in the recycling transaction, and the ability of the person to detect the nature of the consuming facility's operations concerning its handling, processing, reclamation, or other management activities associated with the recyclable material.

''(C) For purposes of this paragraph, a requirement to obtain a permit applicable to the handling, processing, reclamation, or other management activities associated with recyclable material shall be deemed to be a substantive provision.''.

(2) TRANSITION RULES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The exemptions under subsections (q), (r), and (s) of section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607(q), 9607(r), 9607(s)) (as added by paragraph (1)) shall not apply to any settlement or judgment approved by a United States Federal District Court—

(i) before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EFFECT ON PENDING OR CONCLUDED ACTIONS.—The exemptions provided in subsection (u) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607(u)) (as added by paragraph (1)) shall not affect any concluded judicial or administrative action or any pending judicial action initiated by the United States prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) SERVICE STATION DEALERS.—Section 114(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9614(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''No person'' and inserting ''A person'';

(B) by striking ''may recover'' and inserting ''may not recover'';

(C) by striking ''if such recycled oil'' and inserting ''unless the service station dealer''; and

(D) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) mixed the recycled oil with any other hazardous substance; or

''(B) did not store, treat, transport, or otherwise manage the recycled oil in compliance with any applicable regulations or standards promulgated under section 3014 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6935) and other applicable authorities that were in effect on the date of such activity.''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 302. EXPEDITED SETTLEMENT FOR CERTAIN PARTIES.

(a) PARTIES ELIGIBLE.—Section 122(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9622(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subsection heading and inserting the following:

''(g) EXPEDITED FINAL SETTLEMENT.—'';

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(B) by striking ''(1)'' and all that follows through subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(1) PARTIES ELIGIBLE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—As expeditiously as practicable, the President shall—

''(i) notify each potentially responsible party that meets 1 or more of the conditions stated in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of the party's eligibility for a settlement; and

''(ii) offer to reach a final administrative or judicial settlement with the party.

''(B) DE MINIMIS CONTRIBUTION.—The condition stated in this subparagraph is that the liability is for response costs based on paragraph (3) or (4) of section 107(a) and the party's contribution of a hazardous substance at a facility is de minimis. For the purposes of this subparagraph, a potentially responsible party's contribution shall be considered to be de minimis only if the President determines that both of the following criteria are met:

''(i) MINIMAL AMOUNT OF MATERIAL.—The amount of material containing a hazardous substance contributed by the potentially responsible party to the facility is minimal relative to the total amount of material containing hazardous substances at the facility. The amount of a potentially responsible party's contribution shall be presumed to be minimal if the amount is 1 percent or less of the total amount of material containing a hazardous substance at the facility, unless the Administrator promptly identifies a greater threshold based on site-specific factors.

''(ii) HAZARDOUS EFFECTS.—The material containing a hazardous substance contributed by the potentially responsible party does not present toxic or other hazardous effects that are significantly greater than the toxic or other hazardous effects of other material containing a hazardous substance at the facility.'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A))—

(i) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subclauses (I) through (III), respectively, and adjusting the margins appropriately;

(ii) by striking ''(C) The potentially responsible party'' and inserting the following:

''(C) OWNERS OF REAL PROPERTY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The condition stated in this subparagraph is that the potentially responsible party''; and

(iii) by striking ''This subparagraph (B)'' and inserting the following:

''(ii) APPLICABILITY.—Clause (i)''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) REDUCTION IN SETTLEMENT AMOUNT BASED ON LIMITED ABILITY TO PAY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The condition stated in this subparagraph is that—

''(I) the potentially responsible party is—

''(aa) a natural person;

''(bb) a small business; or

''(cc) a municipality;

''(II) the potentially responsible party demonstrates an inability to pay or has only a limited ability to pay response costs, as determined by the Administrator under a regulation promulgated by the Administrator, after—

''(aa) public notice and opportunity for comment; and

''(bb) consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and

''(III) in the case of a potentially responsible party that is a small business, the potentially responsible party does not qualify for the small business exemption under section 107(s) because of the application of section 107(s)(2).

''(ii) SMALL BUSINESSES.—

''(I) DEFINITION OF SMALL BUSINESS.—In this subparagraph, the term 'small business' means a business entity that—

''(aa) during the taxable year preceding the date of transmittal of notification that the business is a potentially responsible party, had full- and part-time employees whose combined time was equivalent to that of 75 or fewer full-time employees or for that taxable year reported $3,000,000 or less in gross revenue; and

''(bb) is not affiliated through any familial or corporate relationship with any person that is or was a party potentially responsible for response costs at the facility.

''(II) CONSIDERATIONS.—At the request of a small business, the President shall take into consideration the ability of the small business to pay response costs and still maintain its basic business operations, including—

''(aa) consideration of the overall financial condition of the small business; and

''(bb) demonstrable constraints on the ability of the small business to raise revenues.

''(III) INFORMATION.—A small business requesting settlement under this paragraph shall promptly provide the President with all information needed to determine the ability of the small business to pay response costs.

''(IV) DETERMINATION.—A small business shall demonstrate the extent of its ability to pay response costs, and the President shall perform any analysis that the President determines may assist in demonstrating the impact of a settlement on the ability of the small business to maintain its basic operations. The President, in the discretion of the President, may perform such an analysis for any other party or request the other party to perform the analysis.

''(V) ALTERNATIVE PAYMENT METHODS.—If the President determines that a small business is unable to pay its total settlement amount immediately, the President shall consider such alternative payment methods as may be necessary or appropriate.

''(iii) MUNICIPALITIES.—

''(I) CONSIDERATIONS.—The President shall consider the inability or limited ability to pay of a municipality to the extent that the municipality provides information with respect to—

''(aa) the general obligation bond rating and information about the most recent bond issue for which the rating was prepared;

''(bb) the amount of total available funds (other than dedicated funds or State assistance payments for remediation of inactive hazardous waste sites);

''(cc) the amount of total operating revenues (other than obligated or encumbered revenues);

''(dd) the amount of total expenses;

''(ee) the amounts of total debt and debt service;

''(ff) per capita income and cost of living;

''(gg) real property values;

''(hh) unemployment information; and

''(ii) population information.

''(II) EVALUATION OF IMPACT.—A municipality may submit for consideration by the President an evaluation of the potential impact of the settlement on the provision of municipal services and the feasibility of making delayed payments or payments over time.

''(III) RISK OF DEFAULT OR VIOLATION.—A municipality may establish an inability to pay for purposes of this subparagraph by showing that payment of its liability under this Act would—

''(aa) create a substantial demonstrable risk that the municipality would default on debt obligations existing as of the time of the showing, go into bankruptcy, be forced to dissolve, or be forced to make budgetary cutbacks that would substantially reduce the level of protection of public health and safety; or

''(bb) necessitate a violation of legal requirements or limitations of general applicability concerning the assumption and maintenance of fiscal municipal obligations.

''(IV) OTHER FACTORS RELEVANT TO SETTLEMENTS WITH MUNICIPALITIES.—In determining an appropriate settlement amount with a municipality under this subparagraph, the President may consider other relevant factors, including the fair market value of any in-kind services that the municipality may provide to support the response action at the facility.

''(iv) OTHER POTENTIALLY RESPONSIBLE PARTIES.—This subparagraph does not affect the President's authority to evaluate the ability to pay of a potentially responsible party other than a natural person, small business, or municipality or to enter into a settlement with such other party based on that party's ability to pay.

''(E) ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS FOR EXPEDITED SETTLEMENTS.—

''(i) BASIS OF DETERMINATION.—If the President determines that a potentially responsible party is not eligible for settlement under this paragraph, the President shall state the reasons for the determination in writing to any potentially responsible party that requests a settlement under this paragraph.''.

(b) SETTLEMENT OFFERS.—Section 122(g) of the Comprehensive Environment Response, Liability, and Compensation Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9622(g)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(6) SETTLEMENT OFFERS.—

''(A) NOTIFICATION.—As soon as practicable after receipt of sufficient information to make a determination, the Administrator shall notify any person that the Administrator determines is eligible under paragraph (1) of the person's eligibility for the expedited final settlement.

''(B) OFFERS.—As soon as practicable after receipt of sufficient information, the Administrator shall submit a written settlement offer to each person that the Administrator determines, based on information available to the Administrator at the time at which the determination is made, to be eligible for a settlement under paragraph (1).

''(C) INFORMATION.—At the time at which the Administrator submits an offer under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall, at the request of the recipient of the offer, make available to the recipient any information available under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, on which the Administrator bases the settlement offer, and if the settlement offer is based in whole or in part on information not available under that section, so inform the recipient.''.

SEC. 303. FAIR SHARE SETTLEMENTS AND STATUTORY ORPHAN SHARES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 122 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9622) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) FAIR SHARE ALLOCATION.—

''(1) PROCESS.—The President shall conduct an impartial fair share allocation of response costs at National Priority List facilities.

''(2) FACTORS.—In conducting an allocation under this subsection, the President, without regard to any theory of joint and several liability, shall estimate the fair share of each potentially responsible party using principles of equity, the best information reasonably available to the President, and the following factors:

''(A) the quantity of hazardous substances contributed by each party;

''(B) the degree of toxicity of hazardous substances contributed by each party;

''(C) the mobility of hazardous substances contributed by each party;

''(D) the degree of involvement of each party in the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous substances;

''(E) the degree of care exercised by each party with respect to hazardous substances, taking into account the characteristics of the hazardous substances;

''(F) the cooperation of each party in contributing to any response action and in providing complete and timely information to the United States or the allocator; and

''(G) such other equitable factors as the President considers appropriate.

''(3) SCOPE.—A fair share allocation under this subsection shall include any response costs at a National priorities List facility that are not addressed in a settlement or a judgment approved by a United States Federal District Court—

''(A) before the date of enactment of this subsection; or

''(B) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection.

''(4) SETTLEMENTS BASED ON ALLOCATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A party may settle any liability to the United States for response costs under this Act for its allocated fair share, including a reasonable risk premium that reflects uncertainties existing at the time of settlement.

''(B) COMPLETION OF OBLIGATIONS.—A person that is undertaking a response action under an administrative order issued under section 106 or has entered into a settlement decree with the United States of a State as of the date of enactment of this subsection shall complete the person's obligations under the order or settlement decree.

''(5) UNFUNDED AND UNATTRIBUTABLE SHARES.—Any share attributable to an insolvent, defunct, or bankrupt party, or a share that cannot be attributed to any particular party, shall be allocated among any responsible parties not described in subsection (q), (r), (s), (t), or (u) of section 107 or section 122(g).

''(o) STATUTORY ORPHAN SHARES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the statutory orphan share is the difference between—

''(A) the liability of a party described in subsection (q), (s), (t), or (u) of section 107 or section 122(g); and

''(B) the President's estimate of the liability of the party, notwithstanding any exemption from or limitation on liability in this Act.

''(2) DETERMINATION OF STATUTORY ORPHAN SHARES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall include an estimate of the statutory orphan share of a party described in section 107(t) or section 122(g), based on the best information reasonably available to the President, at any time at which the President seeks judicial approval of a settlement with the party.

''(3) TRANSITION RULE AND SUBSEQUENT SETTLEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each settlement presented for judicial approval on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection shall include an estimate of the statutory orphan share for each party described in subsection (q), (s), and (u) of section 107 that is involved in the settlement.

''(B) SUBSEQUENT SETTLEMENTS.—The President shall include in a subsequent settlement at the same facility a revised statutory orphan share estimate if the President—

''(i) determines that the subsequent settlement includes a new statutory orphan share; or

''(ii) has good cause to revise an earlier statutory orphan share estimate.

''(4) FINAL SETTLEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A judicially-approved consent decree or settlement shall identify the total statutory orphan share owing for a facility if the consent decree or settlement—

''(i) includes remedial project construction for the last operable unit at the facility; or

''(ii) provides funding for remedial project construction described in clause (i).

''(B) FUNDING AND REIMBURSEMENT.—A consent decree or settlement described in subparagraph (A) shall include full funding of any statutory orphan shares in accordance with this section.

''(5) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND.—A statutory orphan share constitutes an obligation of the Hazardous Substance Superfund.

''(p) GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO STATUTORY ORPHAN SHARES AND FAIR SHARE SETTLEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A fair share settlement under subsection (g) and a statutory orphan share under subsection (n) shall be subject to paragraph (2).

''(2) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO STATUTORY ORPHAN SHARES AND FAIR SHARE SETTLEMENTS.—

''(A) STAY OF LITIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—All contribution and cost recovery actions under this Act against each party described in sections 107(t) and 122(g) are stayed until the Administrator offers those parties a settlement.

''(ii) SUSPENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Any statute of limitations applicable to an action described in clause (i) is suspended during the period that a stay under this subparagraph is in effect.

''(B) FAILURE OR INABILITY TO COMPLY.—If the President fails to fund a statutory orphan share, reimburse a party as required by subsection (g), or include a statutory orphan share estimate in any settlement when required to do so under this Act, the President shall not—

''(i) issue any new order under section 106 at the facility to any non-Federal party; or

''(ii) commence or maintain any new or existing action to recover response costs at the facility.

''(C) AMOUNTS OWED.—

''(i) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND MANAGEMENT.—The President may provide partial reimbursement payments to a party on a schedule that ensures an equitable distribution of reimbursement payments to all eligible parties on a timely basis.

''(ii) PRIORITY.—The priority for reimbursement shall be based on the length of time that has passed since the settlement between the United States and the party.

''(iii) PAYMENT FROM FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—Any amounts payable in excess of available appropriations in any fiscal year shall be paid from amounts made available for subsequent fiscal years, along with interest on the unpaid balances at the rate equal to that of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with a maturity of 1 year.

''(D) CONTRIBUTION PROTECTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A settlement under this subsection, section 107(t), or section 122(g) shall provide complete protection from all claims for contribution or cost recovery for response costs that are addressed in the allocation under subsection (n).

''(ii) COSTS BEYOND SCOPE OF ALLOCATION.—In the case of response costs at a facility that, as a result of a prior, judicially-approved settlement at the facility, are not within the scope of an allocation under subsection (n), a party shall retain the right to seek cost recovery or contribution from any other party in accordance with the prior settlement, except that no party may seek contribution for any response costs at the facility from—

''(I) a party described in subsection (q), (r), (s), or (u) of section 107; or

''(II) a party that has settled its liability under section 107(t) or 122(g).

''(E) LIABILITY FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES FOR CERTAIN ACTIONS.—A person that, after the date of enactment of this subsection, commences a civil action for contribution under this Act against a person that is not liable by operation of subsections (q), (r), (s), or (u) of section 107, or has resolved its liability to the United States under subsection (n), section 107(t), or 122(g), shall be liable to that person for all reasonable costs of defending the action, including all reasonable attorney's fees and expert witness fees.

''(F) ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES.—Subsections (q), (r), (s), (t), and (u) of section 107 and section 122(g) shall not apply to—

''(i) any person whose liability for response costs under section 107(a) is otherwise based on any act, omission, or status that is determined by a court or administrative body of competent jurisdiction, within the applicable statute of limitation, to have been a violation of any Federal or State law pertaining to the treatment, storage, disposal, or handling of hazardous substances if the violation pertains to a hazardous substance, the release or threat of release of which caused the incurrence of response costs at the vessel or facility;

''(ii) a person described in section 107(o); or

''(iii) a bona fide prospective purchaser.

''(G) EXCEPTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The President may decline to reimburse or offer a settlement to a potentially responsible party under subsections (g) and (n) or section 122(g) if the President makes a decision concerning a reimbursement or offer of a settlement under clause (ii).

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS FOR REIMBURSEMENT OR OFFER OF A SETTLEMENT.—A potentially responsible party may be denied a reimbursement or settlement under clause (i)—

''(I) to the extent that the person or entity has operational control over a vessel or facility, if—

''(aa) the person or entity fails to provide full cooperation to, assistance to, and access to the vessel or facility to persons that are responsible for response actions at the vessel or facility (including the cooperation and access necessary for the installation, integrity, operation, and maintenance of any complete or partial response actions at the vessel or facility); or

''(bb) the person or entity acts in such a way as to impede the effectiveness or integrity of any institutional control employed at the vessel or facility; or

''(II) if the person or entity fails to comply with any request for information or administrative subpoena issued by the President under this Act.

''(H) BASIS OF DETERMINATION.—If the President determines that a potentially responsible party is not eligible for settlement under this paragraph, the President shall state the reasons for the determination in writing to any potentially responsible party that requests a settlement under this paragraph.

''(I) WAIVER.—

''(i) RESPONSE COSTS IN ALLOCATION.—A party that settles its liability under this subsection waives the right to seek cost recovery or contribution under this Act for any response costs that are addressed in the allocation.

''(ii) RESPONSE COSTS OF FACILITY.—A party that settles its liability under subsection 107(t) or section 122(g) waives its right to seek cost recovery or contribution under this Act for any response costs at the facility.

''(J) PERFORMANCE OF RESPONSE ACTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President may require, as a condition of settlement under subsection (n) and section 107(t), that 1 or more parties conduct a response action at the facility.

''(ii) REIMBURSEMENT.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The President shall reimburse a party described in subparagraph (A) for costs incurred in excess of the party's allocated fair share.

''(II) PRO RATA REIMBURSEMENT.—The President shall provide equitable pro rata reimbursement to such parties on at least an annual basis.

''(iii) RESPONSE ACTIONS.—No party described in subsections (q), (r), (s), or (u) of section 107 or 122(g) may be required to perform a response action as a condition of settlement or ordered to conduct a response action under section 106.

''(K) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A court shall not approve any settlement under this Act unless the settlement includes an estimate of the statutory orphan share that is fair, reasonable and consistent with this Act.

''(ii) STATUTORY ORPHAN SHARE SETTLEMENT.—If a court determines that an estimate of a statutory orphan share is not fair, reasonable, or consistent with this Act, the court may—

''(I) approve the settlement; and

''(II) disapprove and remand the estimate of the statutory orphan share.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The President shall issue regulations to implement this title not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—FUNDING

SEC. 401. USES OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 is amended by striking sections 111 and 112 (42 U.S.C. 9611, 9612) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 111. USES OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated from the Hazardous Substance Fund for the purposes specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) not more than $1,000,000,000 for the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Superfund Program Completion Act of 1999.

''(B) RESPONSE ACTIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated from the Hazardous Substance Superfund for the performance of response actions the amounts described in paragraph (2)(C).

''(2) SPECIFIC USES.—The President shall use amounts appropriated out of the Hazardous Substance Superfund only—

''(A) to enter into mixed funding agreements in accordance with section 122;

''(B) to reimburse a party for response costs incurred in excess of the allocated share of the party as described in a final settlement under section 122; and

''(C) for the performance of response actions to the extent that the total amount in the Hazardous Substance Superfund is greater than—

''(i) in fiscal year 2000, $1,000,000,000;

''(ii) in fiscal year 2001, $800,000,000;

''(iii) in fiscal year 2002, $600,000,000;

''(iv) in fiscal year 2003, $400,000,000; and

''(v) in fiscal year 2004, $200,000,000.

''(b) CLAIMS AGAINST HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Claims against the Hazardous Substance Superfund shall not be valid or paid in excess of the total amount in the Hazardous Substance Superfund at any 1 time.

''(2) VALIDITY OF CLAIMS EXCEEDING AMOUNT IN HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND.—Claims against the Hazardous Substance Superfund in excess of the total amount in the Hazardous Substance Superfund shall become valid only when additional amounts are collected for, appropriated for, or otherwise added to the Hazardous Substance Superfund.

''(3) INSUFFICIENT BALANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall not issue an order or seek to recover costs for a response action at a facility if the amount in the Hazardous Substance Superfund is insufficient to enable the President to enter into an agreement or reimburse a party at the facility under subsection (a).

''(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—If sufficient funds are unavailable in the Hazardous Substance Superfund to satisfy claims or to enter into agreements, there are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as are necessary to make such payments.

''(4) NO LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection limits the authority of the President to act under section 104.

''(c) REGULATIONS.—

''(1) OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—The President may promulgate regulations designating 1 or more Federal officials that may obligate amounts in the Hazardous Substance Superfund in accordance with this section.

''(2) NOTICE TO POTENTIAL INJURED PARTIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall promulgate regulations with respect to the notice that shall be provided to potential injured parties by an owner and operator of any vessel or facility from which a hazardous substance has been released.

''(B) SUBSTANCE.—The regulations under subparagraph (A) shall describe the notice that would be appropriate to carry out this title.

''(C) COMPLIANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—On promulgation of regulations under subparagraph (A), an owner and operator described in that subparagraph shall provide notice in accordance with the regulations.

''(ii) PRE-PROMULGATION RELEASES.—In the case of a release of a hazardous substance that occurs before regulations under subparagraph (A) are promulgated, an owner and operator described in that subparagraph shall provide reasonable notice of any release to potential injured parties by publication in local newspapers serving the affected area.

''(iii) RELEASES FROM PUBLIC VESSELS.—The President shall provide such notification as is appropriate to potential injured parties with respect to releases from public vessels.

''(d) NATURAL RESOURCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), funds may not be used under this Act for the restoration, rehabilitation, or replacement or acquisition of the equivalent of any natural resource until a plan for the use of the funds for those purposes has been developed and adopted, after adequate public notice and opportunity for hearing and consideration of all public comment, by—

''(A) affected Federal agencies;

''(B) the Governor of each State that sustained damage to natural resources that are within the borders of, belong to, are managed by, or appertain to the State; and

''(C) the governing body of any Indian tribe that sustained damage to natural resources that—

''(i) are within the borders of, belong to, are managed by, appertain to, or are held in trust for the benefit of the tribe; or

''(ii) belong to a member of the tribe, if those resources are subject to a trust restriction on alienation.

''(2) EMERGENCY ACTION EXEMPTION.—Funds may be used under this Act for the restoration, rehabilitation, or replacement or acquisition of the equivalent of any natural resource only in circumstances requiring action to—

''(A) avoid an irreversible loss of a natural resource;

''(B) prevent or reduce any continuing danger to a natural resource; or

''(C) prevent the loss of a natural resource in an emergency situation similar to those described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

''(e) POST-CLOSURE LIABILITY FUND.—The President shall use the amounts in the Post-closure Liability Fund for—

''(1) any of the purposes specified in subsection (a) with respect to a hazardous waste disposal facility for which liability has been transferred to the Post-closure Liability Fund under section 107(k); and

''(2) payment of any claim or appropriate request for costs of a response, damages, or other compensation for injury or loss resulting from a release of a hazardous substance from a facility described in paragraph (1) under—

''(A) section 107; or

''(B) any other Federal or State law.

''(f) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

''(1) AUDIT.—In each fiscal year, the Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct an annual audit of—

''(A) all agreements and reimbursements under subsection (a); and

''(B) all other activities of the Environmental Protection Agency under this Act.

''(2) REPORT.—The Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to Congress an annual report that—

''(A) describes the results of the audit under paragraph (1); and

''(B) contains such recommendations as the Inspector General considers to be appropriate.

''(g) FOREIGN CLAIMS.—To the extent that this Act permits, a foreign claimant may assert a claim to the same extent that a United States claimant may assert a claim if—

''(1) the release of a hazardous substance occurred—

''(A) in the navigable waters of a foreign country of which the claimant is a resident; or

''(B) in or on the territorial sea or adjacent shoreline of a foreign country described in subparagraph (A);

''(2) the claimant is not otherwise compensated for the loss of the claimant;

''(3) the hazardous substance was released from a facility or vessel located adjacent to or within the navigable waters under the jurisdiction of, or was discharged in connection with activities conducted under—

''(A) section 20(a)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1346(a)(2)); or

''(B) the Deepwater Port Act of 1974 (33 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.); and

''(4)(A) recovery is authorized by a treaty or an executive agreement between the United States and the foreign country; or

''(B) the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Attorney General and other appropriate officials, certifies that the foreign country provides a comparable remedy for United States claimants.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS OUT OF THE GENERAL FUND.—

''(1) REMOVAL AND RESPONSE ACTIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency out of the general fund of the Treasury or from the Hazardous Substance Superfund, in accordance with section 111(a)(2)(C), to conduct removal and response actions under this Act:

''(A) For fiscal year 2000, $900,000,000.

''(B) For fiscal year 2001, $875,000,000.

''(C) For fiscal year 2002, $850,000,000.

''(D) For fiscal year 2003, $825,000,000.

''(E) For fiscal year 2004, $800,000,000.

''(2) HEALTH ASSESSMENTS AND HEALTH CONSULTATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to conduct health assessments and health consultations under this Act, and for epidemiologic and laboratory studies, preparation of toxicologic profiles, development and maintenance of a registry of persons exposed to hazardous substances to allow long-term health effects studies, and diagnostic services not otherwise available to determine whether persons in populations exposed to hazardous substances in connection with a release or suspected release are suffering from long-latency diseases:

''(A) For fiscal year 2000, $60,000,000.

''(B) For fiscal year 2001, $55,000,000.

''(C) For fiscal year 2002, $55,000,000.

''(D) For fiscal year 2003, $50,000,000.

''(E) For fiscal year 2004, $50,000,000.

''(3) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND TRAINING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated not more than the following amounts for the purposes of section 311(a):

''(i) For fiscal year 2000, $40,000,000.

''(ii) For fiscal year 2001, $40,000,000.

''(iii) For fiscal year 2002, $40,000,000.

''(iv) For each of fiscal years 2003 and 2004, $40,000,000.

''(B) TRAINING LIMITATION.—Not more than 15 percent of the amounts appropriated under subparagraph (A) shall be used for training under section 311(a) for any fiscal year.

''(C) UNIVERSITY HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE RESEARCH CENTERS.—Not more than $5,000,000 of the amounts available in the Hazardous Substance Superfund may be used in any of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 for the purposes of section 311(d).

''(4) BROWNFIELD GRANT PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 127 $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

''(5) QUALIFYING STATE RESPONSE PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to maintain, establish, and administer qualifying State response programs during the first 5 full fiscal years following

the date of enactment of this paragraph under a formula established by the Administrator, $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

''(6) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General for the enforcement of this Act—

''(A) for fiscal year 2000, $30,000,000;

''(B) for fiscal year 2001, $28,000,000;

''(C) for fiscal year 2002, $26,000,000;

''(D) for fiscal year 2003, $24,000,000; and

''(E) for fiscal year 2004, $22,000,000.

''(7) PROHIBITION OF TRANSFER.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this subsection may be transferred to any other Federal agency.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) RESPONSE ACTIONS.—Section 104(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''obligations from the Fund, other than those authorized by subsection (b) of this section,'' and inserting '', such response actions''; and

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking ''shall be from funds received by the Fund from amounts recovered on behalf of such fund under this Act'' and inserting ''shall be from appropriations out of the general fund of the Treasury''.

(2) INFORMATION GATHERING AND ANALYSIS.—Section 105(g)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605(g)(4)) is amended by striking ''expenditure of monies from the Fund for''.

(3) PRESIDENT.—Section 107(c)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607(c)(3)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''Fund'' and inserting ''President''.

(4) OTHER LIABILITY.—Section 109(d) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9609(d)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(5) SOURCE OF FUNDING.—Section 119(c)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9619(c)(3)) is amended—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking ''For purposes of section 111, amounts'' and inserting ''Amounts''; and

(B) in the third sentence—

(i) by striking ''If sufficient funds are unavailable in the Hazardous Substance Superfund established under subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make payments pursuant to such indemnification or if the Fund is repealed, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(ii) by striking ''payments'' and inserting ''expenditures''.

(6) REMEDIAL ACTION USING HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND.—Section 121(d)(4)(F) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9621(d)(4)(F)) is amended—

(A) by striking '' using the Fund''; and

(B) by striking ''amounts from the Fund'' and inserting ''funds''.

(7) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING.—Section 122(f)(4)(F) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9622(f)(4)(F)) is amended by striking ''the Fund or other sources of''.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I am pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works in introducing the Superfund Program Completion Act of 1999. This is a good day for the environment and for the American taxpayer, because this bill addresses many of the problems in Superfund that have wasted resources and delayed the cleanup of hazardous waste sites across the country.

Since I became chairman of the Superfund, Waste Control and Risk Assessment Subcommittee in 1995, I have had one overriding goal with respect to Superfund reform: To increase cleanups by decreasing the unfairness of the law.

By now, most are well aware of Superfund's dismal history. The program was created in 1980 to clean up abandoned hazardous waste sites. Begun with the best of intentions, Superfund has failed to meet even minimal expectations. Despite public and private expenditures of more than $40 billion dollars, less than 14% of approximately 1,300 sites have been cleaned up and removed from the National Priorities List over the last nineteen years.

The primary reason for this abysmal performance is Superfund's retroactive, strict, joint and several liability scheme. Under joint and several liability, the EPA or a private party can seek to hold any other potentially responsible party liable for the entire cleanup cost at a site—regardless of the type of contamination, when the material was disposed of, or whether the activity was legal at the time. Joint and several liability allows the government or a larger polluter to legally extort payments far in excess of a company's true share of responsibility for waste at a site.

Most reasonable people would agree that such a liability scheme is simply unfair. Worse yet, this unfairness has significantly hindered progress in cleaning up sites and wasted vast amounts of taxpayer funding. As one might expect, when a company is faced with paying 100% of the costs at a site for which their true liability may be less than 10%, that company will delay, negotiate, and litigate at every stop of the process. That, unfortunately, is the well-documented history of Superfund.

It is important to recognize that this unfairness is not confined to EPA's enforcement of the law. EPA merely begins the process at most sites by targeting one or more large parties who are potentially responsible for cleanup. Then those parties typically turn around and sue tens or hundreds of other parties—average citizens, small businesses, schools, churches, and others who face huge legal bills and years of expensive litigation if they don't pay up.

My position on this issue has been constant: I believe that retroactive, strict, joint and several liability is fundamentally unfair. If I had my way, I would repeal it today. Some of my colleagues see things differently, however, and the bill we introduce today represents a reasonable resolution of conflicting views on that topic.

While our legislation does not go as far as many would like, I believe it goes as far as we can if we are interested in passing a bill this Administration will sign into law. There's an old saying around here: ''Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.'' That is certainly the case with Superfund and the legislation we introduce today. This is a good bill. It will make a profound and positive difference in the lives of millions of Americans. It is a bill that can pass the Senate on a strong bi-partisan basis; and it is a bill that the President should sign into law.

The Superfund Program Completion Act makes major reforms in six areas. Specifically, the SPCA:

Directs EPA to finish the job that was started nearly two decades ago by completing the evaluation of the 3,000 remaining sites on the CERCLA Information System (CERCLIS).

Clearly allocates responsibility between states and EPA for future cleanups.

Protects municipalities, small business, recyclers, and other parties from unfair liability—while making the system fairer for everyone else.

Provides states $100 million per year and full authority for their own cleanup programs.

Revitalizes communities with $100 million in annual brownfields redevelopment grants.

Requires fiscal responsibility by EPA and saves taxpayers money.

Our legislation will result in more hazardous waste sites being cleaned up—and in fewer dollars being wasted on litigation. It will give much-needed and much-deserved liability relief to innocent landowners, contiguous property owners, prospective purchasers, municipalities, small businesses and recyclers. Unlike EPA's administrative reforms, this bill does not shift costs from politically popular parties to those left holding the bag. Instead, it requires payment of a statutory orphan share and authorizes the use of the Superfund Trust Fund for those shares.

For those left trapped in the Superfund liability scheme, the SPCA requires an allocation process to determine a party's fair share in an expedited settlement—instead of fighting it out for years in court.

In addition to increasing fairness, the SPCA provides much needed guidance and direction to a sometimes wayward EPA. It recognizes and builds upon the growth and strength of State hazardous waste cleanup programs. It provides new resources to States and localities for their cleanup and redevelopment efforts. As many of my colleagues know, the fear of Superfund liability has resulted in an estimated 450,000 abandoned or underutilized properties, or ''Brownfields,'' that lay fallow because private developers and municipalities don't want to be dragged into Superfund's litigation quagmire. With new resources and appropriate liability protections, our bill will allow the cleanup of those sites, spurring economic redevelopment in cities, towns, and rural areas across America.

We take a different approach to the brownfields redevelopment issue than

the Administration seeks. Along with many of my colleagues, I believe that economic redevelopment is primarily a State and local issue. Our approach provides the resources and freedom States need to make progress on this front, rather than giving EPA new authority to get into the commercial real estate and redevelopment business. That is not EPA's role, nor should it be. Where EPA does have a role is in identifying and addressing risks at uncontrolled hazardous waste sites. Our legislation ensures that EPA regains its focus on that mission.

Earlier this year, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reported that ''completion of construction at existing sites'' and reducing new entries into the program was the Environmental Protection Agency's top Superfund priority. Unfortunately, EPA's narrow focus on generating construction completion statistics appears to have diverted resources from EPA's fundamental mission—protecting human health and the environment from releases of hazardous waste.

GAO reported last year that there are still 3,000 sites awaiting a National Priorities List decision by EPA, most of which have been in the CERCLIS inventory for more than a decade. According to the report, however, more than 1,200 of those sites are actually ineligible for listing on the NPL, for a variety of reasons. Some of the sites were classified erroneously, while others either do not require cleanup, have already been cleaned up, or have final cleanup underway. EPA's failure to remove the specter of an NPL listing at these sites has likely caused significant economic and social harm to the surrounding communities. EPA needs to focus on that task.

In addition, far too many of the sites that are still potentially eligible for listing have received little or no attention from EPA. EPA admitted taking no cleanup action at all at 336 sites and provided no information for another 48 sites. The only action taken at 719 sites was an initial site assessment. EPA's inattention may be due to the fact that EPA and state officials together identified only 232 of the sites as worthy of being added to the NPL. In that case, however, the appropriate response is to archive the sites while ensuring that any necessary cleanup occurs under some other Federal or state program. EPA needs to focus on that task as well.

Unforfunately, there is also disagreement between EPA and state officials about even those 232 sites. EPA identified 132 that may be listed on the NPL in the future, but state officials agreed on only 26 of those. Conversely, state officials identified a different group of 100 sites as worthy of an NPL listing in the future.

EPA agreed with GAO's recommendation that it ''develop a joint strategy'' with the States for addressing these sites. After nearly 20 years and $20 billion in taxpayer funded EPA appropriations, it is disturbing that the agency only now is developing such a strategy. Nonetheless, Congress has an obligation to provide direction and assistance to EPA in this effort. The Superfund Program Completion Act provides that direction by:

Requiring EPA to finish evaluating and/or archiving old sites stuck in the CERCLIS inventory, correcting the current imbalance between evaluating uncontrolled sites and amassing construction completed statistics.

Providing EPA with a schedule of 30 NPL listings per year, to ensure that it and the States appropriately allocate sites for cleanup under Superfund, RCRA, or State response programs.

Increasing current law limits on EPA removal actions to provide greater flexibility in responding to sites that at least initially should be the responsibility of the Federal government, but ultimately do not require an NPL listing.

These provisions will ensure that the limited universe of sites remaining in the Superfund pipeline are dealt with quickly and safely.

In addition to keeping EPA focused on the task at hand, our bill provides increased resources and authority to the States, in recognition of the progress made by State cleanup programs in the last decade.

Superfund is notable among the major Federal environmental statutes not only for its abysmal track record, but also for its heavy reliance on EPA action rather than state implementation. In other environmental programs—RCRA, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act—EPA typically sets general program direction and provides technical support while leaving implementation and enforcement to the states. In the Superfund program, however, EPA takes a direct role in both enforcement and cleanup. This leadership role was originally justified by a perceived inability or alleged unwillingness on the part of states to perform or oversee cleanups. The situation today is far different.

The Environmental Law Institute reported last year that States have now completed 41,000 cleanups, with another 13,700 in progress. The Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials (ASTSWMO) reports that ''States are not only addressing more sites at any given time, but are also completing more sites through streamlined State programs. State programs have matured and increased in their infrastructure capacity.''

Most now recognize that states have made great strides in their programs, and even EPA in May of 1998 released a ''Plan to Enhance the Role of States and Tribes in the Superfund Program.'' Not surprisingly, while that plan appears to provide some increased opportunities for state leadership, it also envisions a significant, on-going role for EPA.

The Superfund Program Completion Act, on the other hand, assists, recognizes and builds on the growth of state cleanup programs. The SPCA also responds to pleas from ASTSWMO, the National Governors Association and others to remove the ever-present threat of EPA over-filing and third party lawsuits under Superfund when a site is being cleaned up under a State program. The SPCA recognizes the fact that States should be the leaders in cleaning up hazardous waste sites by:

Providing $100 million annually for State core and voluntary response programs to allow States to build on their impressive record of accomplishment in this area.

Providing finality, except in cases of emergency or at a State's request, for cleanups conducted under State law.

Requiring EPA to work with the States so that sites listed on the NPL are those the Governor of the State agrees warrant an NPL listing.

Mr. President, the legislation we introduce today represents the culmination of years of hard work. In the four years I have been Chairman of the Superfund Subcommittee, we have heard from more than 100 witnesses, representing every viewpoint, in an effort to grapple with the problems caused by the Superfund law. We have communicated with thousands of individuals and organizations who have urged us to fix this law.

Senator CHAFEE and I have spent long hours with our Democratic colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee, and with EPA Administrator Carol Browner. So far, we and our staffs have devoted more than 600 hours to this effort. We have negotiated issues, identified areas of agreement, eliminated many areas of controversy, and pinpointed those few remaining areas where our differences will need to be resolved through the legislative process itself. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle during that process.

Before I close, let me say a few words about taxes. Simply put, there are no taxes required to finance this bill, and I will oppose all attempts to attach them to it.

Congress has appropriated more than $20 billion to support EPA's Superfund program during the past 19 years. The GAO reports that amount includes more than $6 billion of unrecovered ''recoverable costs.'' ''Recoverable costs'' are taxpayer expenditures that EPA made in anticipation of recovering them from individual polluters at sites. That sum alone would be sufficient to finance EPA's cleanup efforts throughout the life of this reauthorization. Our bill allows those funds to be used for cleanup when EPA does recover them. Further, there should be no doubt that Congress will continue to appropriate funds needed for EPA to finish its job. More taxes are not required to finance this bill or to finish the Superfund program.

During the last two Congresses, I was willing to support the reimposition of

taxes to finance Superfund legislation with major changes in the areas of remedy selection and natural resource damages—as well as more sweeping liability reforms than are contained in the bill we introduce today. There remains a real need for those reforms, and I pledge to continue my efforts in that regard.

The bill we introduce today, however, is designed to achieve all that we can under the current Administration. It represents substantial, real reform that will help thousands of communities and millions of Americans. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to join my colleagues Senator BOB SMITH and Senator. JOHN CHAFEE in introducing the Superfund Program Completion Act. For several years Congress has worked diligently to find common ground for all parties involved, common ground that will also correct the flaws of the original law. Senator SMITH's legislation will do just that.

In 1980, Congress approved the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) which was intended to pay for the cleanup of the nation's most hazardous waste sites. This law became known as Superfund—a bit ironic since the law provides no funding, but instead requires those who operated or used the landfill to pay for the cleanup.

There is logic and fairness in requiring the polluters to pay for the cleanup; however, Superfund's liability structure was so poorly planned excessive litigation was encouraged. Cleanup did not occur and costs were passed to small businesses across the nation. Superfund did cause unnecessary lawsuits and wasted valuable time, all the while leaving sites across America polluted.

Mr. President, this new legislation by Senators SMITH and CHAFEE would exempt those small businesses who acted in good faith and are still being dragged into Superfund as third and fourth party defendants by simply throwing out their household trash. Superfund does not distinguish large from small, nor does it distinguish polluters from responsible businesses. In many instances, these business owners did nothing wrong. Yet, the law penalizes people for something that at one time was legal.

Virtually all sides agree that some small businesses should have never been pulled into the system. While this legislation would not be retroactive, it will save small businesses in other communities from future Superfund lawsuits. It is important to reward those who have acted responsibly. I believe Senator SMITH's bill is responsible.

Mr. President, I do not believe there is one Senator who is pleased with the way in which the Superfund statute has operated. Like small businesses, recyclers have also been targeted to pay for cleanup. They should not be held responsible for pollution at a Superfund site. The Administration agrees. A majority of the Congress agrees. The environmental community agrees. Senator SMITH's bill will fix the recycler's problem and remain faithful to the environment.

Over the past three decades, concern for our environment and natural resources has grown—as has the desire to recycle and reuse. This makes environmental sense. This legislation would remove an unintended yet troublesome legal obstacle to recycling. This bill corrects current law and encourages recycling. It simply recognizes that recycling is not disposal and that recyclables are not waste. Common sense tells us that recycling something is not the same as disposing of it.

This bill will help level the playing field between the use of recycled goods and competitive virgin raw materials. Currently suppliers of virgin raw materials face no Superfund liability for contamination caused by the consumer. This bill will supply the same waiver to those who sell recyclable materials.

This bill also contains protections to ensure that sham recyclers are unable to benefit from this exemption. In order for recyclers to be relieved of Superfund liability, they must act in an environmentally sound manner and sell their product to manufacturers with environmentally responsible business practices. Considering that most recyclers are currently operating in a reasonable and conscience manner, this should be an easy test.

Mr. President, the recycling portion of the bill is the product of lengthy negotiations between the federal and state governments, the environmental community and the recycling industry. It serves only one purpose—to remove from the liability loop those who collect and ship recyclables to a third party site. These negotiations have resulted in a provision that I believe to be both environmentally and fiscally sound. By removing the threat of Superfund liability for recyclers, we will encourage more recycling.

Mr. President, while this provision is not precisely the Superfund Recycling Equity Act which Senator DASCHLE and I introduced last year—a bill which was supported by 63 of our Senate colleagues—I look forward to working with all parties to ensure we pass a bill that the Administration, environmentalists, and industry can support.

Mr. President, I will also work with my colleagues to ensure that no Superfund taxes will be reinstated. After many years and millions and millions of dollars spent by the government, large businesses, municipalities, schools, and small businesses, only a fraction of the costs has been devoted to cleanup. This cannot continue to happen.

I have seen a copy of the May 14, 1999, letter from Senators CHAFEE and SMITH to the Environmental Protection Agency, and I completely agree with its conclusions. There is no need for additional tax revenue. I want to quote from their letter because the Senators said it just right.

''Many responsible parties who have already paid for their own cleanups would also be liable for reimposed taxes. They are frankly unwilling to see the tax reinstated unless there are sweeping reforms in the structure of the program, as well. We find their arguments persuasive. We will not vote to reimpose the tax, unless it is part of a comprehensive Superfund reform.''

''There is a second reason for our opposition to a tax extension at this time. As we noted in a recent letter to Administrator Browner, Congress has appropriated $15.9 billion for Superfund from its inception through 1988. The Superfund Trust Fund was created to facilitate rapid cleanups carried out by the federal government's expenditures would be recovered from responsible parties once the cleanup action was complete. This is real ''polluters pay'' principle.''

''However, only a small percentage of the $15.9 billion has been recovered. To date, the Agency has obtained commitments to recover $2.4 billion. EPA has written off $5 billion of past expenditures and GAO reports that another $1.9 billion is likely unrecoverable because EPA did not properly calculate its indirect costs. This is a troubling record. A good cost recovery program that actually made the real polluters (as opposed to the taxpaying industries) pay could have recovered sufficient funds to carry Superfund through another authorization cycle without the reimposition of taxes. We are reluctant to ask Superfund taxpayers to once again prop up a Trust Fund that EPA has allowed to dwindle.''

Mr. President, I'm very impressed with the Chairman CHAFEE and Chairman SMITH have done in getting this bill drafted and introduced. They are also working on a second major environmental bill in the waste area—RCRA. Last year we jointly requested a report from the GAO on what saving and efficiencies can be achieved with rifle shot fixes. This year Senators CHAFEE and SMITH have been diligently working on finalizing a legislative approach that is compatible to this GAO study. I know their staffs have been consulting with all the stakeholders, and I look forward to seeing this bill this summer. Hopefully, both bills will have a chance to advance through the legislative process so that the full Senate can consider them. Both approaches are reforms that Americans deserve and need.

As environmentalists talk about laws which protect the environment, Congress must determine who actually bears the burden of cost, and determine the balance. Superfund does not discriminate. The way Superfund is being implemented, it attacks our neighbors, our schools, and even our corner grocers. The Superfund Program Completion Act makes positive strides toward

correcting the balance and reflects society's progress from the 80's and incorporates the methods of the 90's.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BOND):

S. 1091. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a pediatric research initiative; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

THE PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE ACT OF 1999

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation that will increase our nation's investment in pediatric research.

Despite the medical breakthroughs that have been made by health researchers in recent years, it is obvious that health care research is under funded. I have joined with many senators to express support for doubling the budget at HIH for biomedical research. I will continue to fight for this increased funding so that NIH can expand its research efforts. An increase in funding is especially needed to improve our knowledge about illnesses and conditions affecting children.

Children under age 12 represent 30 percent of the population—and yet, NIH devotes less than 12 percent of its budget to their needs. There has been a growing consensus that children's health deserves more attention from the research community.

The bill I am introducing today would help us begin to remedy the need for stronger investment in children's health research. I thank Senator BOND for joining with me in sponsoring this important legislation. This bill would authorize the Pediatric Research Initiative within the Office of the Director of National Institutes of Health (NIH) to encourage, coordinate, support, develop, and recognize pediatric research.

The bill would authorize $50 million annually for the next three years. During the last three years, I worked with my colleagues to fund this important Initiative and as a result, it received $5 million in fiscal year (FY) 1997, $38.5 million in FY 1998, and at least $38.5 million in FY 1999. I look forward to working with my colleagues again to continue on the path toward reaching the necessary funding level.

Under this bill, the Initiative would provide $45 million over the next three years to encourage new initiatives and promising areas of pediatric research. It would also promote greater coordination in children's health research. Today, there are some 20 Institutes and Centers and Offices within NIH that do something in the way of pediatrics. In my view, we need to bring some level of coordination and focus to these efforts.

In developing this Initiative, I have made sure that it would give the Director of NIH as much discretion as possible. The money has to be spent on outside research, so that the dollars flow out to the private sector—but it can go toward basic research or clinical research.

This bill does not create any new Office, Center, or Institute. I would simply authorize funding for more research and better research coordination for children—not infrastructure.

In addition to authorizing the Initiative, the legislation would authorize new funding, through the National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), for pediatric research training grants to provide a major increase in support for training additional pediatric research scientists. We need to strengthen our national investment in pediatric research training.

The supply of pediatrician scientists needs to increase if we are to fulfill the new NIH policies that require the participation of children in NIH-funded clinical trials and the new Food and Drug Administration (FDA) policies that require the testing of drugs for use by children before they can receive FDA approval.

The number of pediatricians training to become subspecialists—the potential supply of future pediatrician scientists—is declining. The number of medical school pediatric departments that receive significant NIH research training grant support is limited—fewer than half receive any NIH research training grants. Many pediatricians in training have little or no exposure to research.

Together, the Pediatric Research Initiative and the pediatric research training grants are crucial investments in our country's future—and will produce great returns. If we focus on improving health care for our children, we'll set the stage for them becoming healthy adults.

This important legislation has the support of the pediatric research community in children's hopsitals and university pediatric departments all over the country, including the National Association of Children's Hospitals, Association of Medical School Pediatric Department Chairmen, American Pediatric Society, and Society for Pediatric Research, as well as the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International, March of Dimes, Association of Ohio Children's Hospitals, and many more

I urge my colleagues to support this investment in our children and cosponsor this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1091

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 ''Pediatric Research Initiative Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) innovations in health care, deriving from scientific investigation of the highest quality, offer substantial benefits to the well-being of children and savings in health care costs;

(2) findings in pediatric research not only promote and maintain health throughout a child's lifespan, but also contribute significantly to new insights and discoveries that will aid in the prevention and treatment of illnesses and conditions among adults;

(3) the rapidly expanding knowledge base in biology and medicine is offering greater opportunities than ever for pediatric physician-scientists and basic researchers to harness this knowledge to the benefit of children and society;

(4) the relatively smaller number of children compared as to adults and the relative rarity of many of their diseases and conditions has resulted in comparatively fewer resources being devoted to pediatric research and a lesser focus on children's needs;

(5) substantially more of the support for children's health research is provided through the Federal Government than is the case for adults because of these market forces;

(6) a new commitment to invest in children's research today will make a real difference for children tomorrow;

(7) the commitment to invest in children's research should include not only added investment that is devoted to pediatric research but should also focus on ensuring the existence of a future supply of pediatric physician-scientists;

(8) the supply of pediatric physician-scientists is threatened by market demands which provide little room for support for research training for new pediatric physician-scientists;

(9) over 60 percent of the pediatric departments in the United States have no National Institutes of Health training grant support; and

(10) improvements in the level of training grant support is essential to ensuring the existence of future generations of pediatric clinical investigators who are responsible for moving research discoveries from the laboratories to the patients, and who are therefore critical to clinical research.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF A PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

Part A of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 281 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 404F. PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish within the Office of the Director of NIH a Pediatric Research Initiative (referred to in this section as the 'Initiative'). The Initiative shall be headed by the Director of NIH.

''(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Initiative is to provide funds to enable the Director of NIH to encourage—

''(1) increased support for pediatric biomedical research within the National Institutes of Health to ensure that the expanding opportunities for advancement in scientific investigations and care for children are realized;

''(2) enhanced collaborative efforts among the Institutes to support multidisciplinary research in the areas that the Director deems most promising; and

''(3) the development of adequate pediatric clinical trials and pediatric use information to promote the safer and more effective use of prescription drugs in the pediatric population.

''(c) DUTIES.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Director of NIH shall—

''(1) consult with the Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the other Institutes, in considering their requests for new or expanded pediatric research efforts, and consult with other advisors as the Director determines appropriate;

''(2) have broad discretion in the allocation of any Initiative assistance among the Institutes, among types of grants, and between basic and clinical research so long as the—

''(A) assistance is directly related to the illnesses and conditions of children; and

''(B) assistance is extramural in nature; and

''(3) be responsible for the oversight of any newly appropriated Initiative funds and annually report to Congress and the public on the extent of the total extramural support for pediatric research across the NIH, including the specific support and research awards allocated through the Initiative.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated in the aggregate, $50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2002.

''(e) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The Director of NIH may transfer amounts appropriated under this section to any of the Institutes for a fiscal year to carry out the purposes of the Initiative under this section.''.

SEC. 4. INVESTMENT IN TOMORROW'S PEDIATRIC RESEARCHERS.

Subpart 7 of part C of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285g et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 452E. INVESTMENT IN TOMORROW'S PEDIATRIC RESEARCHERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make available within the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development enhanced support for extramural activities relating to the training and career development of pediatric researchers.

''(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of support provided under subsection (a) shall be to ensure the future supply of researchers dedicated to the care and research needs of children by providing for—

''(1) an increase in the number and size of institutional training grants to medical school pediatric departments and children's hospitals; and

''(2) an increase in the number of career development awards for pediatricians building careers in pediatric basic and clinical research.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.''.

BY MR. CRAPO:

S. 1092. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to regulation of pharmacists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

PHARMACIST'S PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President. I rise today to introduce the ''Pharmacist's Patient Protection Act of 1999.'' The purpose of the legislation is to stop the implementation of final regulations that have been issued by the Food and Drug Administration that will require community pharmacists to provide agency sanctioned information when certain prescription drugs are dispensed to a patient. Such regulations, commonly called ''MedGuides'', were issued in final form on December 1, 1998.

Now why would Congress want to prohibit a regulation which would give patients written information about their medications? The answer is very simple. During the 104th Congress, the House and Senate debated this very same issue, and ultimately a compromise was reached whereby FDA agreed not to promulgate its MedGuide regulations for a period of time so that the private sector would have the opportunity to work with the Administration to develop a voluntary action plan to continue to increase the quality and quantity of written information already being provided to consumers with prescription medication. Under the agreement which was enacted into law as part of the FY 97 Agriculture Appropriations, FDA is prohibited from implementing any part of the MedGuide regulations until the year 2001. When we get to the year 2001, FDA would be permitted to move forward with the MedGuide initiative only if voluntary efforts failed to get written information to 75 percent of all patients receiving a new prescription.

Regrettably, FDA has chosen not to live up to its part of the agreement. The agency's final rule to require Medication Guides for selected prescription drugs, which will take effect on June 1, 1999, is in clear violation of federal law. It appears that FDA is deliberately ignoring the law. It would be my hope that the Administration would hold in abeyance the implementation of the MedGuide regulations, and honor the remainder of the moratorium relating to this rule making. However, I am not confident that this will occur, and therefore this bill is necessary so that we can put back into place the terms of the agreement that were made with the Administration during the 104th Congress.

Finally, I should point out that holding off the implementation of the MedGuide rule will not deny patients access to prescription drug information, nor will it preclude FDA from communicating with pharmaceutical companies and community pharmacists about the importance of providing information to patients about their prescription drugs. In other words, nothing in this bill should be construed as restricting the ability of the FDA to use its existing authority regarding the provision of written patient information on a product-by-product basis with certain prescription medications.

Let the competitive retail pharmacy marketplace continue to make great strides in providing consumers with meaningful, accurate and easily understood written information about prescription drugs. I urge my colleagues to co-sponsor the ''Pharmacist's Patient Protection Act of 1999.''•

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1093. A bill to establish the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Sites, to provide for the protection of archaeological sites in the Galisteo Basin of New Mexico and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

GALISTEO BASIN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill designed to provide for the protection of various historical sites in the Galisteo Basin. The Basin is located in and around Santa Fe County, New Mexico, as depicted by this map. (See, map) To understand the importance of these sites, it's important to understand the history of this Basin.

Mr. President, when the Spanish Conquistadores arrived in New Mexico in 1598, they found a thriving native Pueblo culture with its own unique traditions of religion, architecture, and art, which was enriched and influenced by an extensive system of trade. The subsequent history of conflict and coexistence between these two cultures, Pueblo Indian and Spanish, shaped much of the language, art, and cultural worldview of New Mexicans today.

That initial history of cultural interaction in New Mexico encompassed a period of a little over one hundred years from the 1598, through the Pueblo revolt in 1680, and the recolonization by the Spanish in the early 1700s. Among these sites are examples of both the stone and adobe pueblo architectural styles which typified Native American pueblo communities prior to and during early Spanish colonization, including two of the largest of these ancient towns, San Marcos and San Lazaro Pueblos, which each had thousands of rooms at their peak. Also included in these sites are spectacular examples of Native American petroglyph art as well as historic missions which were constructed as part of the Spaniards' drive to convert the native populace to Catholicism. The twenty six archeological sites addressed in this bill provide cohesive picture of this crucial nexus in New Mexican history, depicting the culture of the pueblo people, and illustrating how it was affected by the Spanish settlers .

Mr. President, through these sites, we have an opportunity to truly understand the simultaneous growth and the coexistence of these two cultures. Unfortunately, this is an opportunity we may soon lose. Most of these sites are not currently part of any preservation program and through weathering, erosion, vandalism, and amateur excavations are losing their interpretive value.

This legislation creates a program under the Department of the Interior to preserve these sites, and to provide interpretive research in an integrated manner. While many of these sites are on federal public land, many are privately owned and a few are on state trust lands. The vision behind this legislation is that an integrated preservation program at sites on Federal lands could serve as a foundation for archaeological research that could be augmented with voluntary cooperative agreements with state agencies and private land owners. These agreements would provide landowners with the opportunity for technical and financial assistance to preserve the sites on their property. Where the parties deem

it appropriate, the legislation would also allow for the purchase or exchange of property to acquire these very valuable sites. With such a program in place, we should be able to preserve the history embodied in these sites for future generations.

Mr. President, I would also like to add that this legislation is supported by Cochiti Pueblo which is culturally and historically tied to these sites. I have received a letter from Isaac Herrera , the Governor of Cochiti Pueblo expressing his support and that of the tribal council. Governor Herrera notes that the tribe has already donated $10,000 to the preservation of one of these sites. This legislation is also supported by the State Land Commissioner.

Let me conclude by showing you some examples of these magnificent sites. These first 2 charts are from the Comanche Gap site, they are outstanding examples of petroglyph art. The next three charts I have show three of the various pueblo sites. The first, Pueblo Blanco. As you can see the drywash at the top of the picture and the road at the bottom, these are the types of erosion threats which I mentioned earlier. The next picture is Arroyo Hondo. Again, you have a drywash at the top, a major road along the site, and development around the site, which shows the threats posed. Finally is the Pueblo of Colorado, once again showing the threat of erosion from the drywashes above.

Mr. President, I want to especially thank Jessica Schultz who has been an intern in my office this past year, and has done yeoman work in providing research for this bill and in helping to draft it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Act of 1999 printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1093

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 ''Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(a) The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Galisteo Basin and surrounding area of New Mexico is the location of many well preserved prehistoric and historic archaeological resources of Native American and Spanish colonial cultures;

(2) These resources include the largest ruins of Pueblo Indian settlements in the United States, spectacular examples of Native American rock art, and ruins of Spanish colonial settlements; and

(3) These resources are being threatened by natural causes, urban development, vandalism, and uncontrolled excavations.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide for the preservation, protection, and interpretation of the nationally significant archaeological resources in the Galisteo Basin in New Mexico.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF GALISTEO BASIN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROTECTION SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The archaeological sites listed in subsection (b), as generally depicted on a map entitled ''Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Sites,'' and dated May 1999, are hereby designated as ''Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Sites'' (in this Act referred to as the ''archaeological protection sites'').

(b) SITES DESCRIBED.—The archaeological sites referred to in subsection (a) consist of 26 sites in the Galisteo Basin, New Mexico, totaling approximately 4022 acres, as follows:

Name	*Acres*
Arroyo Hondo Pueblo	21
Burnt Corn Pueblo	110
Camino Real Site	1
Chamisa Locita Pueblo	40
Comanche Gap Petroglyphs	768
Espinoso Ridge Site	160
La Cienega Pueblo & Petroglyphs	126
La Cienega Pithouse Village	179
La Cieneguilla Petroglyphs	186
La Cieneguilla Pueblo	12
Lamy Pueblo	30
Lamy Junction Site	65
Las Huertas	20
Pa'ako Pueblo	29
Petroglyph Hill	90
Pueblo Blanco	533
Pueblo Colorado	120
Pueblo Galisteo/Las Madres	284
Pueblo Largo	60
Pueblo She	120
Rote Chert Quarry	1
San Cristobal Pueblo	390
San Lazaro Pueblo	416
San Marcos Pueblo	152
Tonque Pueblo	97
Upper Arroyo Hondo Pueblo	12
Total Acreage	4,022

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Secretary shall keep the map referred to in subsection (a) on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices in New Mexico of the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service.

(d) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary may make minor boundary adjustments by publishing notice thereof in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall

(1) continue to search for additional Native American and Spanish colonial sites in the Galisteo Basin area of New Mexico; and

(2) submit to Congress, within three years after the date funds become available and thereafter as needed, his recommendations for additions to, deletions from, and modifications of the boundaries of the list of archaeological protection sites in section 4 of this Act.

(b) ADDITIONS ONLY BY STATUTE.—Additions to or deletions from the list in section 3(b) shall be made only by an Act of Congress.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the archaeological protection sites, which are located on Federal lands, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.), and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et. seq.), and other applicable laws in a manner that will protect, preserve, and maintain the archaeological resources and provide for research thereon.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Within three complete fiscal years after the date funds are made available, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on Energy and Resources of the United States Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the United States House of Representatives, a general management plan for the identification, research, protection, and public interpretation of the archaeological protection sites located on Federal land and for those sites for which the Secretary has entered into Cooperative Agreements regarding sites that are located on private or state lands.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The plan shall be developed by the Secretary in consultation with the Governor of New Mexico, the New Mexico State Land Commissioner, affected Native American pueblos, and other interested parties.

SEC. 6. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of non-Federal land with regard to the inclusion of the archaeological protection sites located on their property. The purposes of such an agreement shall be to protect, preserve, maintain, and administer the archaeological resources and associated lands of such a site. Where appropriate, such agreement may also provide for public interpretation of an archaeological protection site.

SEC. 7. ACQUISITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests therein within the boundaries of the archaeological protection sites, and access thereto, by donation, by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or by exchange.

(b) CONSENT OF OWNER REQUIRED.—The Secretary may only acquire lands or interests therein within the consent of the owner thereof.

(c) STATE LANDS.—The Secretary may acquire lands or interests therein owned by the State of New Mexico or a political subdivision thereof only by donation or exchange.

SEC. 9. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal lands within the protection sites are hereby withdrawn—

(1) from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws and all amendments thereto;

(2) from location, entry, and patent under the mining law and all amendments thereto; and

(3) from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing, and all amendments thereto.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1095. A bill to amend section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the placed in service date for biomass and coal facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

THE BIOMASS AND COAL FACILITIES EXTENSION ACT

• Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I join again with my friend from Utah, Senator HATCH, to introduce the Biomass and Coal Facilities Extension Act. This legislation would extend by eight months the placed-in-service date under section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code.

We are offering the same bill we offered in the 105th Congress because the problem addressed by the bill remains uncorrected. The change we propose is

necessary in order to alleviate a hardship taxpayers are suffering as a result of their reliance on actions taken by Congress nearly three years ago.

A number of taxpayers made substantial commitments of resources to develop alternative fuel technology projects in good faith reliance on the incentives provided in the Small Business Protection Act of 1996. Under that law, Congress intended to ensure that alternative fuel technology projects involving coal and biomass would qualify for the credit provided under section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code as long as projects were subject to a binding contract by December 31, 1996 and placed in service by June 30, 1998.

That should have settled the matter. However, a proposal offered by the Administration in February 1997 contained a proposal to shorten the placed-in-service deadline by a full year for facilities producing gas from biomass and synthetic fuel from coal. The Administration was concerned about what it characterized as rapid growth in the section 29 credit. Congress considered that argument, but concluded that no change in the 1996 legislation was necessary.

In the tax legislative arena, even a mere proposal can have consequences. When the Joint Committee on Taxation published its analysis of the Administration's budget proposals in March 1997, it warned Congress about just such a consequence as it observed that ''[b]ecause the binding contract date has already passed * * * the proposal might place an unfair financial burden on those taxpayers who are bound to contracts entered into prior to the Administration's announcement.''

Mr. President, that is exactly what happened—many taxpayers who found themselves in that situation lost their sources of funding because financial institutions were obligated to take into account the possibility that the Administration's proposal could have become law. Because the tax credit plays a significant role in the financial examination lenders must make, its potential loss made securing the necessary financing impossible for taxpayers who were proceeding in good faith under binding contracts made in reliance on the provisions of the Small Business Protection Act of 1996.

The bill would extend the placed-in-service date for a period eight months from the date of the bill's enactment. This would restore some of the time that taxpayers lost as a result of the confusion which resulted from the events of 1997.

Let me emphasize that the bill would not authorize any ''new starts.'' The binding contract date provided in the 1996 Act would not be altered. The sole purpose of this bill is to allow taxpayers who began projects under the 1996 Act to proceed in an orderly manner to create the kinds of facilities that will help increase the country's useful energy resources.●

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I stand today with my colleague, Senator CONRAD, to introduce legislation aimed at helping companies to develop technologies for cleaner burning fuels. This is important to the people in my home state of Utah where air pollution is one of the top concerns of citizens.

I believe that cleaner burning fuels that will reduce emissions is a key element of the solution to this problem. The Biomass and Coal Facilities Extension Act would provide a tool for companies that are stepping into this void and developing clean burning fuels by extending the ''placed in service'' date under section 29 for facilities that produce alternative fuels.

Section 29 was originally created to encourage the development of alternative fuels to reduce our dependence on imports and to reduce the environmental impacts of certain fuels. With the enormous reserves of low rank coals and lignite in the United States and around the world, and with the potential for use of biomass and other alternatives, it is particularly important to the American economy and to our environment that new, more environmentally friendly fuels are brought to market both here and in developing nations.

Bringing new technologies to market is financially risky. In particular, finding investors to take a new technology from a laboratory table to the marketplace is difficult because working the bugs out of a first-of-a-kind, full-sized plant is a costly undertaking. Incentives to bring new, clean energy technologies to the market in the U.S. are a worthwhile use of the tax code.

In 1996, Congress provided sufficient incentives to make the development of alternative fuels a viable pursuit by extending the section 29 ''placed in service'' date for facilities designed to produce energy from biomass or processed coals to July 1, 1998, provided that those facilities were constructed pursuant to a binding contract entered into before January 1, 1997. Many contracts were signed and construction projects started.

Then the Administration released its budget in February 1997. It contained a proposal to eliminate the extension granted just one year before, cutting off the section 29 credit for plants not completed by July 1, 1997, which is an impossible deadline to meet for many of these projects.

Without the assurance of the section 29 tax credit, financing for these projects dried up. Taxpayers were stranded in contracts, some of which contained significant liquidated damages clauses. As a result of the Administration's proposal, taxpayers essentially lost a significant amount of the extension given them by Congress in 1996.

The bill before us would give companies with projects already in progress and contracts signed by January 1, 1997 some additional time to finish these projects. The bill does not extend the contract deadline, allow more projects to be initiated, or change the 2008 deadline for receiving the section 29 tax credit. This bill simply restores some of the time that taxpayers lost in their efforts to develop environmentally friendly fuels under section 29.

Bringing new alternative fuel technologies to the market is an important part of our commitment to a cleaner environment and a secure economy. Congress reflected that commitment in our efforts to mitigate some of the financial risk involved in developing this much needed technology in 1996. This bill maintains that commitment. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KERREY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 1099. A bill to establish a mechanism for using the duties imposed on products of countries that fail to comply with WTO dispute resolution decision to provide relief to injured domestic producers; to the Committee on Finance.

TRADE INJURY COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BINGAMAN, DORGAN, KERREY, JOHNSON, and DASCHLE. I rise to introduce the Trade Injury Compensation Act of 1999.

Under U.S. trade law, we may retaliate when a trading partner improperly closes its market to American goods or services. In certain circumstances, the World Trade Organization endorses that retaliation. The normal form of trade retaliation is to increase the tariff to one hundred percent on a designated list of imported goods.

The intention of retaliation is not protectionist. It is just the opposite—use the leverage of access to the huge United States market to open up a foreign market and expand trade. Retaliation is a tool designed to inflict enough economic pain on a trading partner that he returns to the negotiating table and removes the trade barriers that started the problem in the first place. Sometimes these negotiations restart quickly, sometimes even before the retaliation goes into effect. Other times, the negotiations start again only after the impact of retaliation sinks in.

In some cases, the new one hundred percent tariff raises the price of the imported good so prohibitively that it is priced completely out of the market. In other cases, the product is still sold in the United States, perhaps at a higher price, or perhaps at the original price with the importer absorbing the added tariff.

The United States is increasingly taking trade disputes to the WTO's Dispute Settlement Body. However, some of our trading partners have been, in effect, snubbing their nose at the WTO's decisions. The most egregious example of this is the European Union, whose approach to WTO dispute

settlement is, frankly, outrageous. First, in bananas, and now in beef, the EU is using legal and procedural technicalities to delay implementation of important and legitimate WTO panel decisions. Each time they do this, the EU seriously undermines the credibility of the WTO as a fair and even-handed place to get trade justice.

The Trade Injury Compensation Act establishes a mechanism for using the tariffs imposed when a country fails to comply with WTO dispute resolution decisions. Normally, the additional tariff revenues received from retaliation go to the Treasury. This bill establishes a trust fund so that the affected industry will receive those revenues as compensation for its injury.

In the case of agriculture, the money will be spent on promotion and development of products for the industry. In non-agriculture cases, the money will go to additional Trade Adjustment Assistance payments to the affected industry.

Mr. President, the WTO is a critically important institution that sets the foundation and framework to make world trade grow. We all recognize that it needs improvement, and I, along with many of my colleagues, are working on ways to fix it, starting with the WTO Ministerial in Seattle. But, while the United Staes is striving to support and improve the WTO system, the EU seems to be working overtime to undercut the WTO. We must stop this abuse of the WTO, and we must provide assistance to our industries that are damaged by these illegal actions of the EU or others in the future.

Within two weeks, the Administration will implement retaliatory measures against the European Union because of its WTO-illegal restrictions on beef. My bill would provide the American beef industry with much needed compensation while the retaliatory measures remain in place.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1099

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 ''Trade Injury Compensation Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) United States goods and services compete in global markets and it is necessary for trade agreements to promote such competition.

(2) The current dispute resolution mechanism of the World Trade Organization is designed to resolve disputes in a manner that brings stability and predictability to world trade.

(3) When foreign countries refuse to comply with a panel or Appellate Body report of the World Trade Organization and violate any of the Uruguay Round Agreements, it has a deleterious effect on the United States economy.

(4) A WTO member can retaliate against a country that refuses to implement a panel or Appellate Body report by imposing additional duties of up to 100 percent on goods imported from the noncomplying country.

(5) In cases where additional duties are imposed on imported goods, the duties should be used to provide relief to the industry that is injured by the noncompliance.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ''agricultural commodity'' has the meaning given the term by section 102 (1) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602(1)).

(2) INJURED AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PRODUCER.—The term ''injured agricultural commodity producer'' means a domestic producer of an agricultural commodity with respect to which a dispute resolution proceeding has been brought before the World Trade Organization, if the dispute resolution is resolved in favor of the agricultural commodity producer, and the foreign country against which the proceeding has been brought has failed to comply with the report of the panel or Appellate Body of the WTO.

(3) INJURED PRODUCER.—The term ''injured producer'' means a domestic producer of a product (other than an agricultural product) with respect to which a dispute resolution proceeding has been brought before the World Trade Organization, if the dispute resolution is resolved in favor of the producer, and the foreign country against which the proceeding has been brought has failed to comply with the report of the panel or Appellate Body of the WTO.

(4) RETALIATION LIST.—The term ''retaliation list'' means the list of products of a foreign country that has failed to comply with the report of the panel or Appellate Body of the WTO and with respect to which the United States Trade Representative is imposing duties above the level that would otherwise be imposed under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(5) URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS.—The term ''Uruguay Round Agreements'' has the meaning given such term in section 2(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(7)).

(6) WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.—The term ''World Trade Organization'' means the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(7) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term ''WTO Agreement'' means the Agreement Establishing The World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

(8) WTO AND WTO MEMBER.—The terms ''WTO'' and ''WTO member'' have the meanings given those terms in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

SEC. 4. TRADE INJURY COMPENSATION TRUST FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ''Trade Injury Compensation Trust Fund'' (referred to in this Act as the ''Fund'') consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated to the Fund under subsection (b) and any amounts credited to the Fund under subsection (c)(2).

(b) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS EQUIVALENT TO CERTAIN DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are hereby appropriated and transferred to the Fund an amount equal to the amount received in the Treasury as a result of the imposition of additional duties imposed on the products on a retaliation list.

(2) TRANSFERS BASED ON ESTIMATES.—The amounts required to be transferred under paragraph (1) shall be transferred at least quarterly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury. Proper adjustment shall be made in amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(c) INVESTMENT OF TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Fund as is not, in the Secretary's judgment, required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Fund.

(d) DISTRIBUTIONS FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available as provided in appropriations Acts, for making distributions in accordance with subsections (e) and (f).

(e) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING INJURED PRODUCERS AND AMOUNT TO BE PAID.—Not later than 30 days after the implementation of a retaliation list, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce, shall promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. The regulations shall include the following:

(1) Procedures for identifying injured producers and injured producers of agricultural commodities.

(2) Standards for determining the eligibility of injured producers and injured producers of agricultural commodities to participate in the distribution of any money from the Fund.

(3) Procedures for determining the amount of the distribution each injured producer and injured producers of agricultural commodities should be paid.

(4) Procedures for establishing separate accounts for duties collected with respect to each retaliation list and for making distributions to the group of injured producers and injured producers of agricultural commodities with respect to each such retaliation list.

(f) DISTRIBUTION TO INJURED PRODUCERS.—

(1) DISTRIBUTION TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as may be transferred or credited to the Fund as the result of items on a retaliation list because of injury to producers of agricultural commodities. The Secretary of Agriculture shall distribute to each injured producer of an agricultural commodity that the Secretary determines is eligible a portion of the amount so transferred. The distribution shall be made in accordance with the subsection (e) and shall be used by the producers for the promotion and development of products of the injured producers.

(2) DISTRIBUTION TO OTHER INJURED PRODUCERS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of Commerce such sums as may be transferred or credited to the Fund as the result of items on a retaliation list because of injury to producers (other than producers of agricultural commodities). The Secretary of Commerce shall distribute to each injured producer (other than a producer described in paragraph (1)) that the Secretary determines is eligible a portion of the amount so transferred. The distribution shall be made in accordance with subsection (e) and in accordance with the procedures applicable to the provision of assistance under chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341 et seq.).

(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, after consultation with the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce, submit a report to the Congress each year on—

(1) the financial condition and the results of the operations of the Fund during the preceding fiscal year; and

(2) the expected condition and operations of the Fund during the fiscal year following the fiscal year that is the subject of the report.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON REDUCING SERVICES OR FUNDS.

No payment made to an injured producer or an injured agricultural commodity producer under this Act shall result in the reduction or denial of any service or assistance with respect to which the injured producer or injured agricultural commodity producer would otherwise be entitled.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. CRAP, and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 1100. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that the designation of critical habitat for endangered and threatened species be required as part of the development of recovery plans for those species; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

CRITICAL HABITAT LEGISLATION

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce a bill, together with my distinguished colleagues, Senators DOMENICI and CRAPO, to address one of the most problematic, controversial and misunderstood provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. This is the provision relating to the designation of critical habitat for endangered or threatened species.

As I have often said, the key to protecting our nation's fish and wildlife is to protect the habitat on which those species depend. This is particularly true for endangered and threatened species, which often fall into such precarious condition precisely because of habitat loss and degradation. This makes habitat protection for those species all the more vital. It is thus terribly ironic that the provisions in the ESA relating to habitat are those that present the most problems. My bill goes a long way to fix those problems. It is virtually identical to the critical habitat provisions contained in S. 1180 from the last Congress, which was approved by the Environment and Public Works Committee by a vote of 15 to 3, with strong bipartisan support.

Landowners fear that critical habitat imposes severe restrictions on use of their own lands; the Secretary frequently does not designate critical habitat to avoid these controversies; and environmental groups often bring lawsuits over this failure to designate. Of almost 1,200 species listed by the Fish and Wildlife Service, only 113—nine percent—have critical habitat designated. Indeed, of the 256 species listed since April 1996, the Service has designated critical habitat for only two. As a result, numerous lawsuits have been brought against the Service in recent years. Currently, 15 active lawsuits are pending, with six already decided—all against the Secretary—and prospective challenges for another 40 species are on the horizon.

These statistics underscore the problems with the existing law with respect to critical habitat designations. The root of these problems lies in the fact that designation of critical habitat requires knowledge of the conservation needs of the species as well as an assessment of the economic impacts of the designation, neither of which is generally known, or can be determined, at the time of listing.

Designation of critical habitat is more appropriate in the context of developing a recovery plan for a listed species, because the recovery plan specifically addresses the conservation needs of the species and provides for an estimate of the costs for recovery actions. Indeed, numerous individuals and organizations, including the National Research Council, have suggested that the requirement to designate critical habitat be moved from the time of listing to the time of recovery plan development.

As for recovery plans, the Secretary is required to develop and implement recovery plans for listed species. However, there is no deadline for the Secretary to do so. Less than 70 percent of listed species are covered in a recovery plan, and 56 percent of those species without plans have been listed for longer than one year. These statistics underscore the need for a mandatory deadline for developing recovery plans.

The bill that I introduce today would move the requirement to designate critical habitat from the time of listing to the time of recovery plan development. The bill would also require that a recovery team be appointed, unless the Secretary states otherwise through notice and comment. The bill would also provide a deadline for development of recovery plans, no later than 36 months after listing. In the event that the designation is necessary to avoid the imminent extinction of the species, the bill allows the Secretary to designate critical habitat concurrently with listing. A new provision would be added to the citizen suit section that would require any lawsuit challenging the actual designation of critical habitat to be brought in conjunction with a suit challenging the recovery plan on which the designation is based. Other than these changes, the critical habitat provisions would remain virtually the same as in existing law.

Let me say that I do not have any desire to open the broader question of reauthorization of the ESA. I believe that this bill addresses a narrow fix in a way that answers the complaints of both environmental groups and the regulated community. I do not advocate the inclusion of other issues not related to critical habitat. There may be another time and vehicle for that, but this is not the time, and this bill should not be the vehicle.

In closing, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his cooperation on this issue, and for his decision to work on this bill together in lieu of offering a rider on the recent supplemental appropriations bill. I know this issue is of no great importance to the constituents in his home State, and I am pleased to work with him to find a resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1100

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

SECTION 1. RECOVERY PLANS AND CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATIONS.

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 4 the following:

''RECOVERY PLANS AND CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATIONS

''SEC. 4A.'';

(2) by moving subsection (f) of section 4 to appear at the end of section 4A (as added by paragraph (1)); and

(3) in section 4A (as amended by paragraph (2))—

(A) by striking ''(f)(1) RECOVERY PLANS.—The'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as subsections (b) through (e), respectively;

(C) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''(b) The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(b) RECOVERY TEAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) APPOINTMENT OF A TEAM.—Not later than 60 days after the date of publication under section 4 of a final determination that a species is a threatened species or endangered species, the Secretary, in cooperation with any State affected by the determination, shall—

''(A) appoint a recovery team to develop a recovery plan for the species; or

''(B) after public notice and opportunity for comment, determine that a recovery team shall not be appointed.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) SCHEDULE.—For each species determined to be an endangered species or a threatened species after the date of enactment of this subsection for which the Secretary is required to develop a recovery plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall publish—

''(1) not later than 18 months after the date of the publication under section 4 of the final regulation containing the listing determination, a draft recovery plan; and

''(2) not later than 3 years after the date of publication under section 4 of the final regulation containing the listing determination, a final recovery plan.''.

SEC. 2. CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4A of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (as added by section 1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATIONS.—

''(1) RECOMMENDATION OF THE RECOVERY TEAM.—

''(A) RECOVERY TEAM APPOINTED.—Not later than nine months after the date of publication under section 4 of a final regulation containing a listing determination for a species, the recovery team (if a recovery team has

been appointed for the species) shall provide the Secretary with a description of any habitat of the species that is recommended for designation as critical habitat pursuant to this subsection and any recommendations for special management considerations or protection that are specific to the habitat.

''(B) NO RECOVERY TEAM APPOINTED.—If a recovery team is not appointed by the Secretary, the Secretary shall perform all duties of the recovery team required under this section.

''(2) DESIGNATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary, to the maximum extent prudent and determinable, shall by regulation designate any habitat that is considered to be critical habitat of an endangered species or a threatened species that is indigenous to the United States or waters with respect to which the United States exercises sovereign rights or jurisdiction.

''(A) DESIGNATION.—

''(i) PROPOSAL.—Concurrently with publication of a draft recovery plan, the Secretary, after consultation and in cooperation with the recovery team, shall publish in the Federal Register a proposed regulation, based on the draft recovery plan for the species, that designates critical habitat for the species.

''(ii) PROMULGATION.—Concurrently with publication of a final recovery plan, the Secretary, after consultation and in cooperation with the recovery team, shall publish a final regulation, based on the final recovery plan for the species, that designates critical habitat for the species.

''(B) OTHER DESIGNATIONS.—If a recovery plan is not developed under this section for an endangered species or a threatened species, the Secretary shall publish a final critical habitat determination for the endangered species or threatened species not later than three years after making a determination that the species is an endangered species or a threatened species.

''(C) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may publish a regulation designating critical habitat for an endangered species or a threatened species concurrently with the final regulation implementing the determination that the species is endangered or threatened if the Secretary determines that designation of such habitat at the time of listing is essential to avoid the imminent extinction of the species.

''(3) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—The designation of critical habitat shall be made on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available and after taking into consideration the economic impact, impacts to military training and operations, and any other relevant impact, of specifying any particular area as critical habitat. The Secretary shall describe the economic impacts and other relevant impacts that are to be considered under this subsection in the publication of any proposed regulation designating critical habitat.

''(4) EXCLUSIONS.—The Secretary may exclude any area from critical habitat for a species if the Secretary determines that the benefits of the exclusion outweigh the benefits of designating the area as part of the critical habitat, unless the Secretary determines that the failure to designate the area as critical habitat will result in the extinction of the species.

''(5) REVISIONS.—The Secretary may, from time-to-time and as appropriate, revise a designation. Each area designated as critical habitat before the date of enactment of this subsection shall continue to be considered so designated, until the designation is revised in accordance with this subsection.

''(6) PETITIONS.—

''(A) DETERMINATION THAT REVISION MAY BE WARRANTED.—To the maximum extent practicable, not later than 90 days after receiving the petition of an interested person under section 553(e) of title 5, United States Code, to revise a critical habitat designation, the Secretary shall make a finding as to whether the petition presents substantial scientific or commercial information indicating that the revision may be warranted. The Secretary shall promptly publish the finding in the Federal Register.

''(B) NOTICE OF PROPOSED ACTION.—Not later than one year after receiving a petition that is found under subparagraph (A) to present substantial information indicating that the requested revision may be warranted, the Secretary shall determine how to proceed with the requested revision, and shall promptly publish notice of the intention in the Federal Register.

''(7) PROPOSED AND FINAL REGULATIONS.—Any regulation to designate critical habitat or implement a requested revision shall be proposed and promulgated in accordance with paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(b) in the same manner as a regulation to implement a determination with respect to listing a species.''.

(b) CITIZEN SUITS.—Section 11(g) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C), by inserting ''or section 4A'' after ''section 4''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) ACTIONS RELATING TO CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATION.—With respect to an action relating to an alleged violation of section 4A(g) concerning the area designated by the Secretary as critical habitat, no action may be commenced independently of an action relating to an alleged violation of subsection (a) or (f) of section 4A.''.

(c) PLANS FOR PREVIOUSLY LISTED SPECIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of species included in the list published under section 4(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)) before the date of enactment of this Act, and for which no final recovery plan was developed before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate, shall develop a final recovery plan in accordance with the requirements of section 4A of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, including the priorities of subsection (a)(1) of that section, for not less than one-half of the species not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of this Act and for all species not later than 60 months after such date.

(2) DESIGNATIONS OF CRITICAL HABITAT.—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate, shall review and revise as necessary any designation of critical habitat for a species described in paragraph (1) based on the final recovery plan for the species and in accordance with section 4A(g) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3(5)(A) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532(5)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking '', at the time it is listed in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this Act,''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''at the time it is listed in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this Act''.

(2) Section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) (as amended by section 1(2)) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (3);

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking paragraph (2);

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (D);

(iii) in paragraph (5), by striking '', designation, or revision referred to in subsection (a)(1) or (3),'' and inserting ''referred to in subsection (a)(1),'';

(iv) in paragraph (6)—

(I) by striking ''(6)(A)'' and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(6) FINAL REGULATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Within the one-year period beginning on the date on which general notice is published in accordance with paragraph (5)(A)(i) regarding a proposed regulation, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register—

''(i) a final regulation to implement the determination;

''(ii) notice that the one-year period is being extended under subparagraph (B)(i); or

''(iii) notice that the proposed regulation is being withdrawn under subparagraph (B)(ii), together with the finding on which the withdrawal is based.'';

(II) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''or revision'';

(III) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking ''or revision concerned, a finding that the revision should not be made,''; and

(IV) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(v) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (2) and moving that paragraph to appear after paragraph (1);

(C) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) in the second sentence, by inserting ''designated'' before ''critical habitat''; and

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking ''determinations, designations, and revisions'' and inserting ''determinations'';

(D) by redesignating subsections (g) through (i) as subsections (f) through (h), respectively; and

(E) in subsection (g)(4) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subsection (f) of this section'' and inserting ''section 4A''.

(3) Section 4A of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (as added by section 1) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by striking ''this subsection'' and inserting ''this section''; and

(II) by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''section 4'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(iii) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—

(I) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively; and

(II) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated), by striking ''the provisions of this section'' and inserting ''section 4'';

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''section 4''; and

(C) in subsection (e), by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)''.

(4) Section 6(d)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1535(d)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''section 4(g)'' and inserting ''section 4(f)''.

(5) Section 10(f)(5) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1539(f)(5)) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(6) Section 104(c)(4)(A)(ii)(I) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1374(c)(4)(A)(ii)(I)) is amended by striking ''section 4(f)'' and inserting ''section 4A''.

(7) Section 115(b)(2) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1383b(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(f))'' and inserting ''section 4A of the Endangered Species Act of 1973''.

(8) Section 118(f)(11) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1387(f)(11)) is amended by striking ''section 4'' and inserting ''section 4A''.

(9) The table of contents in the first section of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. prec. 1531) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4 the following:

''Sec. 4A. Recovery plans and critical habitat designations.''.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, just a few weeks ago I rose to speak and share with my fellow Senators an extraordinary exchange that occurred between myself and Interior Secretary Babbitt regarding the failings of the Endangered Species Act in a situation on the Rio Grande River in New Mexico. I told you that the Secretary's remarks were significant because they acknowledged that this law, however well intentioned, is not working.

I felt Secretary Babbitt's testimony before the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee could open the door to significant reform of the Endangered Species Act, permitting all parties to work together. I pledged to begin serious work on improving the Endangered Species Act, and I am immensely pleased today to be cosponsoring this bill with Senators CHAFEE and CRAPO to do just that.

I was in the Senate to vote in favor of the Endangered Species Act, but the courts are implementing it in a cart before the horse fashion never contemplated by the Congress. The focus of saving species should be on planning recovery, not using premature habitat designation as a hammer on the heads of humans sharing that habitat. We want to protect endangered species, but we don't want to unnecessarily hurt people. Tying critical habitat designation to recovery plan implementation is logical, defensible, and the right thing to do. This legislation goes directly to the heart of this issue.

The protection of endangered species is supposed to be accomplished by first figuring out the necessary habitat for survival, then designating that critical habitat. But the Endangered Species Act and the courts are rushing the process. According to Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt, recent litigation will ''strait jacket'' the federal government into prematurely designating the critical habitat for, in one case, the Rio Grande silvery minnow.

People in D.C. tend to forget that the western United States is the arid, ''great American desert.'' Western rivers and streams are primarily supported by melting snow pack. They change annually from roaring torrents in April to bare trickles in June, to dried up river beds in August. The Rio Grande, despite its ''big river'' title, is no exception to this cyclical flow. As a child, I often walked across the dry riverbed in Albuquerque.

This will be a very dry year in the normally arid New Mexico. The historical hydrographic record shows that between 1899 and 1936, long before Albuquerque grew, or the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District started to farm, the Rio Grande was dry twenty percent of the time in August as measured at the San Marcial Gauge.

Now, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, prodded by various groups, are claiming a ''new'' water demand on the river for the silvery minnow. They should assert the interest in the water needed for the minnow, but the demand isn't new. The issue, however, is how should that interest be asserted and what the need really is. And, once known, how do we continue to address the human water needs, and at what cost?

I believe something is terribly wrong in the way the courts are handling this situation because you may have to close down a river to human users without knowing the habitat needs for an endangered species. The Secretary of Interior is required to base critical habitat designation on the best scientific data available, after taking into consideration the economic impact of that designation.

I asked Secretary Babbitt whether the Interior Department had sufficient data to determine the true water needs to sustain the silvery minnow in the Rio Grande, and to make an accurate economic and social assessment of what a critical habitat designation would mean to existing water rights owners. Babbitt testified that his department does not have sufficient information, but that it has no choice but to act because of federal court orders.

The U.S. Supreme Court has unanimously agreed that the best scientific and commercial data available must be used to designate a critical habitat. Designation of critical habitat is more appropriate in the context of a final recovery plan for an endangered species, because that plan must specifically address conservation needs and costs of recovery. This bill will move the requirement to designate habitat from the time of listing to the time of recovery plan development.

The quantity of water needed by the Rio Grande silvery minnow is unknown. The Fish and Wildlife Service has conceded that there has never been a thorough study of the economic consequences of providing water as a critical habitat for the minnow.

While we all want the silvery minnow and other endangered species to have their critical habitat, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Reclamation acknowledge that they do not know what the ''critical habitat'' is or should be. Were the consequences of designation insignificant, a guesstimate might be acceptable. However, as noted by the Bureau of Reclamation, a designation requiring year-round continuous flows on a river that has never produced such flows could have a ''profound effect on downstream water users.''

We must not try to cure the problem of endangered species with premature, uninformed, unscientific critical habitat designation, the validity of which has not been substantiated by adequate economic, scientific and social research. When the scientific facts on the possible side effects of a drug are unknown, the Food and Drug Administration does not authorize the sale of that drug. Likewise, the Endangered Species Act should not permit designation of critical habitat until we have scientifically determined that the habitat designation will be helpful to the species and does not impose unnecessary social and economic side effects.

It is abundantly clear that a complete environmental analysis of a critical habitat designation is an absolute necessity. Senator CHAFEE, Senator CRAPO, and I are now addressing this illogical and unworkable current situation with this bill. I thank them for their leadership on the Environment Committee. We will be working with the administration, and I encourage all my fellow Senators to participate in this limited, local and necessary endangered Species Act reform.

This bill will now tie designation of critical habitat to the development of recovery plans for endangered and threatened species, as it should be. Federal agencies should not have their hands tied by premature designation, forced by litigation. If we want to save species, as was and is the intent of the Endangered Species Act, then we have to plan how to recover them.

Recovery plans require objective and measurable criteria for saving species, specific descriptions of management actions, and cost estimates for those actions. This bill will create a mandatory deadline for developing final, comprehensive recovery plans. Critical habitat will now be designated in conjunction with those plans.

These changes will go towards achieving the original goal of the Endangered Species Act. I am very proud to be a part of this historic legislation, and I anticipate a bipartisan group, along with the administration, feels as I do. The time has come for commonsense reform to the Endangered Species Act.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1101. A bill to provide for tort liability of firearms dealers who transfer firearms in violation of Federal firearms law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GUN DEALER RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1999

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to help turn the tide of gun violence by requiring greater responsibility from those in the business of selling weapons.

Currently, there are over 104,000 federally licensed firearms dealers in the United States. While most of these dealers are responsible small business people, recent tracing of crime-related guns by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) has found substantial evidence that some dealers are selling guns to minors, convicted felons, and others who are prohibited by federal law from purchasing firearms. This direct diversion of weapons from retail to illegal markets is taking place both through off-the-book sales

by corrupt dealers and through so-called straw purchases, when an ineligible buyer has a friend or relative buy a firearm for him.

While federal law already prohibits a person from transferring a firearm when a person knows that the gun will be used to commit a crime, it is very difficult for victims of gun violence to seek legal redress from gun dealers who sell guns to those prohibited from buying firearms. There is very little case law and no federal law giving victims of gun violence the right to sue gun dealers who make illegal gun sales.

To remedy this situation, my legislation, the Gun Dealer Responsibility Act, would provide a statutory cause of action for victims of gun violence against dealers whose illegal sale of a gun directly contributes to the victim's injury.

I believe this legislation will make unscrupulous gun dealers think twice about selling weapons to minors, convicted felons, or any other ineligible buyer, either directly or through straw purchases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1101

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 ''Gun Dealer Responsibility Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEALER.—The term ''dealer'' has the meaning given such term in section 921(a)(11) of title 18, United States Code.

(2) FIREARM.—The term ''firearm'' has the meaning given such term in section 921(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code.

(3) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''law enforcement officer'' means any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or of a State or political subdivision thereof, who is authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of law.

SEC. 3. CAUSE OF ACTION; FEDERAL JURISDICTION.

Any person suffering bodily injury as a result of the discharge of a firearm (or, in the case of a person who is incapacitated or deceased, any person entitled to bring an action on behalf of that person or the estate of that person) may bring an action in any United States district court against any dealer who transferred the firearm to any person in violation of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, for damages and such other relief as the court deems appropriate. In any action under this section, the court shall allow a prevailing plaintiff a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs.

SEC. 4. LIABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the defendant in an action brought under section 3 shall be held liable in tort, without regard to fault or proof of defect, for all direct and consequential damages that arise from bodily injury or death proximately resulting from the illegal sale of a firearm if it is established by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant transferred the firearm to any person in violation of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) DEFENSES.—

(1) INJURY WHILE COMMITTING A FELONY.—There shall be no liability under subsection (a) if it is established by a preponderance of the evidence that the plaintiff suffered the injury while committing a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

(2) INJURY BY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—There shall be no liability under subsection (a) if it is established by a preponderance of the evidence that the injury was suffered as a result of the discharge, by a law enforcement officer in the performance of official duties, of a firearm issued by the United States (or any department or agency thereof) or any State (or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof).

SEC. 5. NO EFFECT ON OTHER CAUSES OF ACTION.

This Act shall not be construed to limit the scope of any other cause of action available to a person injured as a result of the discharge of a firearm.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY.

This Act applies to any—

(1) firearm transferred before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) bodily injury or death occurring after such date of enactment.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 14

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 14, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the use of education individual retirement accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 247

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 247, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to reform the copyright law with respect to satellite retransmissions of broadcast signals, and for other purposes.

S. 254

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 254, a bill to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by rehabilitation of juvenile criminals, punish and deter violent gang crime, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to provide for continuation of the Federal research investment in a fiscally sustainable way, and for other purposes.

S. 303

At the request of Mr. ROTH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 303, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to enhance the ability of direct broadcast satellite and other multichannel video providers to compete effectively with cable television systems, and for other purposes.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor for determining that certain individuals are not employees.

S. 348

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance training, research and development, energy conservation and efficiency, and consumer education in the oilheat industry for the benefit of oilheat consumers and the public, and for other purposes.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individuals and employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to designate the legal public holiday of ''Washington's Birthday '' as ''Presidents' Day'' in honor of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Roosevelt and in recognition of the importance of the institution of the Presidency and the contributions that Presidents have made to the development of our Nation and the principles of freedom and democracy.

S. 542

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 542, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the deduction for computer donations to schools and allow a tax credit for donated computers.

S. 593

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase maximum taxable income for the 15 percent rate bracket, to provide a partial exclusion from gross income for dividends and interest received by individuals, to provide a long-term capital gains deduction for individuals, to increase the traditional IRA contribution limit, and for other purposes.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to provide assistance for poison prevention and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers.

S. 664

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 664, 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.

S. 712

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 712, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for highway-rail grade crossing safety through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps.

S. 731

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 731, a bill to provide for substantial reductions in the price of prescription drugs for medicare beneficiaries.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to regulate the transmission of unsolicited commercial electronic mail on the Internet, and for other purposes.

S. 784

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 784, a bill to establish a demonstration project to study and provide coverage of routine patient care costs for medicare beneficiaries with cancer who are enrolled in an approved clinical trial program.

S. 875

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 875, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand S corporation eligibility for banks, and for other purposes.

S. 879

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 879, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain leasehold improvements

S. 918

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 918, a bill to authorize the Small Business Administration to provide financial and business development assistance to military reservists' small business, and for other purposes.

S. 924

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 924, a bill entitled the ''Federal Royalty Certainty Act''.

S. 934

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 934, a bill to enhance rights and protections for victims of crime.

S. 935

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 935, a bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to authorize research to promote the conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to promote access to health care services in rural areas.

S. 1029

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1029, a bill to amend title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for digital education partnerships.

S. 1073

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1073, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to ensure that United States industry is consulted with respect to all aspects of the WTO dispute settlement process.

S. 1077

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1077, a bill to dedicate the new Amtrak station in New York, New York, to Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN.

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1077, supra.

SENATE RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 92, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that funding for prostate cancer research should be increased substantially.

SENATE RESOLUTION 104—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 104

Whereas, in the case of *United States* v. *Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., et al.*, Court No. 96–12–02853, pending in the United States Court of International Trade, a subpoena for testimony and documents has been issued to Tim Osborn, a former employee of the Senate Committee on Small Business, concerning the performance of his duties on behalf of the Committee;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§228b(a) and 228c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent Members or employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony or documents relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Tim Osborn, and any other former Senate Member or employee from whom testimony may be required, are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of *United States* v. *Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., et al.*, except matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Tim Osborn, and any other former Member or employee of the Senate from whom testimony may be required, in connection with the case of *United States* v. *Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., et al.*

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

VIOLENT AND REPEAT JUVENILE OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1999

DURBIN AMENDMENT NO. 367

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 254) to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by rehabilitation of juvenile criminals, punish and deter violent gang crime, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Family Responsibility Act''.

SEC. ___. CHILDREN AND FIREARMS SAFETY.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 921(a)(34)(A) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or removing'' after ''deactivating''.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (y) the following:

''(z) PROHIBITION AGAINST GIVING JUVENILES ACCESS TO CERTAIN FIREARMS.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF JUVENILE.—In this subsection, the term 'juvenile' means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

''(2) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), it shall be unlawful for any person to keep a loaded firearm, or an unloaded firearm and ammunition for the firearm, any of which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce or

otherwise substantially affects interstate or foreign commerce, within any premise that is under the custody or control of that person if that person knows, reasonably should know, or recklessly disregards the risk that a juvenile is capable of gaining access to the firearm without the permission of the parent or legal guardian of the juvenile.

''(3) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (2) does not apply if—

''(A) the person uses a secure gun storage or safety device for the firearm;

''(B) the person is a peace officer, a member of the Armed Forces, or a member of the National Guard, and the juvenile obtains the firearm during, or incidental to, the performance of the official duties of the person in that capacity;

''(C) the juvenile obtains, or obtains and discharges, the firearm in a lawful act of self-defense or defense of one or more other persons;

''(D) the person has no reasonable expectation, based on objective facts and circumstances, that a juvenile is likely to be present on the premises on which the firearm is kept; or

''(E) the juvenile obtains the firearm as a result of an unlawful entry by any person.''.

(c) PENALTIES.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) Whoever violates section 922(z), if a juvenile (as defined in section 922(z)) obtains access to the firearm and thereby causes death or bodily injury to the juvenile or to any other person, or exhibits the firearm either in a public place, or in violation of section 922(q)—

''(A) shall be fined not more than $10,000, imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both;

(d) ROLE OF LICENSED FIREARMS DEALERS.—Section 926 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) CONTENTS OF FORM.—The Secretary shall ensure that a copy of section 922(z) appears on the form required to be obtained by a licensed dealer from a prospective transferee of a firearm.''.

(e) NO EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to preempt any provision of the law of any State, the purpose of which is to prevent juveniles from injuring themselves or others with firearms.

HARKIN AND KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 368

Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 254, supra; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. APPROPRIATE INTERVENTIONS AND SERVICES; CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAW.

(a) APPROPRIATE INTERVENTIONS AND SERVICES.—School personnel shall ensure that immediate appropriate interventions and services, including mental health interventions and services, are provided to a child removed from school for any act of violence, including carrying or possessing a weapon to or at a school, on school premises, or to or at a school function under the jurisdiction of a State or local educational agency, in order to—

(1) to ensure that our Nation's schools and communities are safe; and

(2) maximize the likelihood that such child shall not engage in such behaviors, or such behaviors do not reoccur.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAW.—Nothing in Federal law shall be construed—

(1) to prohibit an agency from reporting a crime committed by a child, including a child with a disability, to appropriate authorities; or

(2) to prevent State law enforcement and judicial authorities from exercising their responsibilities with regard to the application of Federal and State law to a crime committed by a child, including a child with a disability.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to pay the costs of the interventions and services described in subsection (a) such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

(2) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary of Education shall provide for the distribution of the funds made available under paragraph (1)—

(A) to States for a fiscal year in the same manner as the Secretary makes allotments to States under section 4011(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7111(b)) for the fiscal year; and

(B) to local educational agencies for a fiscal year in the same manner as funds are distributed to local educational agencies under section 4113(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) for the fiscal year.

HELMS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 369

Mr. HATCH (for Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 254, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

''SEC. . SAFE SCHOOLS.

''(a) AMENDMENTS.—Part F of title XIV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.) is amended as follows:

''(1) SHORT TITLE.—Section 14601(a) is amended by replacing ''Gun-Free'' with ''Safe'', and ''1994'' with ''1999''.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 14601(b)(1) is amended by inserting after ''determined'' the following: ''to be in possession of felonious quantities of an illegal drug, on school property under the jurisdiction of, or in a vehicle operated by an employee or agent of, a local educational agency in that State, or''.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 14601(b)(4) is amended by replacing ''Definition'' with ''Definitions'' in the catchline, by replacing ''section'' in the matter under the catchline with ''part'', by redesignating the matter under the catchline after the comma as subparagraph (A), by replacing the period with a semi-colon, and by adding new subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as follows:

''(B) the term ''illegal drug'' means a controlled substance, as defined in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)), the possession of which is unlawful under the Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), but does not mean a controlled substance used pursuant to a valid prescription or as authorized by law; and

''(C) the term ''illegal drug paraphernalia'' means drug paraphernalia, as defined in section 422(d) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 863(d)), except that the first sentence of that section shall be applied by inserting 'or under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.)' before the period.

''(D) the term ''felonious quantities of an illegal drug'' means any quantity of an illegal drug—

(i) possession of which quantity would, under federal, State, or local law, either constitute a felony or indicate an intent to distribute or

(ii) that is possessed with an intent to distribute.''.

''(4) REPORT TO STATE.—Section 14601(d)(2)(C) is amended by inserting ''illegal drugs or'' before ''weapons''.

''(5) REPEALER—Section 14601 is amended by striking subsection (f).

''(6) POLICY REGARDING CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM REFERRAL.—Section 14602(a) is amended by replacing ''served by'' with ''under the jurisdiction of'', and by inserting after ''who'' the following: ''is in possession of an illegal drug, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property under the jurisdiction of, or in a vehicle operated by an employee or agent of, such agency, or who''.

''(7) DATA AND POLICY DISSEMINATION UNDER IDEA.—Section 14603 is amended by inserting ''current'' before ''policy'', by striking ''in effect on October 20, 1994'', by striking all the matter after ''schools'' and inserting a period thereafter, and by inserting before ''engaging'' the following: ''possessing illegal drugs, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property, or in vehicles operated by employees or agents of, schools or local educational agencies, or''.

''(b) COMPLIANCE DATE; REPORTING:—

''(1) States shall have two years from the date of enactment of this act to comply with the requirements established in the amendments made by subsection (a).

''(2) Not later than three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit to Congress a report on any State that is not in compliance with the requirements of this part.

''(3) Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit to Congress a report analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of approaches regarding the disciplining children with disabilities.''

HARKIN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 370

Mr. HATCH (for Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. WELLSTONE)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 254, supra; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. SCHOOL COUNSELING.

Section 10102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8002) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 10102. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELING DEMONSTRATION.

''(a) COUNSELING DEMONSTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants under this section to local educational agencies to enable the local educational agencies to establish or expand elementary school counseling programs.

''(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give special consideration to applications describing programs that—

''(A) demonstrate the greatest need for new or additional counseling services among the children in the schools served by the applicant;

''(B) propose the most promising and innovative approaches for initiating or expanding school counseling; and

''(C) show the greatest potential for replication and dissemination.

''(3) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall ensure an equitable geographic distribution among the regions of the United States and among urban, suburban, and rural areas.

''(4) DURATION.—A grant under this section shall be awarded for a period not to exceed three years.

''(5) MAXIMUM GRANT.—A grant under this section shall not exceed $400,000 for any fiscal year.

''(b) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each application for a grant under this section shall—

''(A) describe the school population to be targeted by the program, the particular personal, social, emotional, educational, and career development needs of such population, and the current school counseling resources available for meeting such needs;

''(B) describe the activities, services, and training to be provided by the program and the specific approaches to be used to meet the needs described in subparagraph (A);

''(C) describe the methods to be used to evaluate the outcomes and effectiveness of the program;

''(D) describe the collaborative efforts to be undertaken with institutions of higher education, businesses, labor organizations, community groups, social service agencies, and other public or private entities to enhance the program and promote school-linked services integration;

''(E) describe collaborative efforts with institutions of higher education which specifically seek to enhance or improve graduate programs specializing in the preparation of school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers;

''(F) document that the applicant has the personnel qualified to develop, implement, and administer the program;

''(G) describe how any diverse cultural populations, if applicable, would be served through the program;

''(H) assure that the funds made available under this part for any fiscal year will be used to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would otherwise be available from non-Federal sources for the program described in the application, and in no case supplant such funds from non-Federal sources; and

''(I) assure that the applicant will appoint an advisory board composed of parents, school counselors, school psychologists, school social workers, other pupil services personnel, teachers, school administrators, and community leaders to advise the local educational agency on the design and implementation of the program.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Grant funds under this section shall be used to initiate or expand school counseling programs that comply with the requirements in paragraph (2).

''(2) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—Each program assisted under this section shall—

''(A) be comprehensive in addressing the personal, social, emotional, and educational needs of all students;

''(B) use a developmental, preventive approach to counseling;

''(C) increase the range, availability, quantity, and quality of counseling services in the elementary schools of the local educational agency;

''(D) expand counseling services only through qualified school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers;

''(E) use innovative approaches to increase children's understanding of peer and family relationships, work and self, decision-making, or academic and career planning, or to improve social functioning;

''(F) provide counseling services that are well-balanced among classroom group and small group counseling, individual counseling, and consultation with parents, teachers, administrators, and other pupil services personnel;

''(G) include inservice training for school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, other pupil services personnel, teachers, and instructional staff;

''(H) involve parents of participating students in the design, implementation, and evaluation of a counseling program;

''(I) involve collaborative efforts with institutions of higher education, businesses, labor organizations, community groups, social service agencies, or other public or private entities to enhance the program and promote school-linked services integration;

''(J) evaluate annually the effectiveness and outcomes of the counseling services and activities assisted under this section;

''(K) ensure a team approach to school counseling by maintaining a ratio in the elementary schools of the local educational agency that does not exceed 1 school counselor to 250 students, 1 school social worker to 800 students, and 1 school psychologist to 1,000 students; and

''(L) ensure that school counselors, school psychologists, or school social workers paid from funds made available under this section spend at least 85 percent of their total worktime at the school in activities directly related to the counseling process and not more than 15 percent of such time on administrative tasks that are associated with the counseling program.

''(3) REPORT.—The Secretary shall issue a report evaluating the programs assisted pursuant to each grant under this subsection at the end of each grant period in accordance with section 14701, but in no case later than January 30, 2003.

''(4) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall make the programs assisted under this section available for dissemination, either through the National Diffusion Network or other appropriate means.

''(5) LIMIT ON ADMINISTRATION.—Not more than five percent of the amounts made available under this section in any fiscal year shall be used for administrative costs to carry out this section.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'school counselor' means an individual who has documented competence in counseling children and adolescents in a school setting and who—

''(A) possesses State licensure or certification granted by an independent professional regulatory authority;

''(B) in the absence of such State licensure or certification, possesses national certification in school counseling or a specialty of counseling granted by an independent professional organization; or

''(C) holds a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling from a program accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs or the equivalent;

''(2) the term 'school psychologist' means an individual who—

''(A) possesses a minimum of 60 graduate semester hours in school psychology from an institution of higher education and has completed 1,200 clock hours in a supervised school psychology internship, of which 600 hours shall be in the school setting;

''(B) possesses State licensure or certification in the State in which the individual works; or

''(C) in the absence of such State licensure or certification, possesses national certification by the National School Psychology Certification Board;

''(3) the term 'school social worker' means an individual who holds a master's degree in social work and is licensed or certified by the State in which services are provided or holds a school social work specialist credential; and

''(4) the term 'supervisor' means an individual who has the equivalent number of years of professional experience in such individual's respective discipline as is required of teaching experience for the supervisor or administrative credential in the State of such individual.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $150,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

BIDEN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 371

Mr. HATCH (for Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. KERREY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. REID, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. HOLLINGS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 254, supra; as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

TITLE V—21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY POLICING INITIATIVE

SEC. 501. 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY POLICING INITIATIVE.

(a) COPS PROGRAM.—Section 1701(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(a)) is amended by—

(1) inserting ''and prosecutor'' after ''increase police''; and

(2) inserting ''to enhance law enforcement access to new technologies, and'' after ''presence,''.

(b) HIRING AND REDEPLOYMENT GRANT PROJECTS.—Section 1701(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting after ''Nation,'' ''or pay overtime to existing career law enforcement officers;'';

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) promote higher education among in-service State and local law enforcement officers by reimbursing them for the costs associated with seeking a college or graduate school education.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking all that follows SUPPORT SYSTEMS.—'' and inserting ''Grants pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) for overtime may not exceed 25 percent of the funds available for grants pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year; paragraph (1)(C) may not exceed 20 percent of the funds available for grants pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year, and grants pursuant to paragraph (1)(D) may not exceed 5 percent of the funds available for grants pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year.

(c) ADDITIONAL GRANT PROJECTS.—Section 1701(d) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''integrity and ethics'' after ''specialized''; and

(B) by inserting ''and'' after ''enforcement officers'';

(2) in paragraph (7) by inserting ''school officials, religiously-affiliated organizations,'' after ''enforcement officers'';

(3) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

''(8) establish school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and local school systems, by using school resource officers who operate in and around elementary and secondary schools to serve as a law enforcement liaison with other Federal, State, and local law enforcement and regulatory agencies, combat school-related crime and disorder problems, gang membership and criminal activity, firearms and explosives-related incidents, illegal use and possession of alcohol and the illegal possession, use, and distribution of drugs; '';

(4) in paragraph (10) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(5) in paragraph (11) by striking the period that appears at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) develop and implement innovative programs (such as the TRIAD program) that bring together a community's sheriff, chief of police, and elderly residents to address the public safety concerns of older citizens.''.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 1701(f) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting ''use up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated under subsection (a) to'' after ''The Attorney General may'';

(B) by inserting at the end the following: ''In addition, the Attorney General may use up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated under subsections (d), (e), and (f) for technical assistance and training to States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, and to other public and private entities for those respective purposes,'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting ''under subsection (a)'' after ''the Attorney General''; and

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''the Attorney General may'' and inserting ''the Attorney General shall'';

(B) by inserting ''regional community policing institutes'' after ''operation of''; and

(C) by inserting ''representatives of police labor and management organizations, community residents,'' after ''supervisors,''.

(e) TECHNOLOGY AND PROSECUTION PROGRAMS.—Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) is amended by—

(1) striking subsection (k);

(2) redesignating subsections (f) through (j) as subsections (g) through (k); and

(3) striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(f) LAW ENFORCEMENT TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.—Grants made under subsection (a) may be used to assist police departments, in employing professional, scientific, and technological advancements that will help them—

''(1) improve police communications through the use of wireless communications, computers, software, videocams, databases and other hardware and software that allow law enforcement agencies to communicate more effectively across jurisdictional boundaries and effectuate interoperability;

''(2) develop and improve access to crime solving technologies, including DNA analysis, photo enhancement, voice recognition, and other forensic capabilities; and

''(3) promote comprehensive crime analysis by utilizing new techniques and technologies, such as crime mapping, that allow law enforcement agencies to use real-time crime and arrest data and other related information—including non-criminal justice data—to improve their ability to analyze, predict, and respond pro-actively to local crime and disorder problems, as well as to engage in regional crime analysis.

''(g) COMMUNITY-BASED PROSECUTION PROGRAM.—Grants made under subsection (a) may be used to assist State, local or tribal prosecutors' offices in the implementation of community-based prosecution programs that build on local community policing efforts. Funds made available under this subsection may be used to—

''(1) hire additional prosecutors who will be assigned to community prosecution programs, including (but not limited to) programs that assign prosecutors to handle cases from specific geographic areas, to address specific violent crime and other local crime problems (including intensive illegal gang, gun and drug enforcement projects and quality of life initiatives), and to address localized violent and other crime problems based on needs identified by local law enforcement agencies, community organizations, and others;

''(2) redeploy existing prosecutors to community prosecution programs as described in paragraph (1) of this section by hiring victim and witness coordinators, paralegals, community outreach, and other such personnel; and

''(3) establish programs to assist local prosecutors' offices in the implementation of programs that help them identify and respond to priority crime problems in a community with specifically tailored solutions.

At least 75 percent of the funds made available under this subsection shall be reserved for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2) and of those amounts no more than 10 percent may be used for grants under paragraph (2) and at least 25 percent of the funds shall be reserved for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2) to units of local government with a population of less than 50,000.''.

(h) RETENTION GRANTS.—Section 1703 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd–2) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''(d) RETENTION GRANTS.—The Attorney General may use no more than 50 percent of the funds under subsection (a) to award grants targeted specifically for retention of police officers to grantees in good standing, with preference to those that demonstrate financial hardship or severe budget constraint that impacts the entire local budget and may result in the termination of employment for police officers funded under subsection (b)(1).''.

(i) HIRING COSTS.—Section 1704(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd–3(c)) is amended by striking ''$75,000'' and inserting ''$125,000''.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) CAREER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—Section 1709(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd–8) is amended by inserting after ''criminal laws'' the following: ''including sheriffs deputies charged with supervising offenders who are released into the community but also engaged in local community policing efforts.''.

(2) SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER.—Section 1709(4) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd–8) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) to serve as a law enforcement liaison with other Federal, State, and local law enforcement and regulatory agencies, to address and document crime and disorder problems including gangs and drug activities, firearms and explosives-related incidents, and the illegal use and possession of alcohol affecting or occurring in or around an elementary or secondary school;

(B) by striking subparagraph (E) and inserting the following:

''(E) to train students in conflict resolution, restorative justice, and crime awareness, and to provide assistance to and coordinate with other officers, mental health professionals, and youth counselors who are responsible for the implementation of prevention/intervention programs within the schools;''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) to work with school administrators, members of the local parent teacher associations, community organizers, law enforcement, fire departments, and emergency medical personnel in the creation, review, and implementation of a school violence prevention plan;

''(I) to assist in documenting the full description of all firearms found or taken into custody on school property and to initiate a firearms trace and ballistics examination for each firearm with the local office of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms;

''(J) to document the full description of all explosives or explosive devices found or taken into custody on school property and report to the local office of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; and

''(K) to assist school administrators with the preparation of the Department of Education, Annual Report on State Implementation of the Gun-Free Schools Act which tracks the number of students expelled per year for bringing a weapon, firearm, or explosive to school.''.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(11) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part Q, to remain available until expended—

''(i) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

''(ii) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

''(iii) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

''(iv) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

''(v) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

''(vi) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''3 percent'' and inserting ''5 percent'';

(B) by striking ''85 percent'' and inserting ''$600,000,000''; and

(C) by striking ''1701(b),'' and all that follows through ''of part Q'' and inserting the following: ''1701(b) and (c), $350,000,000 to grants for the purposes specified in section 1701(f), and $200,000,000 to grants for the purposes specified in section 1701(g).''.

SATELLITE HOME VIEWERS IMPROVEMENT ACT

MCCAIN AMENDMENT NO. 372

Mr. HATCH (for Mr. MCCAIN) proposed an amendment to the bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to reform the copyright law with respect to satellite retransmissions of broadcast signals, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 1, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

TITLE I—SATELLITE HOME VIEWERS IMPROVEMENTS ACT

On page 1, line 3, strike ''SECTION 1.'' and insert ''SEC. 101.''.

On page 2, line 1, strike ''SEC. 2.'' and insert ''SEC. 102.''.

On page 1, line 4, strike ''Act'' and insert ''title''.

On page 10, line 1, strike ''SEC. 3.'' and insert ''SEC. 103.''.

On page 10, line 7, strike ''SEC. 4.'' and insert ''SEC. 104.''.

On page 11, line 18, strike ''SEC. 5.'' and insert ''SEC. 105.''.

On page 12, line 11, strike ''SEC. 6.'' and insert ''SEC. 106.''.

On page 13, line 17, strike ''SEC. 7.'' and insert ''SEC. 107.''.

On page 14, line 6, strike ''SEC. 8.' and insert ''SEC. 108.''

On page 14, line 7, strike ''Act'' each place it appears and insert ''title''.

On page 14, line 9, strike ''section 4'' and insert ''section 104''.

On page 14, after line 9, add the following:

TITLE II—SATELLITE TELEVISION ACT OF 1996

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Satellite Television Act of 1999''.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Congress stated its policy of promoting competition in cable services and making available to the public a diversity of views and information through cable television and other video media.

(2) In the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Congress stated its policy of securing lower prices and higher quality service for American telecommunications consumers and encouraging the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies.

(3) In most places throughout America, cable television system operators still do not face effective competition form other providers of multichannel video service.

(4) Absent effective competition, the market power exercised by cable television operators enables them to raise the price of cable service to consumers, and to control the price and availability of cable programming services to other multichannnel video service providers. Current Federal Communications Commission rules have been inadequate in constraining cable price increases.

(5) Direct-to-home satellite service has over 8 million subscribers and constitutes the most significant competitive alternative to cable television service.

(6) Direct-to-home satellite service currently suffers from a number of statutory, regulatory, and technical barriers that keep it from being an effective competitor to cable television in the provision of multichannel video services.

(7) The most prominent of these barriers is the inability to provide subscribers with local television broadcast signals by satellite.

(8) Permitting providers of direct-to-home satellite service to retransmit local television signals to their subscribers would greatly enhance the ability of direct-to-home satellite service providers to compete more effectively in the provision of multichannel video services.

(9) Due to capacity limitations and in the interest of providing service in as many markets as possible, providers of direct-to-home satellite service, unlike cable television systems, cannot at this time carry all local television broadcast signals in all the local television markets they seek to serve.

(10) It would be in the public interest for providers of direct-to-home satellite service to fully comply with the mandatory signal carriage rules at the earliest possible date. In the interim, requiring full compliance with the mandatory signal carriage rules would substantially limit the ability of direct-to-home satellite service providers to compete in the provision of multichannel video services and would not serve the public interest.

(11) Maintaining the viability of free, local, over-the-air television service is a matter of preeminent public interest.

(12) All subscribers to multichannel video services should be able to receive the signal of at least one station affiliated with each of the major broadcast television networks.

(13) Millions of subscribers to direct-to-home satellite service currently receive the signals of network-affiliated stations not located in these subscribers' local television markets. Where conventional rooftop antennas cannot provide satisfactory reception of local stations, distant network signals may be these subscribers' only source of network television service.

(14) The widespread carriage of distant network stations in local network affiliates' markets could harm the local stations' ability to serve their local community.

(15) Abrupt termination of satellite carriers' provision of distant network signals could have a negative impact on the ability of direct-to-home satellite service to compete effectively in the provision of multichannel video services.

(16) The public interest would be served by permitting direct-to-home satellite service providers to continue existing carriage of a distant network affiliate station's signal where—

(A) there is no local network affiliate;

(B) the local network affiliate cannot be adequately received off-air; or

(C) continued carriage would not harm the local network station.

SEC. 203. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to promote competition in the provision of multichannel video services while protecting the availability of free, local, over-the-air television, particularly for the 22 percent of American television households that do not subscribe to any multichannel video programming service.

SEC. 204. MUST-CARRY FOR SATELLITE CARRIERS RETRANSMITTING TELEVISION BROADCAST SIGNALS.

Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''SEC. 337. CARRIAGE OF LOCAL TELEVISION STATIONS BY SATELLITE CARRIERS.

''(a) APPLICATION OF MANDATORY CARRIAGE TO SATELLITE CARRIERS.—The mandatory carriage provisions of section 614 and 615 of this Act will apply in a local market no later than January 1, 2002, to satellite carriers retransmitting any television broadcast station in that local market pursuant to the compulsory license provided by section 122 of title 17, United States Code.

''(b) GOOD SIGNAL REQUIRED.—

''(1) COSTS.—A television broadcast station eligible for carriage under subsection (a) may be required to bear the costs associated with delivering a good quality signal to the designated local receive facility of the satellite carrier. The selection of a local receive facility by a satellite carrier shall not be made in a manner that frustrates the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall implement the requirements of this section without imposing any undue economic burden on any party.

''(2) RULEMAKING REQUIRED.—The Commission shall adopt rules implementing paragraph (1) within 180 days after the date of enactment of the Satellite Television Act of 1999.

''(c) CABLE TELEVISION SYSTEM DIGITAL SIGNAL CARRIAGE NOT COVERED.—Nothing in this section applies to the carriage of the digital signals of television broadcast stations by cable television systems.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) TELEVISION BROADCAST STATION.—The term 'television broadcast station' means a full power local television broadcast station, but does not include a low-power or translator television broadcast station.

''(2) NETWORK STATION.—The term 'network station' means a television broadcast station that is owned or operated by, or affiliated with, a broadcasting network.

''(3) BROADCASTING NETWORK.—The term 'broadcasting network' means a television network in the United States which offers an interconnected program service on a regular basis for 15 or more hours per week to at least 25 affiliated broadcast stations in 10 or more States.

''(4) DISTANT TELEVISION STATION.—The term 'distant television station' means any television broadcast station that is not licensed and operating on a channel regularly assigned to the local television market in which a subscriber to a direct-to-home satellite service is located.

''(5) LOCAL MARKET.—The term 'local market' means the designated market area in which a station is located. For a noncommercial educational television broadcast station, the local market includes any station that is licensed to a community within the same designated market area as the noncommercial educational television broadcast station.

''(6) SATELLITE CARRIER.—The term 'satellite carrier' has the meaning given it by section 119(d) of title 17, United States Code.

''SEC. 338. CARRIAGE OF DISTANT TELEVISION STATIONS BY SATELLITE CARRIERS.

''(a) PROVISIONS RELATING TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d), direct-to-home satellite service providers shall be permitted to provide the signals of 1 affiliate of each television network to any household that initially subscribed to direct-to-home satellite service on or after July 10, 1998.

''(2) ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION.—The determination of a new subscriber's eligibility to receive the signals of one or more distant network stations as a component of the service provided pursuant to paragraph (a) shall be made by ascertaining whether the subscriber resides within the predicted Grade B service area of a local network station. The Individual Location Longley-Rice methodology described by the Commission in Docket 98–201 shall be used to make this determination. A direct-to-home satellite service provider may provide the signal of a distant network station to any subscriber determined by this method to be unserved by a local station affiliated with that network.

''(3) RULEMAKING REQUIRED.—

''(A) Within 90 days after the date of enactment of the Satellite Television Act of 1999, the Commission shall adopt procedures that shall be used by any direct-to-home satellite service subscriber requesting a waiver to receive one or more distant network signals. The waiver procedures adopted by the Commission shall—

''(i) impose no unnecessary burden on the subscriber seeking the waiver;

''(ii) allocate responsibilities fairly between direct-to-home satellite service providers and local stations;

''(iii) prescribe mandatory time limits within which direct-to-home satellite service providers and local stations shall carry out the obligations imposed upon them; and

''(iv) prescribe that all costs of conducting any measurement or testing shall be borne by the direct-to-home satellite service provider, if the local station's signal meets the prescribed minimum standards, or by the local station, if its signal fails to meet the prescribed minimum standards.

''(4) PENALTY FOR VIOLATION.—Any direct-to-home satellite service provider that knowingly and willfully provides the signals of 1 or more distant television stations to subscribers in violation of this section shall be liable for forfeiture in the amount of $50,000 per day per violation.

''(b) PROVISION RELATING TO EXISTING SUBSCRIBERS.—

''(1) MORATORIUM ON TERMINATION.—Until December 31, 1999, any direct-to-home satellite service may continue to provide the signals of distant television stations to any subscriber located within predicted Grade A and Grade B contours of a local network station who received those distant network signals before July 11, 1998.

''(2) CONTINUED CARRIAGE.—Direct-to-home satellite service providers may continue to provide the signals of distant television stations to subscribers located between the outside limits of the predicted Grade A contour and the predicted Grade B contour of the corresponding local network stations after December 31, 1999, subject to any limitations adopted by the Commission under paragraph (3).

''(3) RULEMAKING REQUIRED.—

''(A) Within 180 days after the date of enactment of the Satellite Television Act of 1999, the Commission shall conclude a single rulemaking, compliant with subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, to examine the extent to which any existing program exclusivity rules should be imposed on distant network stations provided to subscribers under paragraph (2).

''(B) The Commission shall not impose any program exclusivity rules on direct-to-home satellite service providers pursuant to subparagraph (A) unless it finds that it would be both technically and economically feasible and otherwise in the public interest to do so.

''(c) WAIVERS NOT PRECLUDED.—Notwithstanding any other provision in this section, nothing shall preclude any network stations from authorizing the continued provision of distant network signals in unaltered form to any direct-to-home satellite service subscriber currently receiving them.

''(d) CERTAIN SIGNALS.—Providers of direct-to-home satellite service may continue to carry the signals of distant network stations without regard to subsections (a) and (b) in any situation in which—

''(1) a subscriber is unserved by the local station affiliated with that network;

''(2) a waiver is otherwise granted by the local station under subsection (c); or

''(3) if the carriage would otherwise be consistent with rules adopted by the Commission in CS Docket 98–201.

''(e) Report Required.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of the Satellite Television Act of 1999, the Commission shall report to Congress on methods of facilitating the delivery of local signals in local markets, especially smaller markets.''.

SEC. 205. RETRANSMISSION CONSENT.

''(a) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 325(b).—Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is amended striking the subsection designation and paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

''(b)(1) No cable system or other multichannel video programming distributor shall retransmit the signal of a broadcasting station, or any part thereof, except—

''(A) with the express authority of the station; or

''(B) pursuant to section 614 or section 615, in the case of a station electing, in accordance with this subsection, to assert the right to carriage under that section.

''(2) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to—

''(A) retransmission of the signal of a television broadcast station outside the station's local market by a satellite carrier directly to subscribers if—

''(i) that station was a superstation on May 1, 1991;

''(ii) as of July 1, 1998, such station's signal was transmitted under the compulsory license of section 119 of title 17, United States Code, by satellite carries directly to at least 250,000 subscribers; and

''(iii) the satellite carrier complies with any program exclusivity rules that may be adopted by the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to section 338.

''(B) retransmission of the distant signal of a broadcasting station that is owned or operated by, or affiliated with, a broadcasting network directly to a home satellite antenna, if the subscriber resides in an unserved household; or

''(C) retransmission by a cable operator or other multichannel video programming distributor (other than by a satellite carrier direct to its subscribers) of the signal of a television broadcast station outside the station's local market, if that signal was obtained from a satellite carrier and—

''(i) the originating station was a superstation on May 1, 1991; and

''(ii) the originating station was a network station on December 31, 1997, and its signal was retransmitted by a satellite carrier directly to subscribers.

''(3) Any term used in this subsection that is defined in section 337(d) of this Act has the meaning given to it by that section.''.

''(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection(a) take effect on January 1, 1999.

SEC. 206. DESIGNATED MARKET AREAS.

Nothing in this title, or in the amendment made by this title, prevents the Federal Communications Commission from revising the listing of designated market areas or reassigning those area if the revision or reassignment is done in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commission's cable television mandatory carriage rules provide.

SEC. 207. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title of section 325(b) or 337 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b) or 337, respectively), or the application of that provision to any person or circumstance, is held by a court of competent Jurisdiction to violate any provision of the Constitution of the United States, then the other provisions of that section, and the application of that provision to other provisions and circumstance, shall not be affected.

SEC. 208. SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS.

''(a) AMENDENT OF SECTION 119(A)(2)(B) of TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 119(a)(2)(B) of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(B) SECONDARY TRANSMISSION TO UNSERVED HOUSEHOLDS.—Except as provided in paragraph(5)(E) of this subsection, the license provided or in subparagraph(a) shall be limited to secondary transmissions to persons who reside in unserved households.''.

''(b) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 119(A)(5) of Title 17.—Section 119(a)(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''(E) EXCEPTION.—The secondary transmission by a satellite carrier of a primary transmission made by a network station to subscribers who do not reside in unserved households shall not be an act of infringement if

''(i) that station was a superstation on May 1, 1991; and

''(ii) that station was lawfully retransmitted by satellite carriers directly to at lest 250,000 subscribers as of July 1, 1998.''.

SEC. 209. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) TERMS DEFINED IN COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.—Any term used in this title that is defined in section 337(d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 204 of this title, has the meaning given to it by that section.

(2) DESIGNATED MARKET AREA.—The term ''designated market area'' means a designated market area, as determined by Nielsen Media Research and published in the DMA Market and Demographic Report.

HATCH (AND LEAHY) AMENDMENT NO. 373

Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 372 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill, S. 247, supra; as follows:

On page 17, strike line 4 through page 18, line 4 and insert the following:

SEC. 208 DEFINITIONS.

HATCH (AND LEAHY) AMENDMENTS NOS. 374–375

Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) proposed two amendments to the bill, S. 247, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 374

On page 3, line 9, strike ''that station'' and insert ''the network that owns or is affiliated with the network station''.

On page 3, lines 16 and 17, strike ''the station'' and insert ''the network''.

On page 4, line 3, strike ''the station'' and insert ''the network''.

On page 12, beginning with line 19, strike all through line 5 on page 13 and insert the following:

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''In the case of the Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed, the compulsory license shall be effective until January 1, 2002.''.

On page 13, strike lines 6 through 8 and insert the following:

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 119(d) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

''(9) SUPERSTATION.—The term 'superstation'—

''(A) means a television broadcast station, other than a network station, licensed by the Federal Communications Commission that is secondarily transmitted by a satellite carrier; and

''(B) includes the Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

On page 13, line 25, strike ''and''.

On page 14, line 5, strike the period and insert a semicolon and ''and''.

On page 14, insert between lines 5 and 6 the following:

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) STATUTORY LICENSE CONTINGENT ON COMPLIANCE WITH FCC RULES AND REMEDIAL STEPS.—The willful or repeated secondary transmission to the public by a satellite carrier of a primary transmission made by a broadcast station licensed by the Federal Communications Commission is actionable as an act of infringement under section 501, and is fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 506 and 509, if, at the time of such transmission, the satellite carrier is not in compliance with the rules, regulations, and authorizations of the Federal Communications Commission concerning the carriage of television broadcast station signals.''.

SEC. 8. TELEVISION BROADCAST STATION STANDING.

Section 501 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) With respect to any secondary transmission that is made by a satellite carrier of a primary transmission embodying the performance or display of a work and is actionable as an act of infringement under section 122, a television broadcast station holding a copyright or other license to transmit or perform the same version of that work shall, for purposes of subsection (b) of this section, be treated as a legal or beneficial owner if such secondary transmission occurs within the local market of that station.''.

On page 14, line 6, strike ''**sec. 8.**'' and insert ''**sec. 9.**''.

AMENDMENT NO. 375

On page 12, line 4, insert after ''network'' the following: ''or is not otherwise eligible to receive directly from a satellite carrier a signal of that television network (other than a signal provided under section 122) in accordance with section 338 of the Communications Act of 1934.''.

On page 14, insert between lines 5 and 6 the following:

SEC. 8. MORATORIUM ON COPYRIGHT LIABILITY.

Until December 31, 1999, no subscriber, as defined under section 119(d)(8) of title 17, United States Code, located within the predicted Grade B contour of a local network television broadcast station shall have satellite service of a distant network signal affiliated with the same network terminated, if that subscriber received satellite service of such network signal before July 11, 1998, as a result of section 119 of title 17, United States Code.

On page 14, line 6, strike ''**sec. 8.**'' and insert ''**sec. 9.**''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Thursday, May 20, 1999, at 9:30 a.m. on Internet Filtering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 20, for purposes of conducting a full committee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to receive testimony on damage to the national security from Chinese espionage at DOE nuclear weapons laboratories.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Governmental Affairs Committee be permitted to meet on Thursday, May 20, 1999 at 10 a.m. for a business meeting to consider pending Committee business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Governmental Affairs Committee be permitted to meet on Thursday, May 20, 1999 at 2:30 p.m. for a hearing on Oversight of National Security Methods and Processes Relating to the Wen-Ho Lee Espionage Investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet for a hearing on ''ESEA: From Tales to Tape'' during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 20, 1999, at 10:00 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 20, 1999, at 2:30 p.m. to receive testimony on education issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to request unanimous consent to hold a hearing on pending legislation.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, May 20, 1999, at 2:15 p.m., in room 418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR, WETLANDS, PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. LOTT, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety be granted permission to conduct a hearing on the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed sulfur standard for gasoline as contained in the proposed Tier Two standards for automobiles Thursday, May 20, 9:30 a.m., Hearing Room (SD–406).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, PRODUCTION, AND REGULATION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production, and Regulation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 20, for purposes of conducting a subcommittee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 2:00 p.m. The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 348, a bill to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance training research and development, energy conservation and efficiency and consumer education in the oilheat consumers and the public, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, PRODUCTION, AND REGULATION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production, and Regulation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 20, for purposes of conducting a joint subcommittee hearing with the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs of the House Committee on Government Reform, which is scheduled to begin at 2:30 p.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to receive testimony and conduct oversight on the Administration's FY2000 budget request for climate change programs and compliance with various statutory provisions in FY1999 appropriations acts requiring detailed accounting of climate change spending and performance measures for each requested increase in funding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SPACE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation be authorized to meet on Thursday, May 20, 1999, at 2:30 pm on Commercial Space.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL BUD NANCE

• Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to give tribute to Admiral Bud Nance. His recent death is a great loss to this institution and to this country. His list of accomplishments is long, his list of friends even longer. I want to express my sympathy to his wife and family. I also want to extend that same sympathy to my friend from North Carolina, Senator HELMS, who has lost a great friend and advisor.

I first met Bud in 1991 when he came out of a well-deserved military retirement and took over as Staff Director of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I was a member of the Committee at that time. His career as a Navy Commander brought a steady hand and a cool head to the Committe. I knew that when I had new staff member starting in the Senate I could send him or her to Bud and he would put the staff member on the right track with his fatherly guidance. His maturity and mentoring role will be almost impossible to replace. I also knew that Bud would provide me with clear-headed advice. He was plain spoken and honest, and I truly admired him for that. Even after I left the Committee, I often turned to Bud for assistance or guidance on a particular issue, and he always gave me an honest answer. That counts for a lot up here.

Mr. President, the Admiral's many accomplishments have been noted previously by my colleagues. Although I knew of his military background prior to joining the Senate, Bud was too modest to let the rest of us in on just what he had gone through in his previous career as a Navy officer. He saw active duty in World War II, Korea and Vietnam. It has been reported that during World War II he endured 162 Japanese air and kamikaze attacks. One of the papers reminded me of one of Bud's great lines when the Committee was considering whether U.S. Ambassadors should receive additional benefits, including hardship pay. ''I fought at Iwo Jima,'' he said, ''That's hardship.'' His life experiences helped him keep our work here in perspective.

Mr. President, I noted the obituary from the Charlotte Observer was entitled, ''Bud Nance, Monroe Native Was an Officer and a Gentleman.'' This was certainly a fitting description of the man, and he will be remembered fondly by all who knew him.●

TRIBUTE TO JEFF GLUECK

●Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I want to pay special tribute to an outstanding citizen and participant of the distinguished White House Fellowship Program—Jeffrey Glueck from Newport Beach, CA.

Mr. Glueck, a management consultant with Monitor Co. in Cambridge, Massachusetts, graduated from Harvard University with honors, receiving his BA in social studies. He went on to earn an MA in international relations from Oxford University on a Marshall Scholarship, where he and a partner won the annual Oxford Debating Championship. Mr. Glueck has advised the Peruvian and Bolivian governments on economic competitiveness and from 1995–98, directed a national competitiveness project for the Venezuelan government and private sector. He was also a pro bono advisor to the Center of Middle East Competitive Strategy, an economic development and regional cooperation project for the signatory governments of the Middle East peace process. Mr. Glueck has maintained his long-standing commitment to public service with his involvement in many community-based organizations. He tutored at a housing project as a student in Boston, was editor-in-chief of the Harvard Political Review, was a founding participant of the Harvard Communications Project—an inter-ethnic discussion group—and started a recycling program at the Oxford University dorms.

Since 1965, the White House Fellowship Program has offered outstanding citizens across the United States the opportunity to participate in a once-in-a-lifetime experience. Fellows work closely with influential leaders in government and see U.S. policy in action. The nearly 500 alumni of the program have gone on to become leaders in all fields of endeavor, fulfilling the Fellowship's mission to encourage active citizenship and service to the nation. This program is extremely competitive, choosing individuals that have demonstrated excellence in community service, leadership, and professional and academic achievement. It is the nation's most prestigious fellowship for public service and leadership development.

Mr. Glueck had been assigned to the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. during his White House Fellowship. In this capacity, he works on ways to reconcile free trade with environmental protection around the world. He has helped coordinate a campaign for environmental standards of all OECD governments that would withhold public financing for projects in developing countries that damage the environment. In addition to these responsibilities, Mr. Glueck works to counter unfair trade practices by foreign governments in emerging governments and to promote sales by U.S. companies with environmentally-beneficial products to places in Asia and Latin America that can benefit from American know-how.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Jeffrey Glueck for his accomplishments, and especially for being a distinguished recipient of the White House Fellowship. It is an honor to represent Mr. Glueck in the U.S. Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. GEORGE VERNON IRONS, SR.

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize one of Alabama's great native sons, Dr. George Vernon Irons, Sr., and to acknowledge the eulogy by Dr. James D. Moebes, given at his funeral service on July 21, 1998.

A native of Demopolis, Dr. Irons was Distinguished Professor of History and Political Science, Samford University, 43 years, Distinguished Professor Emeritus, 22 years—a Samford record. Dr. Irons taught not only history but how to make history—teaching 17 students who become university presidents—more than any educator.

Dr. Irons was also one of Alabama's true athletic greats—the only distance man—the only University of Alabama track man—ever inducted into the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame. Mr. President, only three men have been inducted into the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame on the first ballot: Ralph Shug Jordan, Paul Bear Bryant and Dr. George Irons. He was its oldest member at age 95.

Mr. President, Dr. Irons was truly an institution in himself. He first came to Howard College (now Samford University) in Birmingham in 1933. When Dr. Irons reported to Howard College, the school was in serious financial trouble owing a half million dollars. Dr. Irons gave a wealth of leadership, dedication and promise, sorely needed by Howard.

The rest of history. Today Samford University is the largest privately endowed Baptist school in the world; largest Baptist pharmacy school in the world. The only Baptist university in America with an inspiring domed school of divinity on its campus.

Born in Demopolis, Dr. Irons taught at Duke University for two years before joining Samford. Dr. Irons was a founding member of the Alabama Historical Association in 1947 and attended the 50th anniversary of the organization last year in Birmingham. He was also a member of the Southern Historical Association, Alabama Baptist Historical Association, Birmingham-Jefferson Historical Society and John H. Forney Historical Society. Dr. Irons historical writings were published by those organizations.

He was past president of the Alabama Writer's Conclave and received a distinguished service award from that organization in 1977. He also served as Vice President of the Alabama Academy of Science.

Dr. Irons was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal from Freedom's at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, in 1962 and the George Washington Honor Award in 1963. He was Director of Samford's Freedom Foundation Program which won a record seventeen consecutive awards. The Samford yearbook, Entre Nous, was dedicated by the Samford student body to Dr. Irons, and unprecedented four times during his teaching career—in 1941, 1960, 1969, and 1974. He served as a member of the Jefferson County Judicial Commission from 1961 to 1965, selecting circuit judges for the largest judicial circuit in Alabama.

Dr. Irons was selected to Who's Who in America, Who's Who in the South and Southwest, Who's Who in American Education and Directory of American Scholars.

Dr. Irons is a true Alabama sports legend. In the early 1920's, the prowess of the Alabama Crimson Tide football had ebbed. However, Crimson Tide track and distance star, George Irons, kept the athletic flame burning at the Capstone as its ''Knight of the Cinderpath.'' The late Senator John Sparkman, a classmate of Irons, said, ''George Irons was all we had to cheer about—if it hadn't been for Irons, athletics would have been pretty boring back then.''

His athletic feats have been heralded by legendary Coach Paul ''Bear'' Bryant as ''truly outstanding athletic achievements,'' Coach Wallace Wade (three time Rose Bowl winner) as the ''greatest distance runner of his day,'' and Coach Hank Crisp as ''self-made distance star for the Alabama Crimson Tide.''

In 1923, he was described by those who knew him best—his fellow classmates at the University of Alabama, including the late U.S. Senator John Sparkman:

''George Irons: The South's greatest distance runner and a scholarly Christian gentleman. He is one of the true greats of Alabama athletic history, an honor man in scholarship and a record breaking athlete—that is a real man—our Knight of the Cinderpath.''

[The Corolla, 1923.]

At his interment ceremonies Dr. Irons received full military honors. A 21 gun salute was fired and taps bugled in honor of his valiant service in World War II, rising to the rank of Colonel, with 33 years active and reserve duty.

It's no surprise his life had such brilliant radiance. No surprise his devoted valiant service was so broad in scope. Devoted service to:

Family. His wife, Velma Wright Irons, a distinguished educator in her own right—sons, Dr. George Vernon Irons, Jr., Charlotte, North Carolina, a practicing cardiologist and William Lee Irons, a prominent Birmingham attorney. Both have left notable marks on their professions of medicine and law. Parenthetically, Dr. George V. Irons, Sr., and his son, William L. Irons, are the only father-son listing selected to the 1998 Who's Who in America from the entire State of Alabama—yet another record for this remarkable man.

Alma Mater. The University of Alabama—where he established his name in crimson flame as ''one of the true greats in Alabama's famed athletic history.'' A Phi Beta Kappa honors student, Irons was the University of Alabama's—the State of Alabama—nominee for the Rhodes Scholarship to England in 1924. Since the University's founding in 1831, only seven athletes have been selected to become a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

College. Dr. Irons was a key player in seeing Howard College grow from a financially distressed school, to the largest privately endowed Baptist university in the world—an internationally acclaimed university.

Dr. Irons was elected by the Samford University Faculty to serve as Grand Marshall of all academic, graduation and commencement exercises. Leading the academic processionals for fifteen years, carrying the silver scepter, symbol of Samford University's authority—Dr. Irons wore brilliant blue academic gowns and silks with dignity and distinction. In 1976, the Samford University Faculty wrote in the University's records by Resolution:

''In the long history of Samford University, Dr. Irons must be ranked at the very top in terms of his widespread beneficent influence, the love that former students evidence from him, and his impeccable character and qualities of modesty, humility, kindness and selfless service to the University.

[Samford University Resolution (1976)]

Country. Dr. Irons distinguished himself in World War II, rising to the rank of Colonel, defending his Nation for a third of the 20th Century in war and peace.

God. Dr. Irons gave tireless service to his Church as deacon, Sunday School teacher and Chairman of the Board of Deacons, and was elected as lifetime Deacon, Southside Baptist Church. His life reflects his depth of devotion in word, thought and deed—an icon of virtue—a legendary role model for generations of Samford students spanning over half a century.

Mr. President, America salutes Dr. George Vernon Irons, Sr., as record breaking champion athlete for his alma mater, the University of Alabama, as Colonel, World War II, who defended his Nation for a third of the 20th century in war and peace, as Distinguished Professor, 43 years, Distinguished Professor Emeritus, 22 years, as Grand Marshall, Samford University, elected by the Faculty to preside over all commencement and academic exercises, as one of its most admired leaders in its proud history. America salutes Dr. Irons for his character, devotion to cause, exemplary standards of honor, duty and integrity. America proudly salutes Dr. George Vernon Irons, Sr., one of Alabama's greatest native sons, whose life of devoted service is an inspiration to all Americans.●

TRIBUTE TO CLARA SHIN

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a true champion of public service: Clara Shin of Orange, CA. Ms. Shin is a former AmeriCorps program officer and is currently a distinguished White House Fellow.

One of the greatest gifts that Clara Shin has been endowed with is an appreciation and a passion for public service. Her background is filled with notable accomplishments that have provided her with a sense of community and an unfailing commitment to helping others.

Ms. Shin received her bachelor's degrees in physiobiopolitics and government from Smith College and a Juris Doctor from Stanford Law School. As a law student, she worked at the U.S. Agency for International Development, serving as a legal intern to the Regional Legal Advisor for Southern Africa. She later joined AmeriCorps as its youngest program officer and was responsible for developing the first national grant applications for local programs seeking funding. She then managed a $25 million grant portfolio for the program and coordinated a service network spanning the Southwest. Ms. Shin also co-designed the $100 million community service component of a Housing and Urban Development initiative to revitalize severely distressed public housing developments. She founded KOSOMOSE Women's Journal, a magazine for Asian American women, and helped start the Tahoe-Baikal Institute, a bi-national environmental institute in California and Siberia that trains environmentalists in land and water issues.

As one of 17 White House Fellows, Ms. Shin has achieved the nation's most prestigious fellowship for leadership development and public service. Her assignment to the White House Office of the Chief of Staff allows her to work hand-in-hand with leaders in government on immigration, race, and science and technology issues, where she coordinates working group meetings, tracks and manages issues, and meets with advocacy groups. For more than thirty years, White House Fellows have carried out the program's mission to encourage active citizenship and service to the nation. Ms. Shin is an individual who exemplifies this notion. Her efforts to serve those around her are an inspiration to us all.

Mr. President, it is with great honor that I pay tribute to Clara Shin for her accomplishment and dedication to public service. Her enthusiasm for social and environmental causes is both uplifting and encouraging. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Clara Shin many more years of success.●

A TIME TO RESPOND: AMERICAN LAMB INDUSTRY THREATENED BY IMPORT SURGES

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to the surging wave of cheap, imported lamb meat that threatens to drown the United States lamb industry, an industry that has been part of our nation's economy since independence.

This surge of imports, primarily from the nations of Australia and New Zealand, can be seen in the numbers collected by our federal inspectors.

In 1993, just 56 million pounds of lamb meat entered this country and its markets.

By 1997, that figure had risen to 84.4 million pounds—a shocking increase of nearly 50 percent.

Those figures have been converted to carcass-weight equivalents, and are higher than those collected by the U.S. Commerce Department. But that department's information shows no indication that the surge is slowing. In 1998, a record 70.2 million pounds—by volume—of lamb meat entered the domestic market.

Not only has the level of imports increased, but the lamb meat flooding the domestic market is directly competitive with products produced by this nation's lamb industry.

In place of lamb carcasses, shipments of fresh, chilled meat—cut and processed and ready for the grocery store shelves—are displacing domestically produced meat across the country.

At this point, importers control one-third of the United States lamb consumption, a market share that makes it difficult, if not impossible, for our producers to control their own destinies.

The importers do not participate in voluntary price reporting. In fact, they have actively fought a joint lamb promotion program through the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Despite ample notice of the effect their skyrocketing levels of imports have had on the domestic industry, and despite ample notice that the industry intended to file a case against them, the importers refused to pull back voluntarily, or even discuss the situation.

The lamb industry's case now rests with the President. I call on this Administration to follow through with the strong and effective relief this industry needs to regain its footing and confidence. With confidence will come investment, and with investment, will come a more competitive industry.●

ROSE FISHER BLASINGAME, NATIVE AMERICAN LOUISIANA ARTIST

● Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a special artist from my state whose art was recently exhibited in our nation's capital. She is Rose Fisher Blasingame, a member of the Jena Band of Choctaw who are located in LaSalle Parish in Jena, Louisiana. Rose Fisher Blasingame was born and raised in Central Louisiana, and is married to Micah Basingame and has four children. Her artwork is basketry, an art she is attempting to revive since its loss from their community after the time of her great-great Aunt Mary Lewis who practiced the craft until she died in the early 1930's. From hearing stories from her family and elders, and seeing some of her aunt's work, she decided to try to learn this art-craft and bring back this lost tradition. She should be very proud that she has accomplished this goal. She also makes blow guns, arrow quivers, and tans deer hides. She shares the task of making china berry necklaces with her elders who she also joins in the tradition of passing down stories about creation, medicinal plants and home remedies. Her new goal, which she shares with her elders, is to attempt to bring back the Choctaw language.

Her baskets have been based on authentic Choctaw artifacts in the Smithsonian. They are splendid works of art which have many complex weaves of light and dark involving a number of incredible shapes and textures. One of her pieces which I saw was composed of an inside weave which was the mirror image of the exterior weave done in reversal contrast of light and dark.

She is a beneficiary of a grant from the Louisiana Arts Endowment Program. By recognizing her artwork, I also wish to honor all Choctaw tribes and culture. The Choctaw call themselves pasfalaya, which means ''long hair.'' They are of the Muskhogean language group. The Choctaw were natives of Mississippi and Alabama, making them one of Louisiana's immigrant tribes. After Spain took control of Louisiana in 1763, the Spanish government, seeking a buffer between themselves and the English, invited the tribes from east of the Mississippi River into Louisiana. Small groups of Choctaw, including the Jena band, took them up on this offer, and there were several Choctaw settlements throughout north and central Louisiana.

Louisiana boasts of many Choctaw place names. Early explorers used Choctaw guides to lead them to the new territories west of the Mississippi. The names given to the rivers, streams and other landmarks have remained as they were named hundreds of years ago. Some of these names include Atchafalaya (long river), Bogue Chitto (big creek), Catahoula (beloved lake), Manchac (rear entrance), and Pontchatoula (hanging hair or Spanish moss). It is also the Choctaw who taught the French and Spanish settlers the use of file' seasoning which is so widely used even today in the gumbo recipes of our unique Louisiana cuisine.

Clearly, Rose Fisher Blasingame knows that she holds the rare coin of her culture which should be cherished and treasured. Imagine the remarkable effort she has undertaken along with her tribe to re-establish their language. In this ambitious effort, Rose has sent her daughter Anna Barber to attend the Choctaw school in Mississippi in that branch of their tribe. I understand there are about 12 Choctaws speakers left among the Jena Choctaw, and the tribe is planning a computer language program which will teach adults as well as children, but aimed specifically at the kids. As always, their hope for the future will be carried by their children.

Mr. President, I thank you for this moment to recognize the work of this remarkable artist and woman, and the Choctaw tribe and culture of Louisiana.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN TIEN

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to salute the work and dedication of Major John Tien, a distinguished White House Fellow from Long Beach, CA.

Major Tien was chosen as one of the selected few to participate in the distinguished 1998–99 White House Fellowship Program. Since 1965, the program has offered outstanding individuals, like Major Tien, the opportunity to apply their considerable talents to public service. Past U.S. Army White House Fellow alumni, including former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Colin L. Powell, have emerged as great military leaders, and I have no doubt that Major Tien will be successful in his future endeavors.

As a White House Fellow, Major Tien has been assigned to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. He conducts research on consumer, labor, and environmental groups in an effort to educate the American public about the benefits of international trade. Other responsibilities include coordinating partnerships with important business groups, including the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Round Table, and the President's Export Council, to develop trade education ideas and advance a free trade agenda. He is a member of the lead team for planning the Third Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization in Seattle, Washington. He is also a member of the steel import crisis response team, where he is responsible for drafting reports for the Congressional Steel Caucus. Major Tien is the special assistant to the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative on all WTO matters.

Major Tien was an assistant professor in the Department of Social Sciences at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He received his bachelor's degree in Civil Engineering from West Point, where he was the top-ranked military cadet in his class. He later attended Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar. As a veteran of Operation Desert Storm, he was among the first soldiers to cross the Saudi Arabia-Iraq border. He has commanded an M1A1 main battle tank company and a headquarters company, and has served as the chief logistics officer for a thousand-soldier brigade. Additionally, Major Tien has successfully balanced several extracurricular activities with his military commitments. For example, he has served as a volunteer tutor for inner-city elementary and high school youth, as a co-organizer of the New York, Orange County Special Olympics and as a youth league soccer and baseball coach.

Mr. President, the importance of the public service should be recognized, and Major Tien stands as an especially admirable role model in this regard. For his efforts, and in recognition of the well-deserved honor of serving as a White House Fellow, I am privileged to commend and pay tribute to Major John Tien.●

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fellow in my office, Bruce Artim, be granted the privilege of the floor for this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination on the Executive Calendar: No. 64.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that any statements relating to the nomination appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Gary L. Visscher, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and

Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2001.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

SATELLITE HOME VIEWERS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, S. 247.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 247) to amend title 17, United States Code, to reform the copyright law with respect to satellite retransmissions of broadcast signals, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets, and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 247

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 ''Satellite Home Viewers Improvements Act''.

SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS; SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS BY SATELLITE CARRIERS WITHIN LOCAL MARKETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 121 the following new section:

''§ 122. Limitations on exclusive rights; secondary transmissions by satellite carriers within local markets

''(a) SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS OF TELEVISION BROADCAST STATIONS BY SATELLITE CARRIERS.—A secondary transmission of a primary transmission of a television broadcast station into the station's local market shall be subject to statutory licensing under this section if—

''(1) the secondary transmission is made by a satellite carrier to the public;

''(2) the secondary transmission is permissible under the rules, regulations, or authorizations of the Federal Communications Commission; and

''(3) the satellite carrier makes a direct or indirect charge for the secondary transmission to—

''(A) each subscriber receiving the secondary transmission; or

''(B) a distributor that has contracted with the satellite carrier for direct or indirect delivery of the secondary transmission to the public.

''(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) INITIAL LISTS.—A satellite carrier that makes secondary transmissions of a primary transmission made by a network station under subsection (a) shall, within 90 days after commencing such secondary transmissions, submit to that station a list identifying (by name and street address, including county and zip code) all subscribers to which the satellite carrier currently makes secondary transmissions of that primary transmission.

''(2) SUBSEQUENT LISTS.—After the list is submitted under paragraph (1), the satellite carrier shall, on the 15th of each month, submit to the station a list identifying (by name and street address, including county and zip code) any subscribers who have been added or dropped as subscribers since the last submission under this subsection.

''(3) USE OF SUBSCRIBER INFORMATION.—Subscriber information submitted by a satellite carrier under this subsection may be used only for the purposes of monitoring compliance by the satellite carrier with this section.

''(4) REQUIREMENTS OF STATIONS.—The submission requirements of this subsection shall apply to a satellite carrier only if the station to whom the submissions are to be made places on file with the Register of Copyrights a document identifying the name and address of the person to whom such submissions are to be made. The Register shall maintain for public inspection a file of all such documents.

''(c) NO ROYALTY FEE REQUIRED.—A satellite carrier whose secondary transmissions are subject to statutory licensing under subsection (a) shall have no royalty obligation for such secondary transmissions.

''(d) NONCOMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the willful or repeated secondary transmission to the public by a satellite carrier into the local market of a television broadcast station of a primary transmission made by that television broadcast station and embodying a performance or display of a work is actionable as an act of infringement under section 501, and is fully subject to the remedies provided under sections 502 through 506 and 509, if the satellite carrier has not complied with the reporting requirements of subsection (b).

''(e) WILLFUL ALTERATIONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the secondary transmission to the public by a satellite carrier into the local market of a television broadcast station of a primary transmission made by that television broadcast station and embodying a performance or display of a work is actionable as an act of infringement under section 501, and is fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 506 and sections 509 and 510, if the content of the particular program in which the performance or display is embodied, or any commercial advertising or station announcement transmitted by the primary transmitter during, or immediately before or after, the transmission of such program, is in any way willfully altered by the satellite carrier through changes, deletions, or additions, or is combined with programming from any other broadcast signal.

''(f) VIOLATION OF TERRITORIAL RESTRICTIONS ON STATUTORY LICENSE FOR TELEVISION BROADCAST STATIONS.—

''(1) INDIVIDUAL VIOLATIONS.—The willful or repeated secondary transmission to the public by a satellite carrier of a primary transmission made by a television broadcast station and embodying a performance or display of a work to a subscriber who does not reside in that station's local market, and is not subject to statutory licensing under section 119, is actionable as an act of infringement under section 501 and is fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 506 and 509, except that—

''(A) no damages shall be awarded for such act of infringement if the satellite carrier took corrective action by promptly withdrawing service from the ineligible subscriber; and

''(B) any statutory damages shall not exceed $5 for such subscriber for each month during which the violation occurred.

''(2) PATTERN OF VIOLATIONS.—If a satellite carrier engages in a willful or repeated pattern or practice of secondarily transmitting to the public a primary transmission made by a television broadcast station and embodying a performance or display of a work to subscribers who do not reside in that station's local market, and are not subject to statutory licensing under section 119, then in addition to the remedies under paragraph (1)—

''(A) if the pattern or practice has been carried out on a substantially nationwide basis, the court shall order a permanent injunction barring the secondary transmission by the satellite carrier of the primary transmissions of that television broadcast station (and if such television broadcast station is a network station, all other television broadcast stations affiliated with such network), and the court may order statutory damages not exceeding $250,000 for each 6-month period during which the pattern or practice was carried out; and

''(B) if the pattern or practice has been carried out on a local or regional basis with respect to more than one television broadcast station (and if such television broadcast station is a network station, all other television broadcast stations affiliated with such network), the court shall order a permanent injunction barring the secondary transmission in that locality or region by the satellite carrier of the primary transmissions of any television broadcast station, and the court may order statutory damages not exceeding $250,000 for each 6-month period during which the pattern or practice was carried out.

''(g) BURDEN OF PROOF.—In any action brought under subsection (d), (e), or (f), the satellite carrier shall have the burden of proving that its secondary transmission of a primary transmission by a television broadcast station is made only to subscribers located within that station's local market.

''(h) GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATIONS ON SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS.—The statutory license created by this section shall apply to secondary transmissions to locations in the United States, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

''(i) EXCLUSIVITY WITH RESPECT TO SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS OF BROADCAST STATIONS BY SATELLITE TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.—No provision of section 111 or any other law (other than this section and section 119) shall be construed to contain any authorization, exemption, or license through which secondary transmissions by satellite carriers of programming contained in a primary transmission made by a television broadcast station may be made without obtaining the consent of the copyright owner.

''(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) The term 'distributor' means an entity which contracts to distribute secondary transmissions from a satellite carrier and, either as a single channel or in a package with other programming, provides the secondary transmission either directly to individual subscribers or indirectly through other program distribution entities.

''(2) The term 'local market' for a television broadcast station has the meaning given that term under rules, regulations, and authorizations of the Federal Communications Commission relating to carriage of television broadcast signals by satellite carriers.

''(3) The terms 'network station', 'satellite carrier' and 'secondary transmission' have the meaning given such terms under section 119(d).

''(4) The term 'subscriber' means an entity that receives a secondary transmission service by means of a secondary transmission from a satellite and pays a fee for the service, directly or indirectly, to the satellite carrier or to a distributor.

''(5) The term 'television broadcast station' means an over-the-air, commercial or noncommercial television broadcast station licensed by the Federal Communications Commission under subpart E of part 73 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 121 the following:

''122. Limitations on exclusive rights; secondary transmissions by satellite carriers within local market.''.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF EFFECT OF AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 119 OF TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 4(a) of the Satellite Home Viewer Act of 1994 (17 U.S.C. 119 note; Public Law 103–369; 108 Stat. 3481) is amended by striking ''December 31, 1999'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

SEC. 4. COMPUTATION OF ROYALTY FEES FOR SATELLITE CARRIERS.

Section 119(c) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) REDUCTION.—

[''(A) SUPERSTATION.—The rate of the royalty fee payable in each case under subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) as adjusted by a royalty fee established under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection shall be reduced by 30 percent.

[''(B) NETWORK.—The rate of the royalty fee payable under subsection (b)(1)(B)(ii) as adjusted by a royalty fee established under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection shall be reduced by 45 percent.]

''(A) SUPERSTATION.—The rate of the royalty fee in effect on January 1, 1998 payble in each case under subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) shall be reduced by 30 percent.

''(B) NETWORK.—The rate of the royalty fee in effect on January 1, 1998 payable under susection (b)(1)(B)(ii) shall be reduced by 45 percent.

''(5) PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVICE AS AGENT.—For purposes of section 802, with respect to royalty fees paid by satellite carriers for retransmitting the Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed, the Public Broadcasting Service shall be the agent for all public television copyright claimants and all Public Broadcasting Service member stations.''.

[SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

[Section 119(d) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

[(1) by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:]

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

Section 119(d) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:

''(10) UNSERVED HOUSEHOLD.—The term 'unserved household', with respect to a particular television network, means a household that cannot receive, through the use of a conventional outdoor rooftop receiving antenna, an over-the-air signal of grade B intensity (as defined by the Federal Communications Commission) of a primary network station affiliated with that network.''.[; and

[(2) by adding at the end the following:

[''(12) LOCAL NETWORK STATION.—The term 'local network station' means a network station that is secondarily transmitted to subscribers who reside within the local market in which the network station is located.''.]

SEC. 6. PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVICE SATELLITE FEED.

(a) SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS.—Section 119(a)(1) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''(1) SUPERSTATIONS AND PBS SATELLITE FEED.—'';

(2) by inserting ''or by the Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed'' after ''superstation''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''In the case of the Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed, subsequent to January 1, 2001, or the date on which local retransmissions of broadcast signals are offered to the public, whichever is earlier, the statutory license created by this section shall be conditioned on the Public Broadcasting Service certifying to the Copyright Office on an annual basis that its membership supports the secondary transmission of the Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed, and providing notice to the satellite carrier of such certification.''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 119(d) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVICE SATELLITE FEED.—The term 'Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed' means the national satellite feed distributed by the Public Broadcasting Service consisting of educational and informational programming intended for private home viewing, to which the Public Broadcasting Service holds national terrestrial broadcast rights.''.

SEC. 7. APPLICATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION REGULATIONS.

Section 119(a) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''is permissible under the rules, regulations, and authorizations of the Federal Communications Commission,'' after ''satellite carrier to the public for private home viewing,''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''is permissible under the rules, regulations, and authorizations of the Federal Communications Commission,'' after ''satellite carrier to the public for private home viewing,''.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1999, except the amendments made by section 4 shall take effect on July 1, 1999.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today the Senate considers legislation that will help provide for greater consumer choice and competition in television services, S. 247, ''The Satellite Home Viewers Improvements Act of 1999.'' The bill before us is a model of bipartisanship and cross-Committee cooperation. The cosponsors of this bill include, first and foremost, the distinguished Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator Leahy, with whom I have worked closely on this legislation; the majority leader, Senator LOTT, and the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE; the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee's Antitrust Subcommittee, Senators DEWINE and KOHL; and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, Senator MCCAIN. We have all worked together with many others of our colleagues to bring this important legislation along on behalf of our constituents.

The options consumers have for viewing television entertainment have vastly increased since that fateful day in September 1927 when television inventor and Utah native Philo T. Farnsworth, together with his wife and colleagues, viewed the first television transmission in the Farnsworth's home workshop: a single black line rotated from vertical to horizontal. Both the forms of entertainment and the technologies for delivering that entertainment have proliferated over the 70 years since that day. In the 1940s and 50s, televisions began arriving in an increasing number of homes to pick up entertainment being broadcast into a growing number of cities and towns.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, cable television began offering communities more television choices by initially providing community antenna systems for receiving broadcast television signals, and later by offering new created-for-cable entertainment. The development of cable television made dramatic strides with the enactment of the cable compulsory license in 1976, providing an efficient way of clearing copyright rights for the retransmission of broadcast signals over cable systems.

In the 1980s, television viewers began to be able to receive television entertainment with their own home satellite equipment, and the enactment of the Satellite Home Viewer Act in 1988 helped develop a system of providing options for television service to Americans who lived in areas too remote to receive television signals over the air or via cable.

Much has changed since the original Satellite Home Viewer Act was adopted in 1988. The Satellite Home Viewer Act was originally intended to ensure that households that could not get television in any other way, traditionally provided through broadcast or cable, would be able to get television signals via satellite. The market and the satellite industry has changed substantially since 1988. Many of the difficulties and controversies associated with the satellite license have been at least partly a product of the satellite business attempting to move from a predominately need-based rural niche service to a full service video delivery competitor in all markets, urban and rural.

Now, many market advocates both in and out of Congress are looking to satellite carriers to compete directly with cable companies for viewership, because we believe that an increasingly competitive market is better for consumers both in terms of cost and the diversity of programming available. The bill we consider today will move us toward that kind of robust competition.

In short, this bill is focused on changes that we can make this year to move the satellite television industry to the next level, making it a full competitor in the multi-channel video delivery market. It has been said time and again that a major, and perhaps

the biggest, impediment to satellite's ability to be a strong competitor to cable is its current inability to provide local broadcast signals to its subscribers. (See, e.g., Business Week (22 Dec. 1997) p. 84.) In fact, marketing research by one firm found that 86 percent of those consumers who consider subscribing to satellite but ultimately do not do so, decide against satellite service because the local television signals are not available. (U.S. Satellite Broadcasting, ''Research Summary for Thomson Electronics,'' Aug. 1997, p. 6.) This problem has been partly technological and partly legal.

As we speak, the technological hurdles to satellite retransmission of local broadcast signals are being lowered substantially. Emerging technology is not enabling the satellite industry to begin to offer television viewers their own local programming of news, weather, sports, and entertainment, with digital quality picture and sound. This will mean that viewers in the remoter areas of my large home state of Utah will be able to watch television programming originating in Salt Lake City, rather than New York or California. In fact, one satellite carrier is already providing such a service in Utah.

Today, with this bill, we hope to remove the legal impediments to use of this emerging technology to make local retransmission of broadcast signals a reality for all subscribers. The most important result will be that the constituents of all my colleagues will finally have a choice for full service multi-channel video programming: They will be able to choose cable or one of a number of satellite carriers. This should foster an environment of proliferating choice and lowered prices, all to the benefit of consumers, our constituents.

To that end, the ''Satellite Home Viewer Improvements Act'' makes the following changes in the copyright law governing satellite television transmissions:

It creates a new copyright license which allows satellite carriers to retransmit a local television station to households and businesses throughout that station's local market, just as cable does, and sets a zero copyright rate for providing this service.

It extends the satellite compulsory licenses for both local and distant signals, which are now set to expire at the end of the year, until 2004.

It cuts the copyright rates paid for distant signals by 30 or 45 percent, depending on the type of signal.

It allows consumers to switch from cable to satellite service for network signals without waiting 90-day period now required in the law.

It allows for a national Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed.

Many of my colleagues in this Chamber will recognize this legislation as substantively identical to a bill reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee last year. It passed the Judiciary Committee this year again with unanimous support. I am pleased with the degree of cooperation and consensus we have been able to forge with respect to this legislation, and I am pleased that we have been able to bring this bill before the Senate for swift consideration and approval.

Let me explain how we will proceed. As I have indicated earlier, the bill we have before us is the copyright portion of a comprehensive reform package crafted in conjunction with our colleagues on the Commerce Committee. As the Judiciary Committee has moved forward with consideration of the copyright legislation embodied in S. 247, the Commerce Committee proceeded simultaneously to consider separate legislation introduced by Chairman MCCAIN, S. 303, to address related communications amendments, including important ares such as the must-carry and retransmission consent requirements for satellite carriers upon which the copyright licenses will be conditioned, and the FCC's distant television signal eligibility process. It is our joint intention to combine our respective work product as two titles of the same bill in a way that will clearly delineate the work product of each committee, but combine them in the seamless whole necessary to make the licenses work for consumers and the affected industries. To do that, Chairman MCCAIN will today offer the text of his committee's companion legislation as an amendment to the Judiciary Committee's underlying copyright bill. Upon adoption of this amendment, we will offer a manager's package of technical and conforming amendments to more fully meld the bills into a comprehensive, pro-consumer package that we can offer to the House for their consideration in a conference.

I am glad we are taking up this legislation today. We need to act quickly on this legislation. The Satellite Home Viewer Act sunsets at the end of this year, placing at risk the service of many of the 11 million satellite subscribers nationwide. Many of our constituents are confused about the status of satellite service in February and April to as many as 2.5 million subscribers nationally who have been adjudged ineligible for distant signal service under current law. The granting of the local license, together with some resolution of the eligibility rules for distant signals and a more consumer-friendly process, can help bring clarity to these consumers, and greater competition in price and service for all subscription television viewers.

I again thank the majority leader for his interest in and leadership with respect to these issues, and the chairman of the Commerce Committee for his collegiality and cooperation in this process. I also thank my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee who have worked on this legislation. This bill is a product of a bipartisan effort with Senators LEAHY, DEWINE, and KOHL, and I have been pleased to work closely with each of them every step of the way. Finally, I thank the Register of Copyrights, Ms. Marybeth Peters, and Bill Roberts of her staff in particular, for their assistance and expertise throughout this process. The Senate process has been a more informed one, and the product of our efforts more sound as a result of their advice and recommendations.

In closing, I look forward to our consideration of this important legislation today, and to continued collaboration with my colleagues to help hasten more vigorous competition in the television delivery market and the ever-widening consumer choice that will follow it.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate is able to pass the Hatch-Leahy Satellite Home Viewers Improvements Act. This bill will provide viewers with more choices and will greatly increase competition regarding network and other video programming.

For some time, I have been concerned about the lack of competition with cable TV and escalating cable rates. This bill will allow satellite TV providers to compete directly with cable and will give consumers a choice. It also avoids needless cutoffs of satellite TV service and protects local TV affiliates.

The Judiciary Committee had a full committee hearing on these satellite issues on November 12, 1997, and Chairman HATCH and I agreed to work together on this bill. On March 5, 1998, the Hatch-Leahy bill, S. 1720, was introduced and was reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously on October 1, 1998. It permits local TV signals, as opposed to distant out-of-State networks signals, to be offered to viewers via satellite; increase competition between cable and satellite TV providers; and provide more PBS programming by also offering a national feed as well as local programming; and reduce rates charged to consumers.

We have been racing against the clock because court orders have required the cutoffs of distant CBS and Fox television signals to over a million households in the U.S.

Under a preliminary injunction, satellite service to thousands of households in Vermont and other states was to be terminated on October 8, 1998, for CBS and Fox distant network signals for households signed up after March 11, 1997, the date the action was filed.

This bill will allow satellite TV to operate just like cable TV with local channels, movies, local weather, sports, CNN, news, superstations, and the like. It allows for local TV stations to be received over satellite, permanently, and could reduce satellite rates.

It ends the cable subscriber 90-day waiting period for those wanting to switch from cable to satellite—which has been a needless barrier to competition.

The bill extends distant network service to allow for a phase-in to local-

into-local TV service and creates a national PBS feed, and also will offer the local PBS.

It also restores all lost distant stations, if the satellite provider is willing to restore service, and delays cutoffs of all other distant signals until December 31 of this year and only for a much smaller number of dish owners.

Ultimately, in 2002, the bill will impose ''must carry'' rules on satellite providers just like the ''must carry'' rules for cable TV which permits a phase-in of local-to-local service.

The chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee, Senator DEWINE, and the ranking member, Senator KOHL, also worked hard on this issue.

It is absurd that home dish owners—whether they live in Vermont, Utah or California—have to watch network stations imported from distant states.

This committee has worked together to protect the local broadcast system and to provide the satellite industry with a way to compete with cable.

Cable TV now offers a full range of local programming as well as programming regarding sports, politics, national weather, education, and a range of movies.

Yet, cable rates keep increasing—I want satellite TV to directly compete with cable TV. The only way they can do that is to be able to offer local TV stations.

We heard testimony in 1997 and 1998 that the major reason consumers do not sign up for satellite service is that they cannot get local programming. I want satellite carriers to be able to offer the full range of local programming.

We should be encouraging this so-called ''local-into-local'' service. Local broadcast stations contribute to our sense of community.

We should be encouraging competition through local-into-local service. Instead, the current policy fosters confusion-into-more-confusion service and lots of litigation.

By striking a burdensome and flawed limitation on satellite providers, we will be prescribing fairness for dish owners and injecting some much-needed competition into the television market.

I look forward to working with my colleagues at conference.

AMENDMENT NO. 372

(Purpose: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to enhance the ability of direct broadcast satellite and other multichannel video providers to compete effectively with cable television systems, and for other purposes)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Senator MCCAIN has an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 372.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.)

AMENDMENT NO. 373 TO AMENDMENT NO. 372

(Purpose: To strike certain provisions amending title 17, United States Code)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk to the MCCAIN amendment, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for himself and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 373 to amendment No. 372.

The amendment follows:

On page 17, strike line 4 through page 18, line 4 and insert the following:

SEC. 208. DEFINITIONS.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 373) was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 372, as amended, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 372), as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NOS. 374 AND 375

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there are two technical amendments at the desk, submitted by myself and Senator LEAHY, and I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 374 and 375) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 374

(Purpose: To provide a manager's amendment to make certain technical and conforming amendments, and for other purposes)

On page 3, line 9, strike ''that station'' and insert ''the network that owns or is affiliated with the network station''.

On page 3, lines 16 and 17, strike ''the station'' and insert ''the network''.

On page 4, line 3, strike ''the station'' and insert ''the network''.

On page 12, beginning with line 19, strike all through line 5 on page 13 and insert the following:

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''In the case of the Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed, the compulsory license shall be effective until January 1, 2002.''.

On page 13, strike lines 6 through 8 and insert the following:

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 119(d) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

''(9) SUPERSTATION.—The term 'superstation'—

''(A) means a television broadcast station, other than a network station, licensed by the Federal Communications Commission that is secondarily transmitted by a satellite carrier; and

''(B) includes the Public Broadcasting Service satellite feed.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

On page 13, line 25, strike ''and''.

On page 14, line 5, strike the period and insert a semicolon and ''and''.

On page 14, insert between lines 5 and 6 the following:

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) STATUTORY LICENSE CONTINGENT ON COMPLIANCE WITH FCC RULES AND REMEDIAL STEPS.—The willful or repeated secondary transmission to the public by a satellite carrier of a primary transmission made by a broadcast station licensed by the Federal Communications Commission is actionable as an act of infringement under section 501, and is fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 506 and 509, if, at the time of such transmission, the satellite carrier is not in compliance with the rules, regulations, and authorizations of the Federal Communications Commission concerning the carriage of television broadcast station signals.''.

SEC. 8. TELEVISION BROADCAST STATION STANDING.

Section 501 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) With respect to any secondary transmission that is made by a satellite carrier of a primary transmission embodying the performance or display of a work and is actionable as an act of infringement under section 122, a television broadcast station holding a copyright or other license to transmit or perform the same version of that work shall, for purposes of subsection (b) of this section, be treated as a legal or beneficial owner if such secondary transmission occurs within the local market of that station.''.

On page 14, line 6, strike ''**SEC. 8.**'' and insert ''**SEC. 9.**''.

AMENDMENT NO. 375

(Purpose: To modify the definition of unserved household, provide for a moratorium on copyright liability, and for other purposes)

On page 12, line 4, insert after ''network'' the following: ''or is not otherwise eligible to receive directly from a satellite carrier a signal of that television network (other than a signal provided under section 122) in accordance with section 338 of the Communications Act of 1934.''.

On page 14, insert between lines 5 and 6 the following:

SEC. 8. MORATORIUM ON COPYRIGHT LIABILITY.

Until December 31, 1999, no subscriber, as defined under section 119(d)(8) of title 17, United States Code, located within the predicted Grade B contour of a local network television broadcast station shall have satellite service of a distant network signal affiliated with the same network terminated, if that subscriber received satellite service of such network signal before July 11, 1998, as a result of section 119 of title 17, United States Code.

On page 14, line 6, strike ''**SEC. 8.**'' and insert ''**SEC. 9.**''.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I want to engage my good friend from Arizona, our chairman of the Commerce Committee, in a colloquy concerning an issue I raised in committee on signal reception standards.

Mr. MCCAIN. I will be happy to accommodate the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, consumers who live in small and rural markets deserve access to network television service via satellite and the competition with cable it provides just as much as their fellow citizens living in urban markets. The local-into-local

service that will be made possible by the legislation we are considering today will provide this much-needed service to consumers, thereby enhancing competition to cable in many urban markets. Unfortunately, because local-into-local will not be available in small and rural markets in the immediate future, consumers who live there must depend on satellite delivery of network signals from distant markets. Recent court-imposed limitations on the delivery of distant network signals, however, will affect households that cannot receive viewable local network signals over-the-air.

To correct this imbalance, we should grant the Federal Communications Commission the authority to set a modern television signal reception standard. If the new signal reception standard is set at a level that will provide consumers with a viewable picture, then the new standard will produce a more realistic and accurate separation between ''served'' and ''unserved'' households for purposes of SHVA. In addition, such a standard would provide consumers who do not qualify to receive distant network signals with a reasonable expectation that, if they go to the trouble and expense of installing a ''conventional'' rooftop antenna, they will be able to receive a television picture they can actually watch.

To make application of the new standard more consumer friendly, I also urge that we give the FCC the authority to establish the most accurate point-to-point predictive model. Such a model would enable a consumer to know whether or not he or she will be able to receive a signal of the strength established by the rulemaking quickly, accurately, and without expensive testing.

Mr. McCAIN. I think my colleague for his work on this very sensitive but important subject. The senator is absolutely correct. With the passage of this bill, the issue of setting an appropriate signal reception standard and predictive model is more important than ever. Consumers are frustrated today by the current situation with distant network signals because they are being told by local broadcasters they must receive their local signals over-the-air, though in many cases traditional antennas do not provide an adequate picture. If the law tells consumers they must get a local signal but they aren't able to get a decent picture, what alternative does a consumer have? Unfortunately, we are dealing here with an antiquated law that needs updating for the twenty first century.

Mr. BRYAN. If this law isn't revised we can expect more consumer confusion and frustration. The ''Grade B'' standard that is used as the signal reception standard today measures the amount of signal intensity that a consumer must receive at his or her rooftop antenna to produce what is considered an ''acceptable'' television picture. Unfortunately, this was a determination made in 1952. Consumer expectations of what constitutes an ''acceptable'' picture have increased substantially in the past 50 years. What constituted an acceptable picture to a focus group in 1951 watching black and white television would almost certainly not be a picture that modern consumers would want to watch on state-of-the-art color sets.

In addition, interference has increased substantially since the early 1950's. Background noise produced by aircraft, automobile and truck traffic, power lines, and the like, and electronic interference produced by computers, cell phones, and other electronic equipment interfere with signal propagation. Because of this increased interference, consumers need higher signal intensity in order to receive a viewable television picture.

Mr. McCAIN. I concur with your concerns over this situation. If we are going to enforce the law and enforce a standard, we need to make sure that consumers can rely on the standard. Today, that is clearly not the case. In addition, since the purpose of the bill before us today is to give satellite television the tools it needs to become more viable competitors to cable, we have to evaluate each of the ways in which cable and satellite are compared. For example, the viewing standard that you discussed is based on three ''grades'' of television picture—''fine,'' ''good,'' and ''acceptable,'' in descending order of quality. Currently, cable viewing standards are based on a ''good'' picture. Satellite's standard is ''acceptable,'' which is a grade below ''good.'' Why wouldn't we want the reception standards between these two competing industries to be equivalent? If we are to provide true competition between cable and satellite, an increase of the standard and a corresponding increase in signal intensity model is necessary.

Mr. BRYAN. Even though the language mandating a new signal standard and predictive model was not adopted in committee, I think the chairman would agree that such language needs to be incorporated into a final measure. Many of my colleagues have been stunned to learn of the crazy circumstance that is facing many of our rural constituents as they attempt to get a network signal that they can actually watch. We shouldn's be making it more difficult for them to get this valuable service.

Mr. McCAIN. I can assure my colleague from Nevada, we will attempt to address this in conference and rectify a very troubling inconsistency in the law.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise to support S. 247, the Satellite Home Viewers Improvement Act. This legislation represents a first step towards providing a viable competitor to cable in the multichannel video programming marketplace. Significantly, S. 247 permits direct-to-home satellite providers to transmit local broadcast signals into local markets, and eliminates the 90 day waiting period for existing cable subscribers who wish to switch to satellite service. These critical changes in the law will substantially help satellite providers compete with their cable counterparts.

I also support, for the most part, the inclusion in S. 247 of the floor amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. McCAIN, Amendment No. 372. This amendment is identical to the text of the committee reported amendment to S. 303, the Satellite Television Act of 1999, which was reported favorably by the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, Senate Report No. 106–51. With one reservation, which I will explain shortly, I am pleased that the work product of the Commerce Committee will be included in the Satellite Home Viewers Improvement Act, S. 247, as passed by the Senate.

As reported by our committee, S. 303 complements S. 247 by removing additional statutory impediments that thwart the ability of direct-to-home satellite service providers to compete with cable television. S. 303 authorizes direct-to-home satellite service providers to offer their subscribers local television station broadcasts, but requires those providers to comply with the must-carry and retransmission consent rules that apply to cable television operators. In addition, S. 303 requires the Federal Communications Commission to use the Individual Location Longely-Rice Methodology to better determine who should be receiving distant network signals and who should not. Finally, the legislation requires the FCC to implement a waiver process to give consumers with unsatisfactory local television reception a timely process in which to have their concerns addressed.

While I support moving S. 247, as amended, out of the Senate, I must note one concern with the legislation. I oppose provisions in S. 303 that sanction the illegal behavior of direct broadcast satellite service providers. Those provisions permanently grandfathered the transmission of distant network signals to subscribers residing outside of their local station's Grade A contour, but within the Grade B contour, regardless of whether those subscribers are actually able to receive the signals of their local stations. My opposition to this approach is explained in greater detail in the minority views filed with the Committee Report. In brief, I will say that the provisions I opposed put the legislation squarely in the position of sanctioning illegal behavior. As a law and order man, that is not an approach I am willing to support.

Otherwise, I am extremely pleased that the Senate has been able to act so quickly on this important issue. By passing legislation so early in the 106th Congress, we have gone a long way toward ensuring greater competition in the video programming marketplace.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise in support of this legislation because it will increase competition between satellite and cable. Senators MCCAIN, HATCH, LEAHY, HOLLINGS, DEWINE and others deserve credit for moving this measure so quickly this term, especially when we came so close last year.

Mr. President, when the Judiciary and Commerce bills are combined as one, it creates a good, comprehensive measure. Satellite companies will finally be allowed to legally broadcast local stations to local viewers—so-called ''local into local.'' The strange anomaly that restricted satellite from providing local signals will be a thing of the past. And to be balanced, satellite companies will also be subject to ''must-carry'' obligations, just like cable. This bill will also reduce the royalty fees for those local signals to a level closer to that paid by cable companies. All of this moves us towards parity between satellite and cable, and it is a huge step forward for consumers. Let me tell you why.

Increased competition will discipline the cable marketplace which, in turn, will create lower prices, increased choice, and wider availability of television programming for all Americans, no matter how remote. And we do this in the best way possible, by promoting competition, not increasing regulation. Moreover, it won't be at the expense of our local television stations, which provide a valuable community benefit in the form of local news, weather, sports and various forms of public service.

One of the hardest questions to address, of course, is which viewers should be entitled to receive ''distant network'' signals, especially in rural states like mine. Authorizing ''local into local'' is a crucial first step and, eventually, when technology advances and more satellites are launched, we will see ''local into local'' almost everywhere. So, this bill goes a long way to ensure that every viewer will receive one signal of each of the major television networks—this is a marked improvement over the current situation.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure which will permit satellite companies to compete on a more level playing field with cable. We have our work cut out for us at conference because the House version is quite different from ours. But there is no excuse for not enacting this pro-competition, pro-consumer legislation this year. Let's get to conference and get this bill done.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 93, H.R. 1554. I further ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 247, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD. I finally ask unanimous consent that S. 247 then be placed back on the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1554), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF LEGAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 104 submitted earlier by Senators LOTT and DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 104) to authorize testimony, production of documents, and legal representation in United States v. Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., et al.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a subpoena for testimony and document production in an action brought by the United States Customs Service in the Court of International Trade against Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., and its parent and subsidiary, alleging false representations to Customs about the composition of imported bearings. The defendants have subpoenaed Tim Osborn, a former employee of the Senate Committee on Small Business, seeking to depose him regarding his communications with the Customs Service and others about this investigation. Mr. Osborn's activities were on behalf of the Small Business Committee, in preparing for and conducting a September 1988 oversight hearing of the Customs Service concerning its enforcement of laws affecting the bearing industry. The information that the defendants seek therefore is privileged from compelled discovery from the Congress under the Constitution's Speech or Debate Clause.

This resolution would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to provide representation in order to move to quash the subpoena and otherwise protect the Senate's privileges in this matter. The resolution would authorize Mr. Osborn and any other former Member or employee of the Senate to testify and produce documents in this case only to the extent consistent with these privileges.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 104) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 104

Whereas, in the case of United States v. Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., et al., Court No. 96–12–02853, pending in the United States Court of International Trade, a subpoena for testimony and documents has been issued to Tim Osborn, a former employee of the Senate Committee on Small Business, concerning the performance of is duties on behalf of the Committee;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C.§§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent Members or employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony or documents relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Tim Osborn, and any other former Senate Member or employee from whom testimony may be required, are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of United States v. Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., et al., except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

Sec. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Tim Osborn, and any other former Member or employee of the Senate from whom testimony may be required, in connection with the case of United States v. Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., et al.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

TREATY

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following treaty on today's Executive Calendar: No. 2. I further ask unanimous consent that the treaty be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification; that all committee provisos, reservations, understandings, declarations be considered agreed to; that any statements be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as if read; I further ask consent that when the resolution of ratification is voted upon the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; the President be notified of the Senate's action and that following the disposition of the treaty, the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The treaty will be considered to have passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification.

The resolution of ratification is as follows:

AMENDED MINES PROTOCOL

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

SECTION 1. SENATE ADVICE AND CONSENT SUBJECT TO A RESERVATION, UNDERSTANDING, AND CONDITIONS.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol (as defined in section 5 of this resolution), subject to the reservation in section 2, the understandings in section 3, and the conditions in section 4.

SEC. 2. RESERVATION.

The Senate's advice and consent to the ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol is subject to the reservation, which shall be included in the United States instrument of ratification and shall be binding upon the President, that the United States reserves the right to use other devices (as defined in Article 2(5) of the Amended Mines Protocol) to destroy any stock of food or drink that is judged likely to be used by an enemy military force, if due precautions are taken for the safety of the civilian population.

SEC. 3. UNDERSTANDINGS.

The Senate's advice and consent to the ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol is subject to the following understandings, which shall be included in the United States instrument of ratification and shall be binding upon the President:

(1) UNITED STATES COMPLIANCE.—The United States understands that—

(A) any decision by any military commander, military personnel, or any other person responsible for planning, authorizing, or executing military action shall only be judged on the basis of that person's assessment of the information reasonably available to the person at the time the person planned, authorized, or executed the action under review, and shall not be judged on the basis of information that comes to light after the action under review was taken; and

(B) Article 14 of the Amended Mines Protocol (insofar as it relates to penal sanctions) shall apply only in a situation in which an individual—

(i) knew, or should have known, that his action was prohibited under the Amended Mines Protocol;

(ii) intended to kill or cause serious injury to a civilian; and

(iii) knew or should have known, that the person he intended to kill or cause serious injury was a civilian.

(2) EFFECTIVE EXCLUSION.—The United States understands that, for the purposes of Article 5(6)(b) of the Amended Mines Protocol, the maintenance of observation over avenues of approach where mines subject to that Article are deployed constitutes one acceptable form of monitoring to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians.

(3) HISTORIC MONUMENTS.—The United States understands that Article 7(1)(i) of the Amended Mines Protocol refers only to a limited class of objects that, because of their clearly recognizable characteristics and because of their widely recognized importance, constitute a part of the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples.

(4) LEGITIMATE MILITARY OBJECTIVES.—The United States understands that an area of land itself can be a legitimate military objective for the purpose of the use of landmines, if its neutralization or denial, in the circumstances applicable at the time, offers a military advantage.

(5) PEACE TREATIES.—The United States understands that the allocation of responsibilities for landmines in Article 5(2)(b) of the Amended Mines Protocol does not preclude agreement, in connection with peace treaties or similar arrangements, to allocate responsibilities under that Article in a manner that respects the essential spirit and purpose of the Article.

(6) BOOBY-TRAPS AND OTHER DEVICES.—For the purposes of the Amended Mines Protocol, the United States understands that—

(A) the prohibition contained in Article 7(2) of the Amended Mines Protocol does not preclude the expedient adaptation or adaptation in advance of other objects for use as booby-traps or other devices;

(B) a trip-wired hand grenade shall be considered a ''booby-trap'' under Article 2(4) of the Amended Mines Protocol and shall not be considered a ''mine'' or an ''anti-personnel mine'' under Article 2(1) or Article 2(3), respectively; and

(C) none of the provisions of the Amended Mines Protocol, including Article 2(5), applies to hand grenades other than trip-wired hand grenades.

(7) NON-LETHAL CAPABILITIES.—The United States understands that nothing in the Amended Mines Protocol may be construed as restricting or affecting in any way non-lethal weapon technology that is designed to temporarily disable, stun, signal the presence of a person, or operate in any other fashion, but not to cause permanent incapacity.

(8) INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL JURISDICTION.—The United States understands that the provisions of Article 14 of the Amended Mines Protocol relating to penal sanctions refer to measures by the authorities of States Parties to the Protocol and do not authorize the trial of any person before an international criminal tribunal. The United States shall not recognize the jurisdiction of any international tribunal to prosecute a United States citizen for a violation of the Protocol or the Convention on Conventional Weapons.

(9) TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE. The United States understands that—

(A) no provision of the Protocol may be construed as affecting the discretion of the United States to refuse assistance or to restrict or deny permission for the export of equipment, material, or scientific or technological information for any reason; and

(B) the Amended Mines Protocol may not be used as a pretext for the transfer of weapons technology or the provision of assistance to the military mining or military countermining capabilities of a State Party to the Protocol.

SEC. 4. CONDITIONS.

The Senate's advice and consent to the ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol is subject to the following conditions, which shall be binding upon the President:

(1) PURSUIT DETERRENT MUNITION.—

(A) UNDERSTANDING.—The Senate understands that nothing in the Amended Mines Protocol restricts the possession or use of the Pursuit Deterrent Munition, which is in compliance with the provisions in the Technical Annex.

(B) CERTIFICATION.—Prior to deposit of the United States instrument of ratification, the President shall certify to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives that the Pursuit Deterrent Munition shall continue to remain available for use by the United States Armed Forces at least until January 1, 2003, unless an effective alternative to the munition becomes available.

(C) EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVE DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term ''effective alternative'' does not mean a tactic or operational concept in and of itself.

(2) HUMANITARIAN DEMINING ASSISTANCE.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(A) UNITED STATES EFFORTS.—The United States contributes more than any other country to the worldwide humanitarian demining efforts, having expended more than $153,000,000 on such efforts since 1993.

(B) DEVELOPMENT OF DETECTION AND CLEARING TECHNOLOGY.—The Department of Defense has undertaken a program to develop improved mine detection and clearing technology and has shared this improved technology with the international community.

(C) EXPANSION OF UNITED STATES HUMANITARIAN DEMINING PROGRAMS.—The Department of Defense and the Department of State have expanded their humanitarian demining programs to train and assist the personnel of other countries in developing effective demining programs.

(3) LIMITATION ON THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENT.—

(A) LIMITATION ON ASSESSMENT FOR COST OF IMPLEMENTATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Amended Mines Protocol, and subject to the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C), the portion of the United States annual assessed contribution for activities associated with any conference held pursuant to Article 13 of the Amended Mines Protocol may not exceed $1,000,000.

(B) RECALCULATION OF LIMITATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—On January 1, 2000, and at 3-year intervals thereafter, the Administrator of General Services shall prescribe an amount that shall apply in lieu of the amount specified in subparagraph (A) and that shall be determined by adjusting the last amount applicable under that subparagraph to reflect the percentage increase by which the Consumer Price Index for the preceding calendar year exceeds the Consumer Price Index for the calendar year three years previously.

(ii) CONSUMER PRICE INDEX DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ''Consumer Price Index'' means the last Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers published by the Department of Labor.

(C) ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS REQUIRING CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.—

(i) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the President may furnish additional contributions for activities associated with any conference held pursuant to Article 13 of the Amended Mines protocol which would otherwise be prohibited under subparagraph (A) if—

(I) the President determines and certifies in writing to the appropriate committees of Congress that the failure to make such contributions would seriously affect the national interest of the United States; and

(II) Congress enacts a joint resolution approving the certification of the President under subclause (I).

(ii) STATEMENT OF REASONS.—Any certification made under clause (i) shall be accompanied by a detailed statement setting forth the specific reasons therefor and the specific activities associated with any conference held pursuant to Article 13 of the Amended Mines Protocol to which the additional contributions would be applied.

(4) UNITED STATES AUTHORITY FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Amended Mines Protocol, no funds may be drawn from the Treasury of the United States for any payment or assistance (including the transfer of in-kind items) under Article 11 or Article 13(3)(d) of the Amended Mines Protocol without statutory authorization and appropriation by United States law.

(5) FUTURE NEGOTIATION OF WITHDRAWAL CLAUSE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, in negotiations on any treaty containing an arms control provision, United States negotiators should not agree to any provision that would have the effect of prohibiting the United States from withdrawing from the arms control provisions of that treaty in a timely fashion in the event that the supreme national interests of the United States have been jeopardized.

(6) LAND MINE ALTERNATIVES.—Prior to the deposit of the United States instrument of

ratification, the President shall certify to Congress that—

(A) the President, in pursuing alternatives to United States anti-personnel mines or mixed anti-tank systems, will not limit the types of alternatives to be considered on the basis of any criteria other than those specified in subparagraph (B); and

(B) in pursuit of alternatives to United States anti-personnel mines, or mixed anti-tank systems, the United States shall seek to identify, adapt, modify, or otherwise develop only those technologies that—

(i) are intended to provide military effectiveness equivalent to that provided by the relevant anti-personnel mine, or mixed anti-tank system; and

(ii) would be affordable.

(7) CERTIFICATION WITH REGARD TO INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS.—Prior to the deposit of the United States instrument of ratification, the President shall certify to Congress that, with respect to the Amended Mines Protocol, the Convention on Conventional Weapons, or any future protocol or amendment thereto, the United States shall not recognize the jurisdiction of any international tribunal over the United States or any of its citizens.

(8) TACTICS AND OPERATIONAL CONCEPTS.—It is the sense of the Senate that development, adaptation, or modification of an existing or new tactic or operational concept, in and of itself, is unlikely to constitute an acceptable alternative to anti-personnel mines or mixed anti-tank systems.

(9) FUNDING REGARDING THE INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN CRISIS.—The Senate finds that—

(A) the grave international humanitarian crisis associated with anti-personnel mines has been created by the use of mines that do not meet or exceed the specifications on detectability, self-destruction, and self-deactivation contained in the Technical Annex to the Amended Mines Protocol; and

(B) United States mines that do meet such specifications have not contributed to this problem.

(10) APPROVAL OF MODIFICATIONS.—The Senate reaffirms the principle that any amendment or modification to the Amended Mines Protocol other than an amendment or modification solely of a minor technical or administrative nature shall enter into force with respect to the United States only pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as set forth in Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

(11) FURTHER ARMS REDUCTIONS OBLIGATIONS.—The Senate declares its intention to consider for approval an international agreement that would obligate the United States to reduce or limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States in a militarily significant manner only pursuant to the treaty-making power as set forth in Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

(12) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally-based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the CFE Flank Document, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(13) PRIMACY OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Amended Mines Protocol requires or authorizes the enactment of legislation, or the taking of any other action, by the United States that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the United States.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this resolution:

(1) AMENDED MINES PROTOCOL OR PROTOCOL.—The terms ''Amended Mines Protocol'' and ''Protocol'' mean the Amended Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, together with its Technical Annex, as adopted at Geneva on May 3, 1996 (contained in Senate Treaty Document 105–1).

(2) CFE FLANK DOCUMENT.—The term ''CFE Flank Document'' means the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) of November 19, 1990, done at Vienna on May 31, 1996 (Treaty Document 105–95).

(3) CONVENTION ON CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS.—The term ''Convention on Conventional Weapons'' means the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, done at Geneva on October 10, 1980 (Senate Treaty Document 103–25).

(4) UNITED STATES INSTRUMENT OF RATIFICATION.—The term ''United States instrument of ratification'' means the instrument of ratification of the United States of the Amended Mines Protocol.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to speak today in support giving the Senate's advice and consent to ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol to the Convention on Conventional Weapons. This amended protocol was adopted on May 3, 1996, and submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification on January 7, 1997. The Foreign Relations Committee approved this resolution of ratification on March 23 of this year, with no dissents.

While this is not as big an issue as NATO enlargement or the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol will be a real achievement. Its enactment is a further demonstration that the Senate and its Foreign Relations Committee can, in fact, reach agreement upon treaties that deal with difficult issues.

My colleagues are well aware of the humanitarian crisis that has developed in the world as a result of the millions of unexploded land mines left from the last generation of wars in the world. The United States is a leader in humanitarian de-mining efforts, and we have all supported those efforts. But a few examples may help explain to the public why the issue of land mines is of such deep concern.

In April 1996, Newsweek magazine wrote about one victim of land mines as follows:

He served three years on Bosnia's front lines and survived. But within days of being demobilized, Petr Jesdimir became a casualty of the peace.

He was working with a private road crew on the outskirts of Sarajevo last month when an anti-personnel mine buried at the roadside blew up under his left foot. As he stumbled down the road to get help, another mine shattered his right leg.

Today he lies in a Sarajevo orthopedic clinic where battle-tested doctors have made their own transition—from treating soldiers hit by grenades to amputating the arms and legs of mine victims, mostly children. Jesdimir, 50, realizes that until he dies he'll probably be a drain on the nation he fought to preserve.

''I know I have to live with this now,'' he sobbed last week, holding up the trembling stump of a leg. ''Now I understand war.''

A year later, The Washington Post recounted the story of another Bosnian victim:

The June weather was perfect as 14-year-old Tibomir Ostojic returned home from a dip in a nearby river. ''Cherries,'' he thought. ''Wouldn't it be nice to have some cherries?''

So he climbed a cherry tree not far from his apartment in the Sarajevo neighborhood of Dobrinja. As he was climbing down—and a split-second before his foot hit the ground—he realized the grass he was about to step on clearly had been avoided by others, and he knew instantly he was in trouble.

The first explosion threw him into the air and onto a second land mine. By then he had his hands over his head for protection. The second blast blew them off.

Land mines were also the major cause of casualties for NATO forces in Bosnia. Yet Bosnia is hardly the only land where this occurs.

A Washington Times article of June 10, 1997, reported: ''The land mines are strewn so widely in the jungles along the cease-fire zones between Ecuador and Peru that when peacekeepers kick a soccer ball out of their compound, it stays there.'' Last year, in the wake of Hurricane Mitch, still more innocent people fell victim to land mines left over from the civil war in Nicaragua.

The catalogue of countries ravaged by land mines—long after the end of the wars in which those mines were laid—goes on and on: Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Mozambique, Vietnam. It was the need to put an end to these seemingly endless post-war tragedies that motivated both the Administration and the Foreign Relations Committee to recommend ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol.

The new Protocol is not a complete ban on anti-personnel land mines. Many of us regret that the United States is not in a position to sign and ratify the Ottawa Convention that institutes such a ban. The Amended Mines Protocol is supported, however, by several mine-producing or mine-using powers that would not sign the Ottawa Convention.

It is a sad fact of life that countries with fortified borders are not yet willing to do without land mines. By adhering to this Protocol, they will save many innocent lives while we work to make a world-wide ban feasible for all countries.

The new Protocol bans mines that are designed to be exploded by the presence of a mine detector, and it requires anti-personnel mines to be detectable. These provisions will greatly aid mine-clearing efforts in future wars.

The Protocol severely limits the use of land mines unless they are both self-destructing within 30 days and self-deactivating within 120 days (in case the self-destruct mechanism should fail). Adherence to these provisions should end the senseless post-war slaughter inflicted by so many mines today.

The Protocol establishes an obligation to clean up minefields after wars

have ended. You might think that this was an obvious duty, but countries have often failed to clean up their lethal mess.

Finally, the new Protocol applies to civil wars, as well as international ones. This is a desperately needed provision, as so many of the worst land mine disasters have been the result of civil wars. The Amended Mines Protocol is the first protocol of the Convention on Conventional Weapons to be applied to civil wars, and this is an important achievement that is in keeping with U.S. policy and practices.

These provisions will go a long way, if adopted and fully implemented by the major mine users and producers, to curtail Future humanitarian crises due to land mines. The amended Protocol specifically meets concerns that the Senate articulated in 1995, when we gave our advice and consent to ratification of the original Mines Protocol and the underlying Convention on Conventional Weapons. For all these reasons, the Amended Mines Protocol deserves our wholehearted support.

Bringing the Amended Mines Protocol to the Senate floor has required us to reconcile sharply differing and strongly held views regarding the utility and morality of using anti-personnel mines that meet the standards of the Amended Mines Protocol. We owe a debt of gratitude to our colleagues who agreed to accept resolution provisions and report language that safeguarded each other's positions on the broader land mine issues.

One colleague who put the lives of innocent civilians ahead of his personal policy preferences is our esteemed Chairman, Senator HELMS of North Carolina. Senator HELMS has stated that anti-personnel mines are essential to the U.S. Armed Forces and that a ban on such weapons would needlessly place U.S. forces at risk.

The Amended Mines Protocol does not pre-judge, however, the question of U.S. adherence to the Ottawa Convention. Both supporters and opponents of that treaty can support the Protocol's limits on the use of anti-personnel land mines by those countries that retain them.

Adherence to the amended Protocol will not require any adjustment of U.S. military weaponry or tactics, moreover. Rather, it will make other countries meet standards that we already have achieved. U.S. military leaders want this Protocol to succeed, because it will save the lives of U.S. service men and women.

In the interests of securing ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol, Senator HELMS agreed to several major changes in the resolution of ratification, both last year and again this year, to remove from that resolution any language that would jeopardize this effort by pre-judging the broader land mine questions in his favor. He also issued a Committee report this year that omitted extensive material on land mines and the Ottawa Convention, thus minimizing any unintended affront to colleagues who favor a complete ban on anti-personnel mines.

Another colleague who has put other people's lives ahead of his own views is Senator LEAHY of Vermont. Senator LEAHY has said many times in this chamber that the United States should adhere to the Ottawa Convention as soon as possible. He has sponsored successful legislation to fund the search for land mine alternatives, and he has an understandable interest in ensuring the effectiveness of that search.

Senator LEAHY is in an interesting position, however: he actually helped to bring about the Amended Mines Protocol. Although he favors a world-wide ban on anti-personnel mines, Senator LEAHY has stated that he also considers the Amended Mines Protocol an improvement over the existing Protocol.

Senator LEAHY agreed not to seek to amend this resolution of ratification, even though he opposes some of its provisions. For example, the resolution will preserve the Pursuit Deterrent Munition until January 1, 2003, even though the U.S. military found that this weapon was too heavy to be of great use to U.S. personnel.

It was not easy to bring Chairman HELMS and Senator LEAHY to agreement on a resolution of ratification for the Amended Mines Protocol. Senator CHUCK HAGEL of Nebraska and I, as well as Executive branch officials from several agencies, had to work at this beginning in 1997.

Chairman HELMS and Senator LEAHY agreed early on, however, that ratification of this Protocol was worth doing, if it could be done without prejudicing their stands on the larger issues. I am very pleased that we achieved such a resolution. I am also proud to be associated with two fine colleagues who kept their eye on the ball and arrived at an agreement.

I want to recognize some of the staff members who have labored so hard to bring about successful U.S. ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol. Marshall Billingslea and Edward Levine of the Foreign Relations Committee staff have kept at this for over a year and a half, framing the issues and enabling Chairman HELMS and me to reconcile our own differences as well as those between the Chairman and Senator LEAHY.

Senator HAGEL'S staff also played a major role in reconciling those differences, especially in the early stages. Tim Rieser of the Senate Appropriations Committee staff ably served Senator LEAHY in crafting language that would not subvert the cause of eventual land mine abolition.

Two State Department lawyers deserve special recognition for their roles. The Principal Deputy Legal Adviser, Michael J. Matheson, was instrumental in the negotiation of the Amended Mines Protocol and in explaining to the Senate its legal intricacies.

Steve Solomon, an attorney in the office of the Assistant Legal Adviser for Political-Military Affairs, was tireless and expert in explaining why U.S. ratification is in our national interest. Time and again, Mr. Solomon kept us on track toward reasonable solutions. Without the assistance of those fine civil servants, we would not be ratifying this Protocol today.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to emphasize that U.S. ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol is an action of which all Senator can feel proud. It will save innocent lives. It will reaffirm U.S. leadership in codifying the laws of war. Irrespective of whether we eventually renounce all anti-personnel mines, and without prejudicing that debate, the Amended Mines Protocol will serve our national interest and the interests of humanity.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in 1981 the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) came into force. The United States was instrumental in drafting that Convention, including Protocol II which imposed modest limits on the use of landmines. The United States signed the CCW, but another 15 years elapsed before President Clinton forwarded it to the Senate for its advice and consent. The U.S. finally ratified it in 1995.

Protocol II, commonly known as the Mines Protocol, was, during those years, the only international agreement which explicitly dealt with the use of landmines, and it was routinely ignored—not by the United States military, but by many other countries. And throughout that period the United States and other mine producers sold and gave away tens of millions of mines to other governments and rebel groups who used them against civilian populations. Our mines can be found today, and we are paying millions of dollars annually to help remove them and assist the victims, in some thirty countries.

By the early 1990's, it was widely recognized that the Mines Protocol had utterly failed to protect civilians from landmines. In fact, during the previous decade, the number of civilian casualties from mines skyrocketed.

There were many reasons for the failure of the Mines Protocol, but certainly among them was that it was riddled with loopholes, and that its rules were difficult to verify and impossible to enforce.

In 1992, convinced that far stronger leadership was needed to solve the mine problem, I sponsored legislation to halt United States exports of anti-personnel mines. I did so because I felt it was wrong for the United States to contribute to the carnage caused by mines, and I believed that little would change unless the United States, by setting an example, encouraged others to act. And that is what happened. In a matter of two or three years, close to fifty governments stopped exporting mines. Today, there is a de facto global export ban in effect. Even governments

that produce mines and have refused to renounce their use, including Russia and China, have publicly said that they no longer export.

At the same time that I was sponsoring legislation in Congress, I was also aware that ten years had elapsed since the Mines Protocol had come into force and that any party could request the United Nations to sponsor a CCW review conference. I saw this as an opportunity to strengthen the Protocol and to consider banning anti-personnel mines altogether. Since the U.S. was not a party, I and others urged the French Government to request the conference. By the time the review conference opened in late 1995, the United States had ratified the CCW and was able to participate fully in the negotiations.

The negotiations were difficult. Despite efforts by myself, some governments, and non-governmental organizations to promote a total ban, the idea was hardly discussed. Instead, the basic premise of the original Protocol remained unchanged—that mines are legitimate weapons of war. To its credit, the Clinton Administration made some constructive proposals dealing with, for example, the detectability of mines, and the Amended Protocol reflects some of those proposals. It requires all anti-personnel mines to contain enough iron to be detectable, and to either contain self-destruct/self-deactivation devices or be placed in marked and monitored minefields. It applies to internal conflicts, and also contains limits on certain transfers of anti-personnel mines.

These are notable improvements, but the negotiators again failed to include effective verification or enforcement provisions. They also refused to include a U.S. proposal to apply the prohibition on non-detectable mines to anti-vehicle mines.

Despite these significant flaws, I supported the Amended Protocol and encouraged the Administration to forward it to the Senate for its advice and consent. Indeed, I suspect that had I not sponsored the first law anywhere to halt exports of anti-personnel mines, or urged the French Government to request a review conference, there would not be an Amended Protocol.

Last year, after the Foreign Relations Committee reported what I and others regarded as a fatally flawed Resolution of Ratification, I refused to consent to its adoption by unanimous consent. At that time I made clear that the issue was not the Amended Protocol itself, but a Resolution and Committee Report that contained language that was extraneous, inaccurate, and provocative.

Today we are again asked to give our consent, and this time I have, with some reluctance, agreed. I say with some reluctance, because if this Resolution and the accompanying Committee Report dealt only with the Amended Protocol there would be no disagreement. In fact, we could have adopted it six months ago. But while the Resolution and Report are far preferable to the versions we were presented last year, they also contain language that has nothing whatsoever to do with the Amended Protocol. That is because, Mr. President, a few members of the Foreign Relations Committee have tried to use this Resolution as a vehicle to attack the Ottawa Convention, governments and individuals like myself who support that Convention, and current United States policy.

After reaching a stalemate last year, Senator BIDEN and I worked with Senator HELMS to resolve our differences. While there is still language in the Resolution which is extraneous and I disagree with, and in the report which is extraneous, factually inaccurate and objectionable, it has been pared down substantially. For that I thank Senator BIDEN and Senator HELMS and their staffs. They worked diligently to reach a result which, while not perfect, each of us can live with.

One of the reasons that I am consenting to this resolution is that the objectionable report language reflects the views of only some members of the Committee. In fact, much of it deals with issues which were never considered or debated by the Committee as a whole. Rather, it is based on the testimony of a handful of like-minded witnesses at a hearing that was attended by Senator HELMS and only one other Member of the Committee, who was a cosponsor of my legislation to ban United States use of anti-personnel mines except in Korea.

In other words, to the extent that the Helms Report purports to lay down markers for future landmine policy, it is neither binding nor representative of the views of the Committee as a whole, and even less so of the United States Senate.

While there is no need to address every objectionable phrase in the Report, two issues require a response.

First, the Report states that it is the view of many members of the Committee that the United States should not agree to any prohibition on the use, production, stockpiling or transfer of short-duration anti-personnel mines. Yet the Committee never debated this issue and the views of its members, with the exception of Senator HELMS, were never publicly expressed. Furthermore, and most important, some 135 countries have signed the Ottawa Convention which bans the production, use, transfer and stockpiling of anti-personnel mines, and 77 have ratified. They include every member of NATO except the United States and Turkey, and every Western Hemisphere country except the United States and Cuba. They also include many countries that have produced, used and exported mines in the past.

To suggest that the United States should remain outside the Convention that is widely and increasingly seen as establishing a new international norm outlawing anti-personnel mines, is inconsistent with United States policy and the interests of the United States. The Administration, including the Pentagon, has stated repeatedly and unequivocally that it will sign the Ottawa Convention when it has suitable alternatives to these weapons, and that it is aggressively searching for such alternatives.

Moreover, 67 members of the Senate voted for my amendment to halt U.S. use of anti-personnel mines, for one year. And 60 Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, including every Senator who fought in combat, cosponsored legislation introduced by myself and Senator Hagel to ban U.S. use of anti-personnel mines except in Korea.

Second, the Report notes that the Administration hopes to negotiate a ban on exports of anti-personnel mines in the U.N. Conference on Disarmament. I believe such a strategy is fraught with problems. It is relevant here only insofar as the Helms Report states that many members of the Committee believes that in future negotiations on an export ban the Administration should differentiate between short and long-duration mines.

Perhaps those members are unaware that five years ago the United States and Britain proposed such an ''export control regime.'' It was rejected out of hand not only by many of our NATO allies, but by developing countries who already had stockpiled millions of long-duration mines and saw the U.S./UK proposal as an attempt to market their higher tech, higher priced mines. Any attempt by the United States to resurrect that failed approach would only further damage U.S. credibility on the mine issue.

I would also refer members to the Minority views in the Report, which ably address this issue. Finally, it is notable that Senator Helms voted twice for my amendment to halt exports of anti-personnel mines, as did the then Majority Leader Robert Dole. Those amendments passed overwhelmingly, and did not differentiate between short and long-duration mines.

Mr. President, the Amended Mines Protocol is a step forward. If adhered to it will help reduce the maiming and killing of civilians, and United States soldiers, by landmines. If its prohibition on non-detectable mines is applied to anti-vehicle mines, as the United States has proposed, that would be a significant advance.

But like its predecessor, the Amended Protocol has too many loopholes and can be easily violated. It is a far cry from what is needed to achieve the goal declared by President Clinton and adopted by the U.N. General Assembly of ridding the world of anti-personnel mines. I believe that can only occur—as was done with poison gas and as the Ottawa Convention would do—by stigmatizing these indiscriminate weapons. That will take far stronger United States leadership than we have seen thus far.

Mr. HATCH. I ask for a division vote on the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is requested. Senators in favor of the resolution of ratification will rise and stand until counted. (After a pause.) Those opposed will rise and stand until counted.

On a division, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 24, 1999

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Monday, May 24. I further ask that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day. I further ask consent that there then be a period of morning business until 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN or his designee from 11 a.m. to 12 noon, with Senator CONRAD in control of 20 minutes of that time; Senator BENNETT in control of time between 12 noon and 12:30 p.m.; and Senator Bob SMITH in control of the time between 12:30 p.m. and 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. I finally ask that at 1 p.m. the Senate immediately begin consideration of calendar No. 114, S. 1059, the Department of Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. HATCH. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene at 11 a.m. on Monday and be in a period of morning business until 1 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will begin consideration of the Department of Defense authorization bill. Amendments to that legislation are expected to be offered during Monday's session of the Senate. If votes are ordered with respect to S. 1059, those votes would be stacked to occur at 5:30 p.m., Monday evening. As always, Senators will be notified as votes are ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 24, 1999, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. HATCH. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:39 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 24, 1999, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 20, 1999:

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY

ROBERT CLARKE BROWN, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 22, 2005. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

JAMES B. LEWIS, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MINORITY ECONOMIC IMPACT, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE CORLIS SMITH MOODY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

LEWIS ANDREW SACHS, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE GARY GENSLER.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED UNITED STATES ARMY OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 152:

To be general

GEN. HENRY H. SHELTON, 0000.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 20, 1999:

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

GARY L. VISSCHER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2001.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DRUGS AND GUNS ACT OF 1999

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation intended to keep firearms out of the hands of those convicted of misdemeanor drug offenses. Current federal law prohibits a person convicted of a felony crime involving drugs and firearms from owning a firearm. However, those convicted of lesser drug offenses can legally own a gun. My legislation would impose strict penalties and fines for misdemeanors during crimes such as use or possession of an illegal substance when a firearm is present. Similar to legislation I have introduced in the past, my bill has had the endorsement of the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police and the National Association of Chiefs of Police.

Quite simple, this bill would expand current law to treat individuals who commit less-serious drug offenses in the same manner as people involved in other drug crimes, such as drug trafficking. Those found guilty of simple possession of a controlled substance, and who possesses a firearm at the same time of the offense, will face mandatory jail time and/or substantial fines in addition to any penalty imposed for the drug offense. Mandatory jail time and fines would be required for second and subsequent offenses.

The guilty party would be prohibited from owning a firearm for 5 years. Exceptions could be granted depending upon the circumstances surrounding each individual's case. Current law states that a person convicted of a drug crime can petition to the Secretary of the Treasury for an exemption to the firearms prohibition provided it would not threaten public safety. This legislation will not affect a law-abiding citizen's right to own a firearm.

By imposing stiff penalties on people convicted of lesser drug offenses where a firearm is present, we will send a serious message that the cost of engaging in this activity far outweighs the benefit. If my bill becomes law, individuals owning firearms for legitimate purposes (hunting, target-shooting, collecting, or personal protection) and who also engage in the use of illicit drugs will think twice before participating in their drug-related endeavors, facing the prospect of enhanced penalties and the loss of their firearms.

Mr. Speaker, the 104th Congress passed legislation to provide increased enforcement on our borders to reduce drug trafficking, and the 105th Congress passed the ''Drug-Free Communities Act,'' to establish a program to support and encourage local communities who demonstrate a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reduce substance abuse among youth. Both measures became law. I urge my colleagues to continue to focus its efforts on the drug war by passing this legislation in an effort to crack down on this criminal behavior. Drugs and guns are a lethal combination that must not be tolerated by a civilized nation.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY RECOGNIZES THE 1999 ASIAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE CELEBRATION AND ASIAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Asian-American Heritage Month and the many diverse accomplishments of Asian-Americans. I also recognize the Asian American Heritage Council of New Jersey, an organization dedicated to celebrating, integrating, and uniting Asian culture in America.

Asian-Americans have a long history of meaningful contributions to the United States.

On may 22, 1999, the Asian American Heritage Council of New Jersey will sponsor a statewide Asian-American Heritage Celebration in Edison, NJ. This organization, which incorporates various Asian-American groups in New Jersey, was founded by Dr. Stephen Ko in 1992. Each year a different ethnic group organizes a celebration in May; this year the activities are being planned by Chinese-Americans and will include dancing and shows by various organizations.

The Asian-American Heritage Celebration's keynote address will be delivered by my colleague from Oregon, the Honorable DAVID WU. Congressman WU is the first Chinese-American to be elected to the U.S. Congress.

The contributions of Asian-Americans to the society and culture of New Jersey and the United States are a vital part of the American fabric. I hope all my colleagues will join me in recognizing the Asian American Heritage Council of New Jersey.

TRIBUTE TO OUR LADY OF MERCY SCHOOL

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to the faculty, parents, and students of Our Lady of Mercy School in Montgomery County, MD, for winning the Blue Ribbon Excellence in Education Award from the Department of Education.

Our Lady of Mercy School has a tradition of academic excellence, intellectual curiosity, fundamental moral and religious values, and an atmosphere of care and respect. The school's mission sets goals which foster students' personal growth, empowers students as active learners, and encourages critical thinking and problem solving. Linkages with communities beyond Mercy help students develop an understanding of different cultures and an appreciation of global interdependence.

In 1998, Mercy received reaccreditation by the Commission on Elementary Schools of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools for its unique project on inclusive education in regular schools. Mercy's Educational Excellence Program: A Model for Inclusive Education identifies inclusive education as one that serves the physically and mentally challenged, empowers the talented and gifted student, and uses a multicultural perspective across the curriculum.

Academic and non-academic services are revised as Mercy's student population grows and changes. The needs of Mercy's stakeholders have served as the catalysts for the Rainbow and anti-drug programs, prayer partners, inclusive life skills instruction, academic tutors, and family health seminars. The role of Mercy's community is to partner in the education of students, to create a forum for adult learning, and to raise responsible, socially concerned individuals.

The Mercy Parent Teacher Organization coordinates parent volunteers to assist the school in the total education of the children. During the 1997–98 school year, 96.5 percent of Mercy's families volunteered. Mercy provides parents with educational opportunities through in-house and outside seminars, guest speakers, health programs, print materials, and private consultants.

As a former teacher, I wish to congratulate Our Lady of Mercy School for creating the right atmosphere for learning. I am proud of their well-trained staff, their supportive parents, and their excellent students. I wish them continued success in creating the excellence in education needed for tomorrow's schools.

HONORING BOB STONE'S RETIREMENT

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Bob Stone, who is retiring after more than thirty years in the federal government representing the highest ideals of government service. For the past six years, Bob has been Vice President AL GORE's right hand man in leading the reinvention of the federal bureaucracy. Reinventing government is often referred to colloquially as ''REGO'' and Bob has been commonly called ''Mr. REGO'' for his dedication and commitment to creating a government that works better, costs less, and gets the results Americans desire.

I first met Bob during the 1980s when he was a deputy assistant secretary in the Defense Department. He helped resolve a complex situation that ended up benefiting both the Defense Department and Northeastern Pennsylvania. Although I had dealt with hundreds of federal employees, Bob stood out as a creative and thoughtful public servant who was absolutely committed to making government work. His dedication to improving the functioning of the Defense Department during

Republican Administrations was brought to the attention of Vice President GORE, who deserves a great deal of credit for recognizing Bob's talents and allowing him to run the National Performance Review in a competent and non-partisan manner.

In leading hundreds of career civil servants in the reinventing government initiative, Bob has helped produce some remarkable results: more than $136 billion in savings, a workforce that is smaller than when John F. Kennedy was President, 640,000 fewer pages of internal rules, and the creation of more than 3,000 customer service standards that citizens can use to judge how well agencies are serving their customers. I was struck by Bob's undying belief that government can work if front-line employees are empowered with the ability to exercise common sense. Bob's inspirational mantra was, ''Federal workers know what's not working in government and—if empowered—can make government work better and cost less.''

Beyond creating a government that was smaller and worked better, Bob wanted to create a movement. As Vice President GORE said at Bob's retirement ceremony, ''Bob's goal was to 'fan the flames of reinvention' among front line employees, to empower them to reinvent their workplaces and how they deal with their customers—to bring common sense to government. He did this, and more.''

Bob Stone is the epitome of the hard-working, unrecognized public servant who is dedicated to doing whatever it takes to accomplish his mission in a thoughtful and creative way. I speak for many in this Congress when I express my gratitude to Bob for the key role he has played in restoring Americans' belief that government can do the right thing. I wish him and his wife, Roxanne, a happy retirement when they join their children and grandchildren in California. We will miss you, Mr. REGO, but hope your spirit of service and reinvention will live long in the federal government.

IN HONOR OF THE DEDICATION OF CENTER HIGH SCHOOL

HON. DOUG OSE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give special recognition to a high school in my district that has its eye on the future and its students on the road to success. Center High School in the Center Unified School District will be dedicated on May 22 after undergoing extensive remodeling of its facilities to accommodate, among other things the continuing emergence of high technology in the classroom, and the growing demand for improved mathematics and science education.

The dramatic changes at Center High School come at a time when this school district faces tremendous challenges in coping with a significant loss of student enrollment due to the imminent closure of McClellan Air Force Base. Despite such a daunting obstacle, forward-thinking trustees, administrators, faculty members, school staff, parents and others in the community moved ahead with plans to give students at Center High School their best possible chance to succeed in a rapidly changing world. It should come as no surprise that this particular school district took such a leadership role. Even as the Gold Rush swept through California and well before the Pony Express began to link my state to the rest of the nation, one of the area's very first schools opened its doors to students in what is now the Center Unified School District. For almost a century and a half, this community has focused on future generations.

At its dedication ceremony, Center High will show off its state-of-the-art science complex and adjoining computer lab, a new mathematics wing with adjoining computer lab, a new library with multiple computer research stations, a new 500 seat performing arts theatre and music building, a special education wing, and a technology-based curriculum integrated in the school's Media Communications and Business Academies.

It also should be noted that student achievements at Center High School are truly remarkable. Most recently, both the student newspaper and yearbook received the Gold Crown Awards from the Columbia Scholastic Press Association—their equivalent of the Pulitzer Prize. It is the only school in the nation to win top honors for both publications. In addition, Center High freshman William John was recently selected to represent California in People to People International at a United Nations conference in Switzerland this summer.

It is refreshing and hopeful for all of us to witness the rebirth of Center High School and to honor the tremendous success of its students. I urge you to join me in congratulating all those involved for a job well done.

STATEMENT ON KOSOVO

HON. ROBERT A. WEYGAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the House debated several resolutions regarding the current situation in Kosovo. I take this opportunity to address that situation and each of those resolutions.

The current situation in Kosovo is indeed a tragedy. People are being forced from their homes, families are being destroyed, people are being murdered because of their ethnic identity. If I may, let me recount some sobering facts. To date, over 603,000 Kosovar-Albanian refugees have been forced from their homes, an estimated 3,700 people have been murdered, and approximately 400,000 people are roaming the Kosovo countryside.

Unfortunately, we have seen this type of activity far too often. Many of us have taken to this very floor and condemned the actions of the Nazis in World War II, the Ottoman Empire during the Armenian Genocide, the Chinese at Tiananmen Square, the treatment of the East Timorese by the Idonesian Government, and the murder of over a million Rwandans. All of us also condemn the actions of Slobodan Milosevic in his efforts to ''cleanse'' the former Yugoslavia of ethnic minorities.

In my view, the United States is the world leader in the efforts to promote democracy and basic human rights. As that world leader, not a police force but a leader, the United States must take its responsibility seriously. Therefore, we must play a role in stopping ongoing genocides, preventing future genocides, and promoting freedom and democracy around the world. Unfortunately, this sometimes requires the use of United States military force.

There is a great deal of debate over whether this operation in Kosovo is in our interests. I believe it is. As part of our role in the world, the United States needs to take action to preserve and in some instances expand alliances that will encourage the establishment of the democratic principles we all cherish. As such, we must remain an active leader in the NATO alliance.

The NATO alliance was formed to provide a strong measure of security to Europe, which in turn provides a measure of security for the United States. Political, military, and economic instability threatens U.S. national security and economic interests. This is a region where two world wars began and the threat that this conflict could spread to neighboring countries is real. It is without a doubt that preventing the spread of this conflict is in our security interest.

During the debate, the first bill the House considered was H.R. 1569, introduced by Representatives FOWLER and GOODLING. This bill would prohibit the President from using any funds for the deployment of ''ground elements'' without congressional authorization. This legislation is far too broad in its scope. It would prevent using U.S. ''ground elements'' to rescue U.S. military personnel or civilians should that be necessary, it would restrict U.S. participation in a peacekeeping operation, it would handcuff the President from responding with ''ground elements'' to a direct threat to U.S. personnel, and it would have even prohibited the rescue of the three U.S. POW's.

Passage of this bill, in my view, gives President Milosevic permission to act without fear that the United States will respond with the swiftest and most forceful action if necessary. Many have argued that we cannot tell our enemies what we will do or how we will act, but this bill tells Milosevic exactly what Congress will allow President Clinton to do.

While at this time I do not think the use of ''ground elements'' is necessary, I do not believe that we should take any option off the table for any period of time. I do not believe that we should handcuff the President or our military leaders from taking whatever action they need to in responding to a developing situation. This bill would do exactly that. For the reasons outlined above I voted against this bill.

The next resolution the House considered was House Concurrent Resolution 82, introduced by Representative CAMPBELL of California. This resolution would have required the United States to withdraw, in 30 days, from its participation in the NATO operations. I also voted against this resolution. The unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from this operation would signal to the world that we do not support the NATO operation and that the United States is willing to ignore its role as a world leader.

House Joint Resolution 44 was the third resolution the House considered. This resolution was a declaration of war by the United States against Yugoslavia. We are in our third month of air strikes against Yugoslavia and that is too early to discuss a declaration of war. We need to continue the air campaign, which is having some success.

This is a time when we need to support both our men and women in harm's way and

our allies. To approve any of these measures would send a message to our troops, allies and enemies that the United States is not unified or committed to ending the tragedy in Kosovo.

The final resolution the House considered was Senate Concurrent Resolution 21. This resolution authorized the use of United States air forces to participate in the NATO action in Kosovo. I voted in favor of this resolution. The United States is already involved in the air operation in Kosovo and refusing to support that ongoing operation is, in effect, telling our air crews that we are not behind them and this operation. Mr. Speaker, I know that every member of this House supports our men and women in the military but refusing to support this resolution sends mixed messages to them. We must be united in our support of them and must let them know that.

A SALUTE TO OWEN MARRON

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, it is with honor and profound respect that I rise today to salute Owen A. Marron, one of the most exemplary longtime leaders in the U.S. labor movement. Brother Marron was appointed to the Alameda County Central Labor Council in 1982 after a two-year stint in the U.S. Army and a long affiliation in the local United Steel Workers Union and SEIU. He rose up the ranks of leadership after his appointment to the Labor Council and was at the helm as Executive Secretary-Treasurer for the past decade. He was also elected vice president of the California Labor Federation.

Brother Marron will be honored as Unionist of the Year on June 17, 1999 in Oakland, California. His numerous contributions and achievements will be applauded and well wishes will be extended as he retires. He will leave a legacy of commitment, strong leadership, unbending advocacy for affirmative action and for the rights of the disabled community, and tenacity in organizing and fighting for working people.

Brother Marron's forty plus years in the labor movement will be long remembered and his leadership will be missed. I join his friends and colleagues in thanking him for his untiring efforts. Brother Owen Marron has indeed made a positive difference in the lives of many individuals.

CONGRATULATING THE LEUKEMIA SOCIETY ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Leukemia Society of America on its 50th anniversary. The Leukemia Society has led the fight to end this terrible disease and many individuals are alive today thanks to its work. This organization possesses not only the scientific and medical expertise needed for such a task, but also the understanding and sensitivity to lend support to the patients and families faced with the challenge of leukemia.

I am personally active with the Northern New Jersey Chapter of the Leukemia Society, and dedicate all my work to the memory of our son, Todd Richard Roukema, who was taken from us by the tragedy of leukemia. I take this opportunity to thank Dr. Richard W. Zahn, our chapter's president, for his dedication and hard work. Dr. Zahn is one of the many people who make the Leukemia Society a success and is bringing hope to all those families who are facing this disease.

In August 1944, 16-year-Robbie deVilliers was diagnosed with acute leukemia. Three months later he died, as did 96 percent of the children diagnosed with leukemia that year. In 1950, as a memorial to their son's brief life, Robbie's parents established the Robert Roesler deVilliers Foundation in an effort to support scientific research into their son's disorder. In 1951, with an income of $11,700, the foundation approved its first research grant. With the hiring of a medical consultant, the foundation established its principle of awarding research grants to young scientists over the next few years. In 1955, it changed its name to the Leukemia Society, eventually becoming known as the Leukemia Society of America to reflect its national stature.

During its half-century of operation, the Leukemia Society has grown tremendously, expanding its scope and developing a wealth of expertise and knowledge. With an income of more than $83 million a year, the Society now funds research into the blood-related cancers of lymphoma, Hodgkin's disease and myeloma as well as leukemia. Under the Leukemia Society's leadership, new chemotherapy drugs combined with radiation treatment have increased survival rates. Today, 80 percent of children under 15 survive leukemia and certain types of leukemia can be cured.

While the past 50 years of accomplishment brings great hope, one adult or child still dies from blood-related cancers every nine minutes. Leukemia and lymphoma are the leading fatal cancers in men and women under 35. Cures for these diseases must be found. Research challenges remain and the Leukemia Society valiantly pursues its mission.

As I have stated, we know personally the tragedy of cancer: My husband, Dr. Richard W. Roukema, M.D., and I lost our son, Todd, to leukemia in 1976 at the age of 17. At that time, bone marrow transplants and other techniques that offered hope were only in their experimental stages. Since then, many advances have been made that have spared thousands of other parents the heartbreak we faced. It is thanks to the brilliant researchers and physicians supported by the Leukemia Society that hope can be maintained.

Today, we are within grasp of a cure for many forms of cancer but much research remains to be done. I thank God for those who are willing to labor toward this goal and pray that with their help a cure can be found and that no one will ever again have to suffer from this terrible disease.

BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and congratulate the extraordinary accomplishments of two schools which are located in my home district. Concordia Elementary and Moulton Elementary recently were selected to receive the Blue Ribbon Schools award.

The Blue Ribbon Schools Program was established by the U.S. Secretary of Education in 1982. Since its establishment, more than 3,500 schools have been recognized for their excellence.

Blue Ribbon status is awarded to schools that have strong leadership, a clear vision, a sense of mission, and most importantly, solid evidence of family involvement. Through exceptional academics, athletics and after-school programs, these schools have set themselves apart from other schools. Concordia and Moulton have achieved the recognition of a Blue Ribbon School that comes from their outstanding level of excellence. Teachers, administrators, parents, volunteers and students should be applauded for their efforts.

I would like to express my congratulations to these schools. Concordia Elementary and Moulton Elementary should be proud of their accomplishment. Nothing is of more importance to our families, our communities and our country than the quality of education in America.

RETIREMENT SECURITY ACT OF 1999

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Retirement Security Act of 1999. This bill, nearly identical to legislation I introduced in the last Congress, would help put the Social Security system on a better financial footing while providing future Americans with the peace of mind that comes with their own personal retirement accounts.

Under my bill, the government will establish a retirement account for each newborn American citizen, initially worthy $1,000. The money for the initial $1,000 will come from income taxes on that portion of Social Security income currently subject to the income tax. This amount is to be invested in the same funds available in the Federal employees' Thrift Savings Plan two of which promise higher rates of return than the Social Security Trust Fund. The investment decisions among the funds are to be made by the parent or guardian until the account holder reaches the age of majority when he or she is able to make such decisions. The account holder, or his or her parent, can add to the principal of the account, up to $2,000 per year tax free. But even if that ever happens the $1,000, if invested in the common stock index fund, at the historical real rate of return of 7 percent, would grow to $89,000 in 1999 dollars. This happens to be just enough to cover the current average Social Security benefit.

Since the initial $1,000 comes from the Government, Social Security payments owed to the account holder would come out of this account first. Only after it is exhausted would the individual begin to draw on the Social Security Trust Fund. Therefore the financial problems of Social Security would be solved starting 67 years after enactment. This would make it easier to deal with the problems we face before that date.

If my plan is adopted, future workers will not have to worry so much whether or not the government will keep its promises or that the Social Security system might go bankrupt because each will have an account which is his or her personal property. I don't claim that this program will solve all of the financial problems of Social Security but it will certainly help.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN A. OREMUS

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant in my district, John A. Oremus. John Oremus has recently retired after serving as mayor of Bridgeview, Illinois for a total of four decades.

Mr. Oremus learned the value of a strong work ethic early on, as he helped out with his father's tanning business and held a job at a gas station. In 1948, he started his own business. All of his children and grandchildren are now very involved with the business. Mr. Oremus began his career in politics when he was appointed to the Zoning Board of Appeals. In 1955, John Oremus became the Mayor of the village of Bridgeview. He retained the position until 1963. In 1967, John Oremus was again elected mayor and has held the position ever since.

Mr. Oremus continued his hard work as mayor, seeing to it that his vision of ''A Well Balanced Community'' became a reality. This concept was that the Bridgeview community of fine homes and families would have low municipal taxes and many places in town to work and shop. As Mayor, Mr. Oremus also encouraged business and industry by offering cooperation and strong Village support services, such as fire and police protection.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to pay tribute to John Oremus. I am certain that the community of Bridgeview, Illinois will miss his presence as a public servant. It is my hope that John Oremus a enjoys good health and good memories in his retirement.

HONORING WYCKOFF HEIGHTS MEDICAL CENTER

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Wyckoff Heights Medical Center located in Brooklyn, New York which is celebrating its 10th Anniversary. For 10 years, the Wyckoff Heights Medical Center has been helping women and children in communities throughout Brooklyn. It has contributed many positive things to the quality of life in our neighborhoods, and I would like to thank its leadership and the many others involved in its success.

The Wyckoff Heights Medical Center is the hub of the WIC program in our area. Along with its satellite clinics at the LaMarca Family Health Center in East New York, Queensbridge Family Heath Center in Long Island City, Park Slope WIC in Park Slope, and the Red Hook WIC in Red Hook, Wyckoff serves an average of 5,800 women, infants and children a year.

Like the National WIC program, which this year celebrates its 25th Anniversary, the Wyckoff WIC program has been enormously successful. Nationally, WIC has helped provide nutrition education, health care referral, breastfeeding support and supplemental nutritious foods to nearly 7.5 million women, infants and children through 10,000 clinics nationwide.

In addition to its success implementing the mandated WIC services, the Wyckoff WIC program has sought to enhance its outreach by conducting seminars and workshops throughout Brooklyn. These efforts have included breastfeeding promotion and immunization screening seminars.

These initiatives have also been enhanced by the work of Mr. William F. Green, Vice President of Ambulatory Services, who is being honored by the Wyckoff WIC this week. Mr. Green has been a strong supporter of the Wyckoff WIC program since its inception in 1989, and he has helped initiate some unique programs. For example, Mr. Green created a monthly Mother's Day which helps create a consistent outreach to women and children. He also has been supportive of the Wyckoff's special holiday programs, which during the major holidays, makes an extra effort to reach out to the women and children of our communities who are in need of vital services. Mr. Green has made a good WIC program great and on behalf of the community, I thank him and congratulate him on his special award.

I would also like to congratulate the fifty WIC children who are graduating this week. These children, all who recently turned five years old, are being honored in a very special way because they have successfully completed their participation in the Wyckoff WIC program. They represent the future—a future of strong, healthy children and mothers who have the chance to realize the American dream.

I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding the Wyckoff WIC program on the occasion of its 10th Anniversary, Mr. Green for his longtime support of the Wyckoff WIC, and most importantly the 50 young WIC graduates and their mothers for a healthy future—congratulations and continued success.

CONGRATULATING THE CENTRAL NEW JERSEY DISTRICT BEST UPS OPERATING DISTRICT IN WORLDWIDE ORGANIZATION

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Central New Jersey District of United Parcel Service, which has been named the best operating district within the UPS worldwide organization.

This district was chosen because of its effective balance in regard to customers, employees, shareholders, and internal practices. UPS employs over 13,000 people in New Jersey and services approximately 99,000 New Jersey customers.

The Central District serves much of my 12th Congressional District, including all or part of Monmouth, Middlesex, Mercer, and Hunterdon Counties.

The district will be presented with the Chairman's Award for excellence at a celebration on May 21, 1999, in Edison, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, the Central New Jersey District of UPS is an excellent example for all New Jersey businesses. I hope all my colleagues will join me in recognizing their accomplishment.

TRIBUTE TO ASHBURTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to the faculty, parents, and students of Ashburton Elementary School in Montgomery County, MD for winning the Blue Ribbon Excellence in Education Award from the Department of Education.

Ashburton Elementary has a large international student population that represents 38 countries and 20 different languages. The fact that the majority of the international students do not speak English when they arrive presents challenges to the faculty that have been met with great success.

Academics are the primary focus tempered with learning other lifelong values. There is a school wide commitment to helping the students develop respect and responsibility for themselves, their schoolmates, the staff, and the school. Ten years ago the school implemented The SHINE Program. The program, which was established to help stress the qualities of being Successful, Helpful, Imaginative, Neighborly, and Enthusiastic, recognizes students who contribute to the school's community in a positive manner.

Students at Ashburton are exposed to the field of technology. The school has a 29 station Macintosh computer lab, and a Macintosh computer in each classroom. All computers are on a local network (LAN) and are connected to the Montgomery County Public Schools wide area network (WAN). Students learn keyboarding, word processing, digital imaging, and how to use the Internet.

In addition to a dedicated principal, staff, and willing students, Ashburton Elementary is supported by an active, interested, and committed parent community.

As a former teacher, I wish to congratulate Ashburton Elementary School for creating the right atmosphere for learning. I am proud of their well trained staff, their supportive parents, and their excellent students. I wish them continued success in creating the excellence in education needed for tomorrow's schools.

HONORING DANIEL J. BADER, RECIPIENT OF THE 1999 COMMUNITY SERVICE HUMAN RELATIONS AWARD

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Daniel J. Bader, recipient of the 1999 Community Service Human Relations Award from the Milwaukee Chapter of the American Jewish Committee.

Mr. Bader is president of the Helen Bader Foundation, which has awarded more than $50 million in grants since 1992 with the express aim of advancing the well-being of people and promoting successful relationships with their families and communities. As president, Mr. Bader leads the foundation's day-to-day interaction with projects and programs in the United States, mainly in Wisconsin, and also Israel.

He is a member of the foundation's seven-member board of directors, which evaluates grant proposals and provides strategic oversight of the foundation's grants programs, mainly in the areas of Alzheimer's disease and dementia, early childhood development in Israel, economic development, education, Jewish life, and learning and supporting programs for central city children and youth.

It is noteworthy to recognize the leadership of Mr. Bader and the foundation in the establishment of the American Jewish Committee's Hands Across the Campus program, which was given its ''jump-start'' in Milwaukee. The program's innovative curriculum and leadership development program now operates in five school districts in southeastern Wisconsin. Each year hundreds of high school students are given hands-on experience in bridge building, conflict resolution, anti-bias activities and the deconstruction of prejudice. The Bader Foundation enabled the Milwaukee Chapter of the American Jewish Committee to provide teacher training for practitioners of the Hands program.

Mr. Bader is partner in Granite Microsystems, Inc., a Mequon-based computer hardware firm. He holds a bachelor's degree in business administration from the Rochester Institute of Technology. A Milwaukee native, he and his wife, Linda, reside with their son on Milwaukee's east side.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I commend Daniel J. Bader for his outstanding and innovative contributions to the community, and congratulate him as a most deserving recipient of the 1999 Community Service Human Relations Award from the Milwaukee Chapter of the American Jewish Committee.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. PAULETTE DALE OF MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Paulette Dale of Miami-Dade Community College in Miami, Florida, for her contributions as a speech-pathology professor towards the emotional betterment of all people. Dr. Dale is the director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at Miami-Dade Community College's Kendall Campus, where she has taught for 23 years.

Previously, Dr. Dale was a bilingual speech pathologist in Dade and Broward County public schools. She holds a Ph.D. in speech pathology and linguistics.

Recently, Dr. Dale published a book on assertiveness which she hopes will help women to develop self-esteem. Dr. Dale believes that low self-esteem is far too pervasive in America, particularly among women. Based on anecdotes from her own life, the book is titled, ''Did You Say Something, Susan? How Any Woman Can Gain Confidence with Assertive Communication.''

It is a privilege to pay tribute to Dr. Paulette Dale, who uses her vast knowledge and her own life experiences to help others.

HONORING MISS AFTON STANFORD

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to honor Miss Afton Stanford of Poplarville, MS. Miss Stanford is the Mississippi winner of the 1999 Voice of Democracy broadcast script-writing contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. As reward for her script, she received a VFW scholarship and an all-expense paid trip to Washington, DC to compete with other national finalists.

The VFW's Voice of Democracy Program is a national essay competition that allows high school students the opportunity to share their opinions on service, sacrifice and responsibility to their country. The 1998–99 competition theme was ''My Service to America,'' in which students reflected on their individual involvement in local communities. Out of the 80,000 participants, Miss Stanford was one of fifty-four finalists, and it gives me great pride to share her winning essay with you.

MY SERVICE TO AMERICA

(By Afton Stanford)

As I stand looking through the thick glass protecting the faded blue uniform, and the yellowed photograph I wonder how old this boy was. If it were not for the fact that he was in the military, I'd say he were my age. He looks like a boy in my chemistry class, you know the silent type that grins a lot but really never says much. I'm not sure if that is what he really was like, but I'd like to think so. Who would ever believe that this young kid would ever have the chance to save others. When I look into his eyes, I don't see a kid who wants to be a hero, I see a kid ready to experience life. Maybe he was a little uncertain about his future, or even wondering if he made the right decision in joining the military, whatever it was I can imagine a mixture of emotions swirling through his dark eyes. At 18, many people might think a kid knows nothing about sacrifice. But this boy, this young boy, made the ultimate sacrifice.

A few summers ago, I volunteered for a women's crisis shelter. At the time I thought it was fun, meeting new people, helping others in the process. But, only after it was all over did I grasp the concept of ''service.'' Service to my God, service to my country. When I got home I found other places to volunteer; I help Red Cross, if any disasters happen and they need help collecting food or handing out blankets, I'll be there. I also help at the food bank, sorting cans that people donate so the families less fortunate can eat. Giving up Saturdays and spending a week helping others seems trivial, in comparison to this boy who gave his life to save others, but it's a beginning.

I got a great start at home. My parents have instilled in me the desire to help other people improve their lives. My parents stressed the need for helping others, because in helping others everyone lives better. They also taught me to take pride in what I do, the jobs I hold and what I believe. National pride is something sacred. All Americans have lost family and friends to have these rights, and the least I can do is maintain the life they fought for.

Sometimes my life gets too hectic and chaotic to think about anyone but myself. That's why every day I try to make it a point to do something, however little for someone else. From sweeping leaves for an elderly neighbor to working at the food bank I try to pitch in. Helping is contagious. When I have volunteered, my friends have seen how much I loved the people I helped and the work and they have begun to volunteer too. If each American has this attitude it will make a big difference. Part of my service to America is encouraging others to help in any way they can and knowing that every kindness honors the people who've gone before us.

I believe that being an American citizen means helping others in need. This is one of the strongest values of Americans. For a young man to throw himself on a land mine to save his platoon exemplifies the ideals of self-sacrifice and service that is the corner stone of America. While I'm standing here looking at this display of congressional honor, I wonder how his mother felt. The last time she ironed his uniform and picked off the little stray threads for this display, was she aware of how much I appreciate what her son gave up and what she gave up through him? I only hope that my little sacrifices and services will be able to honor his death and all deaths that make the quality of life that I enjoy possible. I can only hope that one day I'll be able to give a service of this magnitude to my country.

''Greater love has no one than this, than to lay down one's life for his friends.'' (John 15:13) As I walk away I hope to take a little inspiration from this boy who selflessly embodied these values.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 1999, I was unavoidably detained during a rollcall vote: number 129, on the Sanders of Vermont amendment, as amended, to H.R. 1555, Intelligence Authorization. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted ''no.''

TRIBUTE TO TERMINAL PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate Terminal Park Elementary School in Auburn, Washington, for their selection as a Blue Ribbon School. It is an honor to have this school, located in the Ninth Congressional District, as one of only 266 schools nationwide awarded this prestigious honor.

The Blue Ribbon School award is given to schools that do an outstanding job of meeting local, state, and national goals, and display the qualities of excellence that are necessary to prepare our young people for the challenges of the next century. More specifically, to receive the award, schools must have strong leaders; a clear vision, and sense of mission that is shared by all connected with the school; high-quality teaching; challenging, up-to-date curriculum; policies and practices that ensure a safe environment conducive to learning; a solid commitment to parental involvement; and evidence that the school helps all students to achieve high standards.

I commend the staff, students, and parents of Terminal Park Elementary School for their hard work in building an effective community for learning. The focus on literacy and assuring students obtain the essential skills needed for life is absolutely necessary and I am glad we have Terminal Park Elementary School as an example for how we need to work toward educating our children.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI

HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, Taiwan, known as the Republic of China, will be marking its President's third anniversary in office on May 20, 1999. President Lee Teng-hui, a Taiwan-born statesman, should be commended for his leadership and vision for his country.

President Lee's leadership lies in his ability to rally his 21 million compatriots into understanding that the course Taiwan has chosen, both economically and politically, is right for them. President Lee has convinced them that their future lies in free trade and private enterprise as well as in full democracy. With the help of his compatriots, President Lee will lead the Republic of China to ever greater economic prosperity at home, while achieving international recognition abroad.

On the occasion of the President's third anniversary in office, I wish President Lee Godspeed and good fortune.

TRIBUTE TO BROOKE GROVE ELEMENTARY

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to the faculty, parents, and students of Brooke Grove Elementary School in Montgomery County, MD, for winning the Blue Ribbon Excellence in Education Award from the Department of Education.

Students, parents, and teachers at Brooke Grove have forged a partnership dedicated to excellence and committed to the belief that success is attainable for all students. Participation and involvement is of paramount importance and evident throughout all aspects of learning and teaching.

Brooke Grove has implemented The William and Mary Language Arts Program for Highly Able Learners; Reading Recovery Program, which is an internationally recognized intervention program. The school uses Math and Science Clubs, Science Hands-on kits, Math Content Connections, funded by the National Science Foundation, computer labs, and a research/learning hub to enable children to acquire skills and learn how to problem solve for the future.

At Brooke Grove staff training is essential to the instructional process. New teachers participate in 1 week of training prior to joining the staff and have a coach-mentor throughout their first year of service. A large number of teachers were trained in numerous staff development initiatives, which include The William and Mary Curriculum; AEMP, Science and Expository Reading; and Gifted and Talented Instruction.

The faculty at Brooke Grove has demonstrated innovative and creative avenues for acknowledging and motivating students. The environment is one in which children want to achieve, are supported in their efforts to achieve, and are recognized for their accomplishments.

As a former teacher, I am pleased that Brooke Grove Elementary School is being recognized for its fine educational and extracurricular programs. I congratulate its fine faculty, its supportive parents, and its excellent administrators and wish them continued success in achieving excellence in education.

LACKENMIER RETIREMENT

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extremely well-respected community leader, educator, and close personal friend, Reverend James R. Lackenmier. On May 20th, Father Lackenmier will step down as President of King's College in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania after twenty-five years of distinguished service to this fine institution. Father Lackenmier combines the rare traits of having the executive acumen of a Fortune 500 CEO, the devotion to young people of a lifelong educator, and the warmth of community spirit of a man who has truly embraced ''The Valley with a heart.'' I am pleased and proud to join in a community-wide salute as Father Lackenmier leaves Northeastern Pennsylvania for new pursuits.

The eldest son of Harold and Margaret Murphy Lackenmier, Father Lackenmier was born in Lackawanna, New York. He graduated from Canisius High School in Buffalo, New York in 1956, entered the congregation of Holy Cross in 1957, and was ordained in Rome in 1964. Father Lackenmier earned his Bachelor of Arts degree from Stonehill College in Massachusetts and his S.T.L. from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. Father Lackenmier went on to receive a master's degree in English from the University of North Carolina in 1968 and a master's degree in Religion and Literature from the University of Chicago in 1970. He has subsequently been awarded six honorary degrees from Our Lady of Holy Cross College in New Orleans, University of Portland, Wilkes University, College Misericordia, Luzerne County Community College, and the University of Scranton.

Education has been Father Lackenmier's focus; he served first as an English teacher in Notre Dame High School in Connecticut and later as the chair of the English department at St. Peter's High School in Gloucester, Massachusetts. Father Lackenmier served as the chaplin at St. Xavier College in Chicago and later as the director of the Collegiate Formation program at Notre Dame's Moreau Seminary in Indiana. In 1974, Father Lackenmier arrived at King's College in Wilkes-Barre to serve first as the Director of Campus Ministry, then later as Director of Development, and finally as President.

Mr. Speaker, Father Lackenmier has had a distinguished career while here with us in Northeastern Pennsylvania. He serves on a long list of Boards and belongs to the prestigious Pennsylvania Society, the Knights of Columbus, and the Rotary Club, where he is a Paul Harris Fellow. He has been awarded the Distinguished Eagle Scout Award and the Wyoming Valley Interfaith Council Citation for Devoted Service to the Cause of Human Welfare and the Boy Scouts named him their Distinguished Citizen for 1994.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to work closely with Father Lackenmier during my tenure in Congress on various projects, including the Earth Conservancy, an ambitious community effort to clean up thousands of acres of mine-scarred land in the Wyoming Valley. Father Lackenmier, along with his academic colleague Dr. Christopher Breiseth of Wilkes University, provided great leadership and courage in guiding what is now an award-winning organization, especially during its tumultuous early days. I will be forever grateful for his steadfast devotion to making this dream a reality.

I will also be forever grateful for the many thoughtful gestures he provided to me personally over the years, especially his kindness to me and my family during the period following the loss of my mother.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to bring the accomplishments of this fine community leader to the attention of my colleagues. In August, Father Lackenmier will go to Salsburg, Austria to direct the University of Portland's foreign studies center. He will carry with him my sincere gratitude for a job well done and my very best wishes for continued success and fulfillment.

HONORING OLIVE BEASLEY

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today with a heavy heart, as I stand here to recognize the lifetime achievements of a woman who gave much to her family and her community, in the name of equal rights for all. On May 21, the Beasley family, local officials, civic leaders, and members of the Flint, Michigan, community will gather to honor the memory of Ms. Olive Beasley of Flint, who died May 13.

Olive Beasley was born in Chicago, and upon moving to Michigan, worked for the NAACP, where she was an integral part in the campaign in favor of Michigan's Fair Employment Act. She was later transferred to Flint, in the 1960's, and began a tenure with the Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Olive rose through the ranks, and for 16 years, headed the Civil Rights Commission's Flint office. During that time, she also began a long lasting partnership with the Flint Civil Service Commission. In fact, Olive was the Civil Service Commisison's longest serving member. Her tireless and selfless efforts to ensure that each and every person received the same opportunities for success made her known as one of the area's most staunch advocates, and in many eyes, Olive was indeed the mother of Flint's civil rights movement.

Olive was a steadfast member of the Flint community, and constantly served as a role model and counselor for people throughout the city, including many city officials, who turned to her for advice and insight. Many of Flint's most prominent public servants credit their involvement in politics and activism to Olive's influence. Her dedication to civil rights extended beyond the Civil Rights Commission, as she became a member and served on the boards of such groups as the Urban League of Flint, the Urban Coalition of Greater Flint, the Legal Aid Society, and the advisory board of WFUM, the public television station of the University of Michigan-Flint.

Mr. Speaker, the Flint area, as well as the entire state of Michigan has lost one of its strongest advocates for civil rights. Olive Beasley will always be remembered as a giant person in the community. The respect she commanded from everyone she came into contact with was tremendous. My sincerest condolences go out to her family. She will be sorely missed.

CONGRATULATING THE SUMMIT SCHOOL ON BEING NAMED A BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Summit School of Edgewater, Maryland on being named a 1998–1999 Blue Ribbon School by the United States Department of Education.

This is a special honor because The Summit School is a special institution. They strive for excellence and they have achieved that goal. The non-profit private school was created ten years ago to promote literacy among children ages 6 to 15 with unique educational needs. They opened their doors in 1989 with 25 students and now have 104 students representing six Maryland counties and the District of Columbia.

The Summit School's mission is to leave no room for failure. The teachers foster an environment where success is an attainable personal goal for each and every student. The School houses a media center, an extensive collection of books, films, tapes and computers with Internet access. In addition to their classrooms, the school has transformed a barn into intimate reading rooms. Their record of achievement thus far is reflective of their dedication to the needs of their students; since The Summit School's creation, seventy percent of the students increased their reading scores by three or more grade levels in 4 years or less. Seventy-five percent of all eighth grade graduates go on to attend public and private schools with only limited support but great success.

Mr. Speaker, The Summit School is one of those great success stories which are often overlooked. the hard working teachers and students of The Summit School have earned the right to be called ''A Blue Ribbon School.'' The Blue Ribbon Award is given to schools which display qualities of excellence, high quality teaching and up-to-date curriculum. The Summit school embodies all of these qualities and more.

The school motto, ''Teachers of Excellence'' guides the educators in this institution as they work hard to bring out the best in their students. Teachers conduct lengthy staff meetings on a regular basis to address individual student's needs. They also undergo year-round training to constantly enhance their teaching skills.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have The Summit School in my Congressional District. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the teachers, parents, students and community members who have made this school an institution that should serve as a model for schools around the state and throughout the country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MSPA CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1999

HON. CHARLES T. CANADY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, America's farming community plays a vital role in the prosperity of the nation. Our growers are facing tremendous challenges as the world economy changes—changes in international competition, environmental stewardship, and providing for the nutritional needs of the planet's growing population. Given these pressures, farmers should not have to contend with government agencies that overstep regulatory boundaries set by Congress. Unfortunately, this is precisely what is happening.

Agriculture is a labor-intensive industry, particularly during the planting and harvesting seasons. This is especially true for specialty crops such as citrus, vegetables, apples, and peaches, which are grown in many different regions of the country. Temporary and migrant workers are critical to meeting the need for farm labor. Congress, through the Migrant and Seasonal Workers Protection Act (MSPA) and other initiatives, created a national standard to ensure safe working conditions for these workers and entrusted enforcement of these laws and regulations, primarily with the Department of Labor.

The need for effective migrant worker protections is well recognized; however, current federal policies are placing an unfair burden upon agricultural employers. In 1997, the Department of Labor issued a new interpretation of the joint employer rule found in MSPA that holds farmers to a stricter standard than other employers. The new regulation is written so broadly that virtually any grower can be classified as a joint employer for liability purposes. This is in spite of several court rulings that struck down the Department's attempts to interpret the joint employer rule in such a fashion. Because the new guidelines would apply to MSPA alone, only agriculture employers are subject to them. This action, combined with overlapping housing regulations, Department of Labor initiatives to classify year-round employees as seasonal workers, onerous federal transportation insurance requirements, and other policies are selectively punitive and unfair to agriculture.

The MSPA Clarification Act, which I am introducing today, seeks to ease the inequitable burden on farmers. The bill would restore the original definition of joint employer and make other common sense changes in the regulatory structure governing agricultural labor. It would clarify that farm workers who enter into voluntary carpool arrangements should not be classified by the Department of Labor as licensed farm labor contractors in violation of MSPA; grant farmers a 10-day grace period in which they may correct MSPA violations; streamline worker housing regulations; and require federal investigators to confer with growers prior to entering the farm operation.

The MSPA Clarification Act does not weaken or do away with the basic protections afforded to migrant workers under MSPA. It merely seeks to provide for a reasonable relationship between growers and the government by returning to the original intent of Congress for MSPA. The legislation is supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation and other agricultural groups from around the country. It has the bipartisan support of many in Congress. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure a safe and productive farm workplace through this important piece of legislation.

CAPTAIN DONALD E. PETERS, USN

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American warrior, Captain Donald E. Peters, of the United States Navy.

Captain Peters will end his 30 year career with the Navy on May 28, 1999, a career that has included a host of commands. Most notably for South Texas, one of those commands included the Mine Warfare Center of Excellence at Naval Station Ingleside (NSI) on the Bay of Corpus Christi.

I was always taken with Captain Peters' style of leadership; his philosophy seemed to be: ''Shut up and do it.'' He led by example. He became involved, and stayed involved, in all the things that affected Naval Station Ingleside's mission or the sailors there.

Captain Peters' most significant accomplishment at NSI was the leadership he showed in effort and innovation, an accomplishment that won a presidential tribute for NSI. NSI was recognized with the annual Commander in Chief's Installation Excellence Award in 1997. The base was chosen from among 135 installations world-wide, and was selected from among 11 semi-finalists.

It was innovation in the following areas that attracted the award: leadership, retention of personnel, equal employment opportunity, community relations, energy conservation, pollution prevention, food service excellence and recreational activities.

Captain Peters' service and leadership was pivotal in the development of NSI. In 1992, NSI began with 500 sailors. By the end of 1996, just prior to this award, it had over 4,000 personnel, making it one of the Navy's fastest growing military facilities. Continuing that trend, by next year, NSI will have around 5,000 military and civilian employees at the base.

In 1995, Captain Peters streamlined the base's administrative staff from nine department to five departments. The move made operations more efficient and responsive to the needs of the sailors. Military organizations tend to note efficient models of success, and NSI's administrative operations were rapidly adopted Navy-wide for emulation at similar-sized installations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to a lifetime of service by Captain Donald E. Peters, a real American patriot and hero.

TRIBUTE TO WINSTON WILSON

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation, and particularly the agricultural industry, lost one of its most important assets, Winston Wilson. Winston made a difference for his family, his community, his industry and for this country.

I got to know Winston before either one of us moved to Washington. Following his service as Deputy Undersecretary of Agriculture in the Carter Administration, Winston came to my Congressional office as Administrative Assistant. His time in my office was brief—just about a year from December 1980 to November 1981—but that was plenty of time for Winston and his wife Mickie, and daughters Michelle and Missy, to endear themselves to us and to become a permanent part of our office family.

In an era where the voices of agriculture are becoming fewer and fainter, Winston stood out as one of the most effective spokespersons for the wheat farmers from whom he came. His Daddy trained him well in the fields at Quanah, giving him the kind of Texas common sense that few possess at the national level. Winston never forgot his roots, even though he traveled the world over in promotion of U.S. Agriculture.

When Winston left my office, he continued his advocacy of the industry at U.S. Wheat Associates, where he served as President until 1997. He also was Chairman of the U.S. Agricultural Export Development Council, founding member of the U.S. Grain Quality Workshop, a former President of the National Association of Wheat Growers, and a member of the U.S. Agriculture Department's Trade Advisory Committee.

More than anything, Winston committed his life to the advocacy of American wheat. He spent a great portion of his life working hard to develop overseas markets for U.S. farmers, and he developed strategies and programs to build export demand for U.S. wheat. U.S. Wheat Associates, with whom Winston had such a long relationship, is a worldwide organization supported by wheat producers in Texas and 17 other states along with USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service. Under Winston's leadership, the organization has been successful in establishing and servicing markets for up to 60 percent of the wheat produced in the U.S. and up to 80 percent of the wheat produced in Texas. The farm economy is struggling at the present time but without Winston's efforts, our struggles would be far greater.

Winston is survived by a lovely wife and daughters, who we will continue to hold in our prayers as they deal with this great loss. They and all of Winston's friends, not to be mentioning the entire wheat industry, are enormously proud of what Winston accomplished in his life. We have many fond—and often times amusing—memories of our time with Winston and we will always treasure those thoughts.

For those of us who are left behind, even the longest life of a loved one seems too short. So, in instances such as this untimely death, it is impossible not to feel cheated out of many years which we had hoped to share. We feel a great loss this week but we also celebrate the life Winston Wilson lived. He will remain in our hearts, thoughts and prayers.

CONCERN OVER SAFETY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my grave concern over the safety of medical devices and the effectiveness of government agencies directed to protect the public from unsafe products. We have all read stories in the newspapers about drugs that have been recalled because they were rushed to market without adequate testing. Many critics of our current policies argue that we have put the profit motive ahead of the health and well being of patients. I agree and have yet another example that the system may have failed to protect the health of patients.

Ethicon is a subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson and makes surgical equipment. It is the nation's largest manufacturer of sutures used for deep tissue surgeries. In 1994, Ethicon recalled over 3.5 million boxes of its Vicryl sutures because the sutures may have been contaminated during the manufacturing process. What I find especially disturbing about this episode is how the company and FDA responded to the problem.

Early in 1994, Ethicon began to use a new sterilization process for its sutures. Shortly thereafter, the company discovered that several batches were contaminated. The company decided to resterilize these sutures and then distribute them on the market. This practice continued for several months. Eventually, Ethicon stopped using the new procedure and switched to other sterilization techniques. During this time, Ethicon officials never contacted FDA to report the problem it was having with the sterilizer. Indeed, the FDA did not discover the problem until it conducted one of its routine inspections. These routine inspections occur once every two to three years.

The FDA did send a Warning Letter to Ethicon citing significant deviations from Good Manufacturing Practices. By September, Ethicon decided to recall the sutures it had produced. In other words, many months passed between the initial problems with the sterilization procedure and eventual recall. I can only speculate what would have happened, or not happened, if the FDA had not caught the problems with the sterilizer.

The next sequence of events is what I really find troubling. Ethicon issued its recall according to FDA regulations. However, the letter of the law requires only that Ethicon contact distributors and hospitals, not the surgeons who use the sutures. This means that surgeons across the nation were performing operations and using sutures that were subject to a national recall. While Ethicon followed the letter of the law, I would think that a corporation dedicated to the health of patients would have take a more aggressive stance to ensure that its sutures would be removed from supply rooms and surgical kits.

According to FDA documents only 2% of the suspect sutures were recovered in the recall. Somehow, leaving 98% of the suspect sutures on the market and unaccounted for seemed to be acceptable to the FDA. They considered the recall completed and closed in June of 1995.

Since 1994, over 100 cases of severe postoperative infections have occurred in patients who claim that the infection was due to contaminated sutures. Lance Williams of the San Francisco Examiner has written a series of articles (2/21/1999 & 2/22/1999) describing the pain and suffering that these people experienced. Ethicon has settled many of these cases out of court with exceptionally strong confidentiality requirements. Because the records are sealed, we cannot determine the potential threat to public health by examining the details of the cases.

We may never know with certainty whether the sutures were contaminated and lead to the postoperative infections. According to a letter from the FDA, ''Since typically, 20 units are tested per batch, the finding of ten units were positive results is not conclusive. It is difficult to conclude whether these results mean that the sutures were contaminated or that contamination occurred during the testing.''

Even more amazing is the fact that Ethicon destroyed all the sutures recovered in the recall. Therefore, we cannot know if the recalled sutures were contaminated or sterile.

Our constituents depend upon sound federal regulation to protect them from harm. Few of us have the technical expertise to determine which drugs are safe to treat what ails us or the ability to know how we may be infected by contaminated surgical devices. Rather, we

must depend upon a sound system of checks and oversight to ensure that the medicines and tools our physicians use are good and will not harm us. In addition, corporations that make their money selling health products have the moral and ethical obligation to take every precaution to protect consumers.

A TRIBUTE TO HENRY T. BRAUCHLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: RECIPIENT OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL AWARD

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincerest congratulations to Henry T. Brauchle Elementary School in San Antonio, TX, upon the notification of their receipt of the Blue Ribbon School Award.

Schools are awarded the Blue Ribbon School Award based on their performance in regard to several criteria, including: student focus and support; active teaching and learning; school organization and culture; challenging standards and curriculum; professional community; leadership and educational vitality; school, family, and community partnerships; and indicators of success.

Henry T. Brauchle Elementary School joins three schools in San Antonio and forty other Texas schools, all of which excelled in these areas and were rewarded with the Blue Ribbon School Award from the United States Department of Education.

To receive consideration for this prestigious award, schools must be recommended for national recognition by their individual state department of education or sponsoring agency. Nominations are then evaluated by a National Review Panel including the Department of Education, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Council for American Private Education and a select group of educators from around the country. The Secretary of Education then makes a final determination based on the recommendations of this panel.

In receiving this special recognition, I believe that Henry T. Brauchle Elementary School will inspire others to provide the level of quality education that this Blue Ribbon School Award merits. I am proud to represent a district and hail from a state that has clearly placed an emphasis on the education of our children.

EDUCATION REFORM IN JULESBURG, COLORADO

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the House of Representatives about the education reforms implemented by the Julesburg School District in Julesburg, Colorado. The district's common sense reforms emphasize personal initiative, accountability, high standards and responsiveness. I offer a recent letter for the RECORD, submitted to me by Mr. Rod Blunck, Superintendent of Schools.

Julesburg's no-nonsense, no-excuses approach to raising test scores has several steps. First, the salary schedule is based entirely on professional development. This incentive for personal initiative and improvement has a direct bearing on classroom quality. In the near future, the system will be enhanced to include extra compensation opportunities based on student achievement.

Secondly, the responsibility for student achievement is carried out by everyone in the organization, not just the teachers. Their goal, as a staff, is to become a results-oriented organization in which everyone has responsibility for the outcome.

Thirdly, the District is strengthening its accountability to the community by developing school report cards and community presentations.

I would like to summarize with a quote taken from Superintendent Blunck's letter. The letter quotes author Robert Greenleaf, ''Great ideas, it has been said, come into the world as gently as doves. Perhaps then, if we listen attentively, we shall hear, amid the uproar of empires and nations, a faint flutter of wings, the gentle stirring of life and hope.''

Accountability is a popular by-word today, yet few are willing to put this concept to the test. In Northeast Colorado, far from Denver, far from the noisy rancor of Washington, far from the proposals and speeches, there are people who are making a difference with quiet confidence.

JULESBURG SCHOOL DISTRICT RE–1,
Julesburg, Co, April 18, 1999.

Hon. BOB SCHAFFER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHAFFER: I recently had the pleasure of hearing you speak to a group of people in Julesburg during your recess. I was a member of the audience that day and I wanted to take a minute to tell you that I look forward to your leadership in the educational arena and I anticipate great possibilities for education under your administration. As I listened to you that day it is my understanding that you are the type of leader and congressman who would appreciate what I am about to share with you.

I would like to bring it to your attention that a number of the reforms that you spoke of on that day are already being implemented in the Julesburg School District.

First of all, we do not have the traditional vertical/horizontal salary schedule that is used by most districts in the State. Our schedule is entirely based upon professional development. Within the past year, we have implemented the Julesburg Professional Development Academy where teachers can take professional growth classes that in turn have a direct effect upon their salary and that are specifically directed at increased student achievement. This allows us, as a district, to tailor the classes that teachers take to insure that the requested courses correlate with our District goals of improved student achievement. Some of the courses that have been and will be offered through this program are:

Teaching reading and Writing in the content area

Using the computer to enhance instruction

The Colorado Writing Project

Working with Special Needs students in the regular classroom

Standards and Assessments—How do they affect the classroom teacher

As a result of these courses we have seen veteran teachers begin to write rubrics for their students in areas such as science, industrial arts and other curricular areas. With this type of staff development teachers have a direct responsibility for their salary increases and we as a district are able to determine what classes and professional growth opportunities align with our District goals.

I also wanted to let you know that I have had initial discussion with our teacher representatives about extra compensation opportunities based on student achievement scores. We have already determined that we will be a data-driven, result-oriented organization that is willing to compensate teaching staff for increased student achievement. I anticipate that this program will be fully funded and implemented for the 00–01 school year.

As an example, of our goal of being a result oriented organization I would like to take a minute to share with you an incident that happened after we received the results of the CSAP testing. After receiving the results we noticed that we had declined 25% in reading and 33% in writing from the previous year. Given these known facts we wrote a remediation plan to help us improve our scores. Our remediation included two clauses that I would like to bring to your attention. The first being that, ''we would offer no excuses.'' We would not discuss the test, its norming samples nor the socio-economic status of our children taking the test. In essence we accepted full responsibility for our results. The second caveat that I would like for you to know is that the remediation plan included the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education. Thus, to reiterate your point in your speech, in the Julesburg School District Re-1 accountability for student achievement is placed upon the entire organization not just the classroom teacher. In fact, our remediation plan is a public document that is open for our constituents to view. In Julesburg, Colorado, student achievement is the very crux of our accountability and our decision-making processes. We will not just collect data; our future will be driven by it.

Our next step of this accountability process is the development of a local report card. In addition to printing and publishing our local report card we are going to hold a public local ''shareholders'' meeting. At this meeting we will furnish to our community a ''state of the school'' presentation. This presentation will include fiscal information as well as student achievement information. It is our intention that this ''shareholder'' meeting will become a tradition in the Julesburg community.

Congressman Schaffer, I share this information with you because people with shared goals should communicate to maximize the positive effect for our students. As I close, I would like to share a quote with you. Robert Greenleaf, in his book Servant Leadership cites the following passage, ''Great ideas, it has been said, come into the world as gently as doves. Perhaps then, if we listen attentively, we shall hear, amid the uproar of empires and nations, a faint flutter of wings, the gentle stirring of life and hope.'' Congressman, you and I both know that the future of education is very bright in Colorado.

If I can be of any assistance to you in our shared purpose please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely,

ROD L. BLUNCK,
Superintendent of Schools.

HONORING COMMUNITY PROTESTANT CHURCH OF CO-OP CITY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a church can be the mainstay of a community, the bond which holds its people together in common purpose. In the Bronx, the Co-op City community is fortunate to have such a church, the Community Protestant Church of Co-op City.

And today I rise to congratulate that wonderful institution and its worshippers who are celebrating the church's 30th anniversary.

The Community Protestant Church started humbly enough with the organizational meeting of co-operators, as residents of Co-op City are called, in the spring of 1969. Initially services were held in the homes on a rotating basis before moving to a community room. Visiting ministers were provided by the Council of Churches on a weekly basis. The following year Temple Beth-El shared its space with the Church and the Rev. Julius Sasportas volunteered to serve as pastor.

It was on March 21, 1971, that the church was officially incorporated. That same year the church acquired and renovated space at 2053 Asch Loop North and in May of the following year moved into its new quarters. In December, 1972, the Rev. Daniel Ward was sent by the Southern Baptist Convention to serve as Pastor.

In the following years more space was acquired and in 1976 the Rev. Dr. Calvin E. Owens became the spiritual leader of the church. New land was acquired for a permanent home and in November 3, 1994, groundbreaking ceremonies were held.

I congratulate the Community Protestant Church on its 30th anniversary and wish the church many more years in the community.

IN HONOR OF ST. JOSEPH WORSHIP SPACE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the dedication of the St. Joseph Worship Space.

The Worship Space is an environment where, through private devotion and liturgical celebration, the sisters of St. Joseph may be united with God and with one another. The Worship Space provides the congregation with a much-needed facility where the sisters of St. Joseph and the community can gather to worship.

A Reservation Chapel has been set up for the use of private devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. The Reconciliation Chapel has been built and is dedicated for the reception of the Sacrament of Reconciliation. Also, seating for 250 people is available for liturgy, meetings, jubilees, Chapter assemblies, and, a gathering room has been established where the sisters can meet as well as extend their hospitality to the congregation.

My fellow colleagues, please join me honoring the dedication of the Sisters of St. Joseph Worship Space.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD ANDRUS

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate, Rev. Richard Andrus upon his retirement from the ministry. His parishioners, colleagues, family and friends will honor him with a retirement dinner at the First United Methodist Church in Mount Clemens, MI.

Born in Reese, MI, in 1937, Reverend Andrus has dedicated much of his life to serving others. He entered the ministry in 1967, and has been a leader in nine different churches throughout his exemplary career. Currently, Reverend Andrus serves at the First United Methodist Church in Mount Clemens. He has been with the church for 7 years.

Prior to his arrival at First United Methodist Church in Mount Clemens, Reverend Andrus served in several area churches, including the Warren First United Methodist Church and the Warren Wesley Church. Prior to that, he was assigned to the New Baltimore Congregation and built the Grace United Methodist Church.

Reverend Andrus is a tireless advocate for the people of Macomb County. He formed the Macomb County Ministerium and has been a member of the Macomb Emergency Shelter Coalition for the last 10 years. Reverend Andrus is also a member of the Jail Ministry, the Healthier Macomb Organization and the Rotary Club. While serving in New Baltimore, he was also the Chaplain for the Civil Air Patrol at Selfridge Air Force Base.

For more than 32 years, Rev. Richard Andrus has given his time, love and patience to the people he has served. Now, it is my honor to give Reverend Andrus my heartfelt congratulations as he celebrates his retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO GLEN OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; RECIPIENT OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL AWARD

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincerest congratulations to Glen Oaks Elementary School in San Antonio, TX, upon the notification of their receipt of the Blue Ribbon School Award.

Schools are awarded the Blue Ribbon School Award based on their performance in regards to several criteria, including: student focus and support; active teaching and learning; school organization and culture; challenging standard and curriculum; professional community; leadership and educational vitality; school, family, and community partnerships; and indicators of success.

Glen Oaks Elementary joins three other schools in San Antonio and forty other Texas schools, all of which excelled in these areas and were rewarded with the Blue Ribbon School Award from the United States Department of Education.

To receive consideration for this prestigious award, schools must be recommended for national recognition by their individual state department of education or sponsoring agency. Nominations are then evaluated by a National Review Panel including the Department of Education, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Council for America Private Education and a select group of educators from around the country. The Secretary of Education then makes a final determination based on the recommendations of this panel.

In receiving this special recognition, I believe that Glen Oaks Elementary School will inspire others to provide the level of quality education that this Blue Ribbon School Award merits. I am proud to represent a district and hail from a state that has clearly placed an emphasis on the education of our children.

EDUCATION REFORM, A RURAL PERSPECTIVE

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Gerald Keefe, Superintendent of Kit Carson School District R–1 and a member of my Fourth Congressional District Education Advisory Board. I would like to enter into the RECORD a recent letter from him on education reform.

Superintendent Keefe's common sense ideas emphasize the importance of basic values, including respect for elders, peers, teachers and community. Creating a school culture which affirms values is central not only to the success of the school but to the stability of society. To generate an environment of respect, schools should adopt high standards and good discipline measures.

Secondly, Superintendent Keefe stresses the need for local control. He believes cutting federal red tape to ensure money gets to the classroom is essential. Streamlining regulations, especially those revolving around the Individuals with Disabilities Act is also necessary to ensure each child gets the attention he or she needs to achieve.

I look forward to working with Superintendent Keefe as the Committee on Education and Workforce, of which I am a member, undertakes the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the primary source of education funding.

I would like to finish with a quote from author Robert Greenleaf: ''Great ideas, it has been said, come into the world as gently as doves. Perhaps then, if we listen attentively, we shall hear, amid the uproar of empires and nations, a faint flutter of wings, the gentle stirring of life and hope.''

In rural Colorado, far from Denver, far from the noisy rancor of Washington, far from the proposals and speeches, there are people who are making a difference with quiet confidence.

KIT CARSON SCHOOL DISTRICT R–1,
Kit Carson, CO.

Congressman BOB SCHAFFER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHAFFER, First let me commend you on the outstanding job you are

doing in reforming public education. It's a tough task as you know and I admire your efforts.

I was intrigued by the findings of the Education at a Crossroads report that highlighted characteristics of successful schools. I wholeheartedly agreed with that report and I would like to briefly touch on those findings and offer a few other comments as well.

Please understand that I offer a rural perspective on education and as such my background and feelings may differ from those of my urban colleagues. Rural Coloradans crave technology and would welcome any legislation that increases opportunities in that area for small districts. Technology of course comes with a price tag, but the return on the investment in this area makes it an acceptable cost. The SLC Universal Service Discount has been helpful but other funding opportunities would be welcomed as well.

I applaud your efforts to directly deliver dollars to the classroom instead of seeing a large portion of those funds siphoned off by the bureaucracy. You are most certainly on the right track in this area.

Schools also desperately need the ability to instill basic values in their populace. Respect for ones' elders, country, teachers, fellow students and school community are in my mind essential not only for successful schools but for a stable society as well. Court rulings and legislation restricting the rights of schools to discipline and set standards for their students have improved somewhat over the years, but more progress is still needed in this area.

Schools must be administered at the local level and even though I welcome federal funding from the budget side of the equation, that enthusiasm is tempered by the knowledge that increased federal control may also result from this arrangement.

Special Education is another topic of great concern. I feel that it has become a trap that students often do not return from. It needs to be streamlined so that the classification of students with disabilities is a true and accurate one and not just a convenient label to explain away juvenile behavior.

My Catholic school background tells me that some of these students need a paddle against their backside and not a protective label that provides a ready made excuse to justify anti-social behavior. IDEA legislation should be written to ensure that only those who have a significant need for special education services actually qualify. We are pleased, however, with the Title One program and how it operates in our district.

Vocational Education has the potential to offer a wide variety of opportunities for rural America and as such I ask that continued funding of those programs remain a priority.

After I familiarize myself with specific topics facing Congress through your Ed-Link publication I would be willing to comment on those issues in greater detail. I feel I have spoken today in a very broad sense but I hope my comments are still of some value to you as you tackle the challenges facing America's schools.

Thanks for your time and effort on behalf of the citizens of House District 4 and thanks again for the opportunity to serve on your education advisory committee.

Sincerely,

GERALD KEEFE,
Superintendent.

HONORING JUDGE ASCHER KATZ

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak in praise of a man who has devoted himself to his community. Judge Ascher Katz is not only Administrative Town Judge of Greenburgh, serving on the bench for 23 years, but a man who has immersed himself in the judicial profession as a Director of the County Magistrates Association and as a Chairman of the state Bar Association Committee on District, City, Village and Town Courts.

Judge Katz is also in Who's Who in American Law and a senior partner in his law firm. But he also serves the community as a whole; as a Charter Member of the U.S. Holocaust Commission, in the Jewish War Veterans, as a board member of the American Cancer Society, and in the Rotary and B'nai B'rith. He is a graduate of Harvard Law School and he and his wife have three daughters. On his retirement I want to thank him for all he has done for his community and to wish him the very best.

IN HONOR OF THE LADIES AUXILIARY OF THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 65th Anniversary of Chapter No. 30, The Ladies Auxiliary of the Polish Legion of American Veterans.

Organized on May 23, 1934, The Ladies Auxiliary of the Polish Legion of American Veterans was formed to work with the Post, visit the hospitalized veterans and to participate in all patriotic, civil and religious functions.

Throughout the past 65 years, the Ladies Auxiliary has worked hard for the veterans of Chapter 30 of the Polish Legion by participating in many activities, such as, parades, Memorial Masses, Civil functions, and ward treats at Wade Park and Brecksville V.A. Hospitals. This Chapter has also been involved with State and National Conversions, Veterans and Women of the Year, Evening in Warsaw, State Picnic, Night at the Races and Bowling Tournaments.

The Ladies Auxiliary is dedicated to raising money to support veterans by holding fund raisers such as, Card Parties, Bingo's, Dinners, Picnics, Bake Sales, and Poppy sales. Throughout their years of service of helping veterans, Chapter No. 30 has accumulated over 35,000 registered volunteer hours.

The members of the Chapter are proud of their Polish Heritage and culture and proud to have accomplished so much in the past 65 years. I am confident that the Polish Legion of American Veterans Ladies Auxiliary will continue their commitment to work for the veterans well in to the next millennium.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in honoring the work and dedication of The Ladies Auxiliary of the Polish Legion of American Veterans.

IN CELEBRATION OF REV. MSGR. GERARD LA CERRA

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has devoted his life to God and who has served faithfully as a priest for 30 years. Reverend Monsignor was born on March 12, 1943, and was ordained to the priesthood on May 24, 1969, after completing his seminary studies at St. John Vianney College Seminary in Miami and St. Vincent de Paul Regional Seminary in Boynton Beach, FL. He obtained a Bachelor of Arts, Master of Divinity, Master of Theology and Doctor of Sacred Theology.

His many ecclesiastical achievements began in 1969 when he was Regional Coordinator for Religious Education in Broward County. From 1970 to 1977 he was Director of the MA Program in Religious Studies. A member of the Faculty of St. Vincent de Paul Regional Seminary from 1972 to 1974, he was also Secretary of the National Conference of Diocesan Directors of Religious Education from 1974 to 1978.

In 1978 he was appointed Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Miami and served in that capacity until 1993. In addition, he was appointed Vicar General and Moderator of the Curia in 1984, a position in which he served until March 1995. In this capacity he served as Executive Director of the Ministry of General Services. Besides membership on various Archdiocesan boards and commissions, he is also Chaplain to the Daughters of Isabella.

At a Pastoral level, Msgr. La Cerra was Associate Pastor at Annunciation, Little Flower (Coral Gables) and St. James Parishes. From 1978 until May 15, 1991 he was named Pastor of St. Mary's Cathedral.

In December of 1992 he was appointed administrator of St. Timothy Parish in Miami and currently he holds the Pastoral position. He was given the title of Reverend Monsignor by the highest authority of the Catholic Church, Pope John Paul II, in September of 1995. We are fortunate to have this admirable Monsignor in South Florida and I commend Reverend La Cerra for his many accomplishments.

IN SUPPORT OF THE SCHOOL ANTI-VIOLENCE EMPOWERMENT ACT

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, juvenile crime today tends to be more violent and involves younger children than in the past. The recent tragedies involving school violence has prompted parents, teachers, administrators, and elected officials to work together and set the safety of our children as a national priority. Congress needs to get its priorities in line as well and act on legislation that would stop youth violence and make our schools safe.

According to a 1995 GAO report on school-based violence prevention programs, successful programs have the following characteristics: a comprehensive approach; an early start

and long-term commitment; strong leadership and disciplinary policies; staff development; parental involvement; interagency partnerships and community links; and a culturally sensitive and developmentally appropriate approach.

I am proud to join my colleague from New Jersey, Congressman ROBERT MENENDEZ as a cosponsor of the School Anti-Violence Empowerment Act because it includes many of the recommendations of the GAO report. This bill would:

Provide grants for school districts to hire crisis prevention counselors and fund anti-school violence initiatives. 50% of the grants would go to fund crisis prevention counselors and crisis prevention programs. 50% would go to school districts who would have the flexibility to spend these funds on projects which would best improve security at their schools.

Increased funding for COPS. 50% of the funding would be targeted for cooperative school-police partnerships to place safety officers in schools.

Implements after school and life skills programs for at-risk youth.

Directs the Department of Education to work with the Department of Justice to develop a model violence prevention program for school districts to use. In addition, the Department of Education would create a clearinghouse of anti-school violence to allow school districts to see what types of initiatives are working in other schools across the nation.

It is imperative that we implement aggressive and comprehensive approaches to keep our children safe. They deserve to have an educational experience free from fear or the threat of violence.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION MONTH

HON. ALLEN BOYD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Law Enforcement Appreciation Month to pay tribute to our nation's more than 700,000 men and women who serve our communities as law enforcement officers. We owe these individuals a tremendous debt of gratitude for the many sacrifices they make so that we might enjoy safer places to live and work.

Each day, America's law enforcement officers put their lives on the line as our first defense from violent crime. But these public servants do so much more than apprehend criminals: law enforcement officers are community activists, role models for our nation's young people and defenders of law and order.

This month, in honor of Law Enforcement Appreciation Month, I hope that Americans will take time to thank their local law enforcement officers for their dedication and hard work. We should also take this moment to remember the ultimate sacrifice made by the many officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty and pay our respects to the families these individuals have left behind. Most importantly, as this month comes to a close, we should strive to honor these brave officers each day and give them our support so that together we might make our communities an even better place to live.

CONGRATULATING LEON MEDVEDOW ON HIS 70TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to recognize Leon Medvedow as he celebrates his 70th birthday. This evening friends, family, and the New Haven community will gather to pay tribute to Leon for a lifetime of contributions to the City of New Haven.

A respected leader of the community, Leon has served the City of New Haven and its residents with an unparalleled commitment for over fifty years. His distinguished record of public service began with his election as New Haven's Old Third Ward Alderman in 1953. For decades, Leon continued his leadership and vision for New Haven in many other capacities including City Clerk, Chairman of the Board of Finance, and Chairman of the 25th Ward Democratic Committee.

Leon was honored by former President Jimmy Carter with an appointment to the Federal Small Business Administration Advisory Council in recognition of his professionalism as a small business owner. Today he remains president of Leon A. Medvedow & Associates, Inc., a printing company he built from the ground up, and continues his political career as Campaign General Chairman for New Haven's current mayor, John DeStefano, Jr. His exceptional talents remain focused on the improvement of the New Haven community.

The generosity Leon has shown throughout his life has made him a true friend to the community. He gives his seemingly endless time and energy to many community organizations. Currently, he is a member of Congregation Beth El-Keser Israel as well as the Board of Directors for the New Haven Jewish Community Center, overseeing a myriad of social programs for New Haven's Jewish community. He is a former trustee of the University of Connecticut's Alumni Association and a founder and past president of the UCONN Club. An avid basketball fan, he is a fifty year veteran basketball season ticket holder showing true loyalty and spirit for his alma mater. His passion for the sport led him to sponsor a local team, the New Haven Elms, bringing the game he loves to the City of New Haven.

After five decades of accomplishments, you wouldn't think Leon would have anything left to achieve and yet he continues to add to his extraordinary life. Just five days ago, Leon celebrated his Bar Mitzvah, fulfilling a promise he made to himself over fifty years ago when circumstances forced the ceremony to fall by the wayside.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to join Leon's wife, Phyllis, children, grandchildren, friends, and the entire New Haven community to wish my good friend a very happy 70th birthday. Leon's work and commitment have truly left this community a better place and for that we thank him.

TAIWAN'S 3RD ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in Chinese history, Taiwan held a truly democratic presidential election three years ago. As the people of Taiwan celebrate their president's third anniversary in office on May 20, 1999, I send them my congratulations.

I applaud President Lee's recent proposal that Taiwan and the mainland work together in drafting a comprehensive financial plan to help solve the current financial crisis affecting their neighbors in Asia. President Lee's innovative ideas deserve serious consideration by the mainland China authorities.

The Chinese people as well as the international Community, stand to benefit if Taiwan and China continue to have a meaningful dialogue about their hopeful unification. Taiwan and the Chinese mainland have much to learn from each other. Taiwan's economic miracle and a thriving democracy will be a useful guide to the mainland China's progress toward a free and open economic and political climate.

Congratulations to President Lee Teng-hui and best regards to Foreign Minister Jason Hu for their effort on behalf of democracy in the Pacific Rim.

IN HONOR OF BELVA DAVIS AND ROLLIN POST

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to mark the contributions of two highly respected California journalists. On Sunday, May 23, 1999, veteran Bay Area television journalists Belva Davis and Rollin Post will be honored at the San Francisco City Hall Rotunda. Their combined experience spans 70 years, a long and rich engagement with the social, cultural, and political history of the Bay Area.

Belva Davis, winner of multiple professional awards, has worked continuously on television since 1966, when she became the first African-American female reporter on the West Coast. Since that breakthrough, Belva has contributed significantly to the shape and the texture of today's television news. Her sharp, poignant reports stimulate community awareness. Her commitment is further demonstrated by deep involvement in numerous community organizations. She is also a labor activist and a visible supporter of African-American culture and history.

During her career, Belva Davis has reported for, or anchored, such public affairs programs as KRON's ''California This Week'' with Political Analyst Rollin Post, BayTV's ''Close-up with Belva Davis'' and ''Bay Area Close UP,'' KQED's ''A Closer Look'' and ''Evening Edition.'' She has also served as News Centers

4's anchor and urban affairs specialist. Most recently, she joined Congresswoman Barbara Lee's citizen delegation to report a week-long series on the people, culture and politics of Cuba and on Cuba's relationship with the United States.

Belva has received six local Emmys, the 1996 Governor's Award of the Northern California Chapter of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, a Certificate of Excellence from the California Associated Press Television and Radio Association, and the Golden Gadfly Award of the Media Alliance. She has honorary doctorates from Golden Gate University and John F. Kennedy Universities. The Media Academy of Oakland offers an annual journalism scholarship in Ms. Davis's name.

When Rollin Post announced his retirement, Belva said: ''I've been learning from Rollin Post for three decades, and we have become the real political odd couple. He has taught me how to make the most complicated political issues interesting to a sometimes disinterested electorate.''

Rollin Post has covered politics in the San Francisco Bay Area for more than 40 years. With keen understanding of public affairs, Rollin has covered 14 national political conventions. In addition to state and local political issues, Rollin reported from Cuba in 1978 on trade, tourism, and hijacking. In 1986, Rollin was on special assignment in the Philippines during the transition to democracy.

''Rollin is an old-fashioned reporter who gives you the facts and is genuinely interested in the process, the politics, the issues and ideas. He is exceptionally fair-minded and doesn't have a cynical bone in his body,'' wrote John Jacobs, political editor of McClatchy Newspapers. With a passion for politics, along with a touch of idealism, Rollin brought clarity and understanding to the political process.

Early in his career, Rollin worked for KPIX–TV, where he concentrated on politics and general assignments. He was also head writer and producer for ''The Paul Coates Report,'' a nationally syndicated television interview show. Rollin joined KQED in 1973 to work on three programs: ''A Closer Look,'' ''Newsroom,'' and ''California Tonight.'' In September 1979, Rollin joined KRON–TV, where he served as NewsCenter4's political editor for 18 years. While co-anchoring on KRON's ''California This Week.'' Rollin and Belva brought passion and insight to the issues of the day. Because of their pioneering spirit and leadership, Rollin and Belva became mentors to the next generation of journalists. Rollin speaks of Belva with great affection: ''She's a Type A; I'm the type who likes to take naps.''

Currently, Rollin hosts ''Our World This Week,'' an international news show produced by BayTV in cooperation with the World Affairs Council of Northern California.

Among his many awards, Rollin received the prestigious Broadcast Preceptor Award from the 32nd annual San Francisco State University Broadcast Industry Conference. He has also been honored by the Coro Foundation for his influential leadership in the public arena.

In celebrating the lives and careers of Belva Davis and Rollins Post, we are paying tribute to two remarkable people whom we are also fortunate to know as friends.

A TRIBUTE TO CITY YEAR SAN ANTONIO

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask unanimous consent to submit into the RECORD an article that appeared in the San Antonio Express News recently.

The article highlights City Year San Antonio, a unique public and private partnership program for the national service movement. City Year San Antonio has contributed more than 30,000 hours of service to the San Antonio community in its 3 years of service. City Year San Antonio has established a mentor and tutor program for children from elementary school through high school, including programs on the environment, domestic violence prevention, HIV/Aids awareness, and technology education.

I am proud of the work and the service that City Year provides to the San Antonio community. I look forward to the continued success and future progress of City Year San Antonio.

AMERICORPS WORKERS HELPING OTHERS CITYWIDE

(By Joseph Barrios)

. . . Nathan Miller grew up in a quiet Kansas City, Kan., neighborhood but wanted to travel and learn about different places.

He graduated from high school and then applied to serve with City Year, one of the AmeriCorps volunteer programs operating in San Antonio.

The 19-year-old Miller now works 12-hour days, sometimes tutoring West Side children as part of Project Learn to Read and sometimes working with San Antonio Alternative Housing on minor construction for elderly neighbors.

His favorite responsibility is helping teach a nighttime English class for adults seeking citizenship.

''I feel like I help them get along better in their lives,'' Miller said, ''I have a chance to meet people in drastically different life situations from mine.''

Miller is one of more than 140 full-time volunteers in the San Antonio area serving with various AmeriCorps programs. Although the volunteers are affiliated with different funding agencies, their goals are the same.

They want to tackle some of San Antonio's blight and improve people's lives. AmeriCorps is the national service program started by Congress and President Clinton in 1993. Programs can be funded with federal dollars or matched by a local ''parent'' organization.

The George Gervin Youth Center has 20 full-time AmeriCorps volunteers and Habitat for Humanity has a dozen full-time volunteers working in San Antonio.

Miller works for the 10-year-old City Year program, which has 70 AmeriCorps volunteers and works out of an office downtown.

An average day for h im varies somewhat from Rudy Beltran, 23, a full-time volunteer with the Just Serve AmeriCorps program run by San Antonio Fighting Back of the United Way.

Beltran, based at the Barbara Jordan center of the city's East Side, is a full-time student at the University of Texas at San Antonio. He also teaches an evening, English-as-a-Second-Language class at Highlands High School and tutors high school students in English.

Recently, Beltran helped several students prepare for the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Test.

''I definitely get a lot out of it,'' Beltran said. ''A couple of students came up to me and said it really helped them. They thought they had passed it.''

Fighting Back, a substance abuse, crime and violence prevention and community development program, has 60 full-time volunteers. They are recruiting more than 100 high school students for a new part-time service program in San Antonio.

City Year and Southside High School recently started a part-time volunteer program for students called City Heroes.

Most of the full-time volunteers started their year of service in August and will finish in June.

Volunteers operate primarily on the city's West, East and South sides but can participate in programs anywhere in the city, said Scott Hirsch of the Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service. Volunteers themselves come from all areas of town and sometimes—like Miller—from out of town.

Hirsch said the commission is working on guidelines to evaluate how effective volunteers throughout Texas have been in the past five years since the AmeriCorps program was founded. Overall, the various volunteer programs are going strong.

Hirsch added that associations with other programs can cause confusion. ''Sometimes, when you're at a cocktail party and you mention you work for AmeriCorps, people think it no longer exists,'' Hirsch said.

Some of the benefits to the program are intangible, said Bill Blair, director at the George Gervin Youth Center.

Regularly, when volunteers are painting a house or cleaning up an abandoned lot, neighbors will stop by and offer their help.

''I say, 'Sure, come on and join us.' You can't beat that sort of thing,'' Blair said.

Neighbors can also submit ideas for service projects to any of the programs like City Year or Fighting Back.

AmeriCorps volunteer benefits can include health insurance, a weekly stipend, uniforms and a post-service education award of $4,725 that can pay for school or student loans. The program requires a minimum of 1,700 hours a year from volunteers.

This fall, Miller will begin college in Vermont. He said his favorite times as a volunteer come when someone thanks him for work that an AmeriCorps volunteer did.

''I have people come up to me all the time. They see your shirt and want to thank you,'' Miller said. ''They can be thanking you for something that happened three years or three days ago.''

WORKING ON A SOLUTION

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, in the matter of the Columbine Massacre, I hereby submit to the RECORD a statement issued by the Colorado State Board of Education.

These remarks, I commend to my colleagues upon consideration of various proposals pending this Congress. Clearly, the thoughts offered by the Colorado State Board of Education, signed a thoughtful approach to any legislative initiatives we might consider here and establish a reasonable framework from which to view our responsibilities.

The statement of the Board is as follows:

WHAT IS TO BE DONE: SEARCHING FOR MEANING IN OUR TRAGEDY

In the aftermath of the most terrible day in Colorado education, when the pain and

grief of those who have suffered loss is beyond what words can express, all of us are asking the questions: ''Why? How did this happen? What can we do to keep it from happening again?'' The State Board of Education, adhering to its Constitutional responsibility, joins the Columbine community and the rest of the State in seeking the lessons that may be drawn from the awful tragedy of April 20, 1999.

As we seek the why behind this infamous event, we must find answers beyond the easy and obvious. How weapons become used for outlaw purposes is assuredly a relevant issue, yet our society's real problem is how human behavior sinks to utter and depraved indifference to the sanctity of life. As our country promotes academic literacy, we must promote moral literacy as well, and it is not children, but adults in authority who are ultimately responsible for that.

Our tragedy is but the latest—albeit the most terrifying and costly—of a steadily escalating series of schoolhouse horrors that have swept across the nation. The senseless brutality of these calamities clearly reveals that a dangerous subculture of amoral violence has taken hold among many of our youth.

We cannot pretend that we have not known about this subculture or about those elements of the mass media, from films to video games, from which it derives sustenance. Further, we must honestly admit that essentially we have done nothing to prevent these cultural cancers from spreading through our schools and society.

How often have adults questioning highly dubious youth speech, dress, entertainment, or behavior been decried as old-fashioned, or worse, attacked as enemies of individual expression? How often have parents or teachers reporting alarming predictors of violent behavior been told nothing can be done until someone actually commits a crime? So we do nothing, and then look upon the ruin of so many young lives while hearing those saddest of words: Too Late.

As a Board we believe, with Edmund Burke, that all that is required for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing. We further believe that society must act now before it is too late for more innocent children. We also recognize that failing to act shall make us all accomplices in such future tragedies as may engulf our schools.

Accordingly, we make the following recommendations for renewing that unity and strength of purpose that has historically bonded our schools, our homes, and our society.

I. IN OUR SCHOOLS

While our schools are at once the mold and the mirror of the democratic society they serve, they are not democracies themselves. Schools are founded and controlled by adults for the benefit of children.

The adults accountable for running schools must have the courage, ability, and authority to establish and maintain a safe and orderly environment maximally consonant with the purposes of schooling, i.e. the fullest possible achievement for every single child.

We recognize that in every time, and every society, there is tension between liberty and license, and frankly, we believe that the pendulum has swung too far in the direction of the latter.

Be that as it may, our school children should not be routinely victimized by the quarrels of the wider society. They deserve the shielding mantle of adult authority while they form and strengthen themselves for their own entry into adulthood.

We also recognize the routine cruelty and torment that can occur among adolescents in an unchecked peer culture. This is all the more reason for a strong and vigilant adult authority to prevent victimization of the vulnerable.

We know this won't be easy, and that it must begin with a decisive rollback of those harmful precedents that have so undermined the confident and successful exercise of legitimate adult authority upon which every good school depends.

We must stop disrespecting those who urge discipline and values. We must recognize that their cry is the legitimate voice of the American people. We must listen to respected voices—liberal and conservative—like Albert Shanker and William Bennett—when they tell us flat out that our ''easy'' schools will never get better or safer without a massive renewal of their values, discipline, and work ethic.

Finally, we must remember, respect, and unashamedly take pride in the fact that our schools, like our country, found their origin and draw their strength from the faith-based morality that is at the heart of our national character.

Today our schools have become so fearful of affirming one religion or one value over another that they have banished them all. In doing so they have abdicated their historic role in the moral formation of youth and thereby alienated themselves from our people's deep spiritual sensibilities. To leave this disconnection between society and its schools and unaddressed is an open invitation to further divisiveness and decline. For the sake of our children, who are so dependent upon a consistent and unified message from the adult world, we must solve these dilemmas. Other civilized nations have resolved divisions that are far more volatile. Surely, America can do as well.

II. IN OUR HOMES

We routinely preach about cooperation between home and school, yet too often our actions tell a different story. Too often, we undermine rather than support the values and authority of parents. Too often, we find them handy scapegoats for our own failures.

When countless surveys show our parents to be deeply concerned about the state of public education, something is seriously wrong and we ignore this at our peril.

This alienation has as much to do with parental concerns about safety and values as it does with persistent learning deficiencies. If we are to ask parents to use their authority to support those educating their children, then educators must use their authority to support the work and values of parents. Some schools are already doing this, but sadly in too many instances, these historic bonds of trust and mutual support have frayed badly or broken altogether.

We deeply believe that without a unified adult world, our children will continue to suffer the consequences of our doubts and divisions.

III. IN OUR SOCIETY

The connection between murder in our schools and elements of the mass culture is now beyond dispute. Only those who profit from this filth, and their dwindling bands of apologists deny the evidence of violence, hatred, and sadism routinely found in films, video games, and the like.

We believe it is no longer acceptable for an entertainment industry that spends billions to influence the behavior of children to deny that their efforts have consequences or that they have no accountability for sowing the seeds of tragedy.

If a utility poured sewage into our streets, an outraged public would not tolerate it. Should those responsible for the stream of moral sewage entering our homes and communities be any less accountable?

If we deem it proper to boycott, withhold public investments, and otherwise impose an economic penalty on companies for their labor practices, environmental policies, or countries in which they operate, how could we fail to move at least as aggressively against those who create, promote, and distribute media and other products for which there is no imaginable justification.

In closing we should be reminded that throughout our history our people have demonstrated a remarkable capacity for moral courage and self-renewal in times of great danger and challenge.

Perhaps across the ages we can hear the timeless words of Abraham Lincoln, and, applying them to our own circumstance renew his pledges, ''that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom''.

With history as our judge, let us go forward together with a strong and active faith.

Authorized at a Special Meeting of the State Board of Education, April 21, 1999 and issued by our hand in the city of Denver, Colorado, at the regular meeting May 13, 1999.

Clair Orr, Chairman, 4th Congressional District; Pat M. Chlouber, Vice Chairman, 3rd Congressional District; Ben Alexander, Member-At-Large, John Burnett, 5th Congressional District; Randy DeHouff, 6th Congressional District; Patti Johnson, 2nd Congressional District; Gully Stanford, 1st Congressional District; William J. Moloney, Commissioner of Education.

HONORING H. STEPHEN LIEB

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give tribute and thanks to Stephen Lieb who is retiring as Director of the Northeast Bronx Education Park. For many years he taught our children, before rising to administrative posts in the school district.

He was born and raised in New York City, educated in its public schools and has a B.S. from Hunter College, his M.S. from Fordham University and additional graduate work at Pace University and the University of Washington.

His initial assignment was teaching science at J.H.S. 163. In 1970 he transferred to I.S. 180 as Science Chairman and he was named Planetarium Director when that facility was completed.

Among his accomplishments was the full air conditioning of the five schools in the Park, and the installation of the data communications system. He has worked for 30 years with the Greater New York Council, Boy Scouts of America and takes 30 fatherless boys to camp every year. He also founded a scholarship program. In his retirement as Director of the Education Park, he leaves a hole that will be difficult to fill. I congratulate him for all of his good work and wish him the very best in retirement.

IN HONOR OF THE SALVATION ARMY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Salvation Army's Harbor Light Complex in the Greater Cleveland area on their 50th Anniversary.

The Harbor Light Complex has a strong commitment to helping those in the greater Cleveland area who are less fortunate. Through this institution, programs of Correction, Emergency Sheltering Services, Food Services, New Hope Citadel Corp., Residential Services, as well as Detox & Substance Abuse Programs help people deal with difficulties they face and gives them the courage and the tools to fight through them.

The Harbor Light Complex continues to provide in its historically established tradition the caring services needed to offer comfort, shelter sustenance, education and hope to the Greater Cleveland Community. The Salvation Army's continuing commitment to serving a diverse group of people in need in the Greater Cleveland area, sets an example of how caring individuals can change the world one life at a time.

I would like to recognize the Salvation Army's Harbor Light Complex for 50 years of quality service. They have truly met the needs of those who do not have a voice in our community.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT FOR THE HEALTH CARE WORKER NEEDLESTICK PREVENTION ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues, MARGE ROUKEMA, GEORGE MILLER, and ROB ANDREWS to introduce the Health Care Worker Needlestick Prevention Act, a bill to prevent dangerous, costly and preventable needlestick injuries to our nation's health care workers.

For far too long, we have stood by and watched as health care workers suffer needlestick and sharps injuries in our nation's hospitals and health care system. According to a 1997 report by the Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA), approximately 800,000 hospital-based workers are injured annually from accidental needlesticks. Many of those injuries infections from bloodborne diseases, the worst of which include HIV/AIDS, and Hepatitis B & C.

OSHA estimates that approximately 16,000 needlesticks are contaminated by the HIV/AIDS. As of December 1998, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) had documented 54 cases of HIV seroconversions from needlesticks and more than 110 ''possible'' cases among U.S. healthcare workers. In addition, according to the International Health Care Worker Safety Center at the University of Virginia, there are an estimated 18 to 35 new occupational HIV infections of health care workers occurring from accidental needlesticks each year.

These injuries are largely preventable through use of newer technologies that use engineering devices to minimize accidental needlesticks. Hundreds of hospitals across the country have already converted to the use of these devices, but there are still thousands that haven't done so. Our legislation would make such safety devices the norm rather than the exception.

The Health Care Worker Needlestick Prevention Act is modeled after a California state law. Last year, California became the first state in the nation to require needlestick protections. The legislation was signed into law by then-Governor Pete Wilson and was endorsed by a wide coalition including the California Health Care Association (the state hospital trade association), Kaiser Permanente, health care workers, and labor unions alike.

The California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA) has estimated that each needlestick injury costs between $2,234 and $3,832 for treatment, testing, and prophylactic drugs. Cal-OSHA has also estimated that the California safe needles and sharps law, passed last year and effective this August, will save affected businesses and facilities over $100 million per year in excess of the cost of the new devices. Similar bills are now pending in state legislatures across the country.

While states are stepping to the plate to address this pressing concern, this is a national crisis and it deserves a national solution. The Health Care Worker Needlestick Prevention Act would amend OSHA's bloodborne pathogens standard to require the use of safe needle technology as the means for preventing needlestick injuries. It is a real-life solution that recognizes that these technologies are still not available or appropriate for use in every situation. To that end, it includes an exception process if the device would interfere with patient or worker safety, interfere with the success of a medical procedure, or if no such device is available in the marketplace. It would also require stricter reporting of needlestick injuries and creates a new clearinghouse on safer needle technology within NIOSH (National Institute for Occuaptional Safety and Health) to collect the data and to assist employers with training curriculum and other advice on available technologies.

We stand here today with broad-based support similar to that which made the California law possible. Our legislation is endorsed by numerous organizations including: the Service Employees International Union; the American Nurses Association; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Kaiser Permanente; The Consumer Federation of America; Becton Dickinson, a major medical device manufacturer; and the Emergency Nurses Association, the American Public Health Association, and AIDS Action.

It is time to take the appropriate step of protecting our health care workers. They simply should not be forced to risk their lives while trying to save ours.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank Congresswoman ROUKEMA for her leadership on this issue and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in support of this crucial effort.

Attached is a more detailed summary of the bill.

HEALTH CARE WORKER NEEDLESTICK PREVENTION ACT OF 1999, INTRODUCED BY REPS. PETE STARK AND MARGE ROUKEMA

BILL SUMMARY

Purpose: This bill would correct a dangerous problem in today's health care system in which health care workers suffer preventable needlestick injuries because appropriate technologies to prevent such injuries are not being utilized.

The bill would require the use of engineered safety mechanisms for needles and sharps in the health care arena to protect health care workers from life-threatening injuries caused by needlesticks and other sharps injuries.

OSHA Amendment: The bill amends OSHA's bloodborne pathogens standard to require that employers utilize needleless systems and sharps with engineered sharps protections to prevent the spread of bloodborne pathogens in their workplace.

In carrying out this requirement, employers are to work with direct care health care workers who use such devices to ensure the appropriate selection of technology.

Exceptions: Safe needle technology will not be immediately, universally available and appropriate for all uses in the health care arena. Recognizing this fact, the bill provides for an exceptions process if an employer can demonstrate circumstances in which the technology: Does not promote employee safety; interferes with patient safety; interferes with the success of a medical procedure; and is not commercially available in the marketplace.

Exposure Control Plan: Employers would develop written exposure control plans to identify and select existing needleless systems and sharps with engineered sharps protections and other methods of preventing the spread of bloodborne pathogens.

Sharps Injury Log: While we know that more than 800,000 health care workers suffer needlesticks every year, there is currently no uniform collection of data on sharps injuries to enable these incidents to be tracked, learned from, and prevented.

The bill would create a sharps injury log that employers would keep containing detailed information about any sharps injuries that occur.

Training: Employers would be required to adequately train direct care health care workers on the use of needleless technologies and systems with engineered sharps protections.

National Clearinghouse on Safer Needle Technology: The bill would establish a new clearinghouse within the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to collect data on engineered safety technology designed to help prevent the risk of needlesticks and other sharps injuries. NIOSH would have access to the sharps injury logs in order to carry out these duties. The clearinghouse would also create model training curriculum for employers and health care workers. In order to carry out these new tasks, the institute is authorized $15 million in new funding.

Application to Medicare Hospitals: HHS would promulgate new regulations regarding conditions of participation in Medicare for those hospitals that are not covered by OSHA so that all hospitals across the country would, in effect, be covered by these new bloodborne pathogens requirements.

SIKH JOURNALIST GRILLED BY INDIAN INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS—THERE IS NO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN INDIA

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, India claims that it is democratic, but one of the cornerstones of democracy is freedom of the press. A recent event shows us again that there is no freedom of the press in India.

On May 11, Sukhbir Singh Osan, a journalist who has written for many papers in India and runs the website Burning Punjab, was interrogated by Indian intelligence officers for 45 minutes after he returned from a trip to the United States, Canada, and Great Britain. He came to cover the big Sikh marches in Washington, New York, and Toronto and to deliver a speech on the persecution of Christians that has been going on since Christmas Day.

Apparently, this coverage upset the Indian oligarchy. The intelligence officers who came to Mr. Osan's house said that they had ''specific instructions from Delhi.''

Mr. Osan has been targeted by the Indian government before. He was denied a degree he earned. His telephone has been bugged and he has received threats. He is not the only one. Reporters who exposed government abuses have received telephone threats. One reporter was told that ''it is dangerous to report against the government.'' That was under a Congress Party government. The government controls the television and radio as well as Press Trust of India (PTI) and United News of India (UNI). How can you have a democracy if the government controls the media and tries to intimidate reporters who report news that they don't want to come out?

I thank my friend Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, for bringing this story to my attention. His office issued an excellent press release on the grilling of Mr. Osan, which I believe will be very informative to my colleagues.

How can the United States continue to support a country that claims to be democratic but does not allow freedom of the press, kills tens of thousands over their religious beliefs, joins with the world's most notorious tyrants at the United Nations against the U.S., celebrates the anniversary of its nuclear explosion, routinely violates basic human rights, and will not even allow a simple vote on the political future of the minority nations seeking their freedom? Why should such a country be a major recipient of American aid and trade? We should stop our aid to India until it respects basic human rights and we should publicly declare our support for the 17 freedom movements within India's borders.

I place the Council of Khalistan's press release on the grilling of Mr. Osan into the RECORD.

JOURNALIST GRILLED BY INDIAN INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS

THERE IS NO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN INDIA

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 12—Sikh journalist Sukhbir Singh Osan, who runs the website Burning Punjab, was interrogated by Indian intelligence officers after returning from a trip to the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, where he covered the Sikh 300th anniversary marches in Washington, New York, and Toronto and made a speech on ''Recent Attacks on the Christian Community in India.''

Intelligence officers grilled Mr. Osan at his home yesterday for over 45 minutes. They claimed that ''we have specific instructions from Delhi.'' Mr. Osan stated that this action is ''true to their anti-Sikh stance.''

Mr. Osan has previously had his telephone bugged by the Indian government. He was denied a degree he earned because he has exposed corruption, atrocities, and acts of terrorism by the Indian government. He has received anonymous telephone threats.

''The interrogation of Sukhbir Singh Osan shows that there is no freedom of the press in India,'' said Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan. ''Both Press Trust of India (PTI) and United News of India (UNI) are completely controlled by the Indian government,'' Dr. Aulakh stated. Noting that Mr. Osan has met lawmakers in both the U.S. and Canada, Dr. Aulakh said that ''any more harassment of Mr. Osan will cause India big trouble.''

''Reporters who put out information contrary to the government line are often threatened and harassed as Mr. Osan was yesterday,'' he said. ''Reporters who have exposed government corruption and brutality have received anonymous telephone calls telling them that 'it is dangerous to report against the government,'" Dr. Aulakh said.

Mr. Aulakh urged the United States government to stop supporting the government of India. ''India has joined with China, Russia, Cuba, and Libya in action against the U.S. at the United Nations,'' he noted. ''India tried to build a security alliance against the United States. It recently celebrated the anniversary of its nuclear explosion and reiterated its refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. India is a major human-rights violator. Amnesty International has not been allowed into the country since 1978,'' he pointed out. ''Yet it remains one of the top recipients of U.S. aid.''

The Indian government has murdered more than 250,000 Sikhs since 1984, over 200,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1988, more than 60,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988, and tens of thousands of Assamese, Manipuris, Tamils, Dalit ''untouchables,'' and others. Tens of thousands of Sikhs languish in Indian jails without charge or trial, some since 1984.

''Why should the American taxpayers be forced to support a country where there is no religious freedom, no freedom of the press, and no human rights for minorities?'' he asked. ''Why should America support a country that is so vehemently anti-American?'' he said. ''The time has come for America to defend freedom in South Asia by defending Mr. Osan and other journalists, by cutting off aid to India, and by supporting the 17 freedom movements within India's artificial borders,'' Dr. Aulakh said.

TRIBUTE TO WILLENE C. NESBITT

HON. ROBIN HAYES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Willene C. Nesbitt of Concord, North Carolina for her commitment and dedication to her community.

On Saturday, May 22, 1999, Mrs. Nesbitt will be celebrating her retirement from Northeast Medical Center in Concord. Mrs. Nesbitt has worked for more than 50 years at Northeast Medical Center, formerly Cabarrus Memorial Hospital, and has helped it grow and change into the fine regional hospital it is today.

The celebration on Saturday is not only a retirement celebration, but also a show of appreciation for all of her efforts in the community.

Mrs. Nesbitt has been active in the Shankletown-Sidetown Community Organization. She was one of the founding board members of this organization.

One project that she recently spearheaded was gathering members of the community and surrounding areas together to help rebuild an elderly woman's dilapidated home to make it liveable again. Her selfless acts of kindness have brought so many in our community a better life.

Mrs. Nesbitt and her husband, John C. Nesbitt, have also been active in their church, Gilmore Chapel AME Zion Church.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Willene Nesbitt in her retirement from the hospital, but hope that her community activity will only escalate with her new found free time. She truly brings a smile to the faces of the people she touches and improves the quality of life for everyone in Cabarrus County.

HONORING MRS. ELLA SCHWARTZ

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with sadness to remember and honor a legendary figure from my district, Mrs. Ella Schwartz. She passed away last week at the age of 80. Ella Schwartz was an icon of the city of Torrance and she has left a lasting impression on the city she called home.

Ella Schwartz was the daughter of Sam Levy, a founding father of the city of Torrance. The Sam Levy Department Store was the premier place to shop in the 1940's and 1950's. Following the death of her father in 1965, Mrs. Schwartz assumed control of the department store and in 1988 she transformed it into a women's boutique, naming it Ella's.

Ella Schwartz was actively involved in the community. She will be forever be linked to the revitalization of downtown Torrance. She was devoted to the city of Torrance, becoming a symbol of the city's heart and center.

Ella was a permanent fixture at her boutique until law year when she decided that it was time to retire and spend more time with her grandson. She was 79.

People will remember her fiery spirit and her dedication to improving the city of Torrance. She will be missed but not forgotten.

HONORING SHARI G. LAMBERT

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a woman who has dedicated herself to improving the quality of life in my

hometown of Flint, Michigan. On May 21, 1998, Mrs. Shari Lambert will be the guest of honor as family and friends gather to celebrate her retirement after 25 years of dedicated public service.

Shari Lambert has never once hesitated to reach out and help someone in need. Since 1974, she has worked for the Michigan Employment Security Commission, now known as the Michigan Unemployment Agency. Most recently, Shari worked as Manager for the Agency's Flint branch.

For 25 years, Shari has worked with thousands of individuals, ensuring that each one was set on the road toward prosperous and gainful employment. Her dedication to being an active public servant set a positive tone in each branch of the Michigan Employment Security Commission, as well as its successor, the Michigan Unemployment Agency. She has served as a role model for efficiency, compassion, and fairness. Many Michigan residents owe their ability to provide for themselves and others to Shari's influence.

In addition to her work with the Unemployment Agency, Shari serves as a member of several Workforce Development Boards, such as the Career Alliance Board, Greater Pontiac Area Consortium Board, and Macomb/St. Clair Board. She can also be found working with groups within Macomb County such as Growth Alliance, the Private Industry Council, the School to Work/Tech Prep Board, the Human Services Coordination Body, the Macomb County Economic Club, and the Central Macomb Chamber of Commerce. She has also been a member of the Flint Chamber of Commerce, and is a past president of the Michigan chapter of the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security.

Mr. Speaker, many people, not only in the city of Flint, have been granted a new lease on life because of the dedication of Shari Lambert. As it is our duty to preserve and protect the quality and dignity of life for our constituents, let us remember that our task is made easier by people like Shari. I ask my colleagues in the 106th Congress to join me in acknowledging the accomplishments of Shari Lambert. We owe her a debt of gratitude.

A TRIBUTE TO REVITALIZATION OF THE SOUTHERN AREA OF THE SLOPE (ROSAS) ON THE OCCASION OF ITS COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARDS BANQUET

HON. ANTHONY D. WEINER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to pay tribute to Revitalization of the Southern Area of the Slope (ROSAS) on the occasion of its Community Service Awards Banquet.

The members of ROSAS have long been known for their commitment to community service and to enhancing the quality of life for all New York City residents.

This banquet is not only a festive happening, it is a chance for all of us to celebrate and pay tribute to a group of individuals who have dedicated their lives to helping others. This year's honorees truly represent the best of what our community has to offer.

Simon Brooking is the President of the 6th Avenue & 15th Street Community Garden and a former ROSAS board member. He is a staunch advocate for community green spaces, composting and ROSAS' anti graffiti campaign. His painting company, The Flying Scotsman, helped art teacher Alison Conte and local children create a mural on 14th Street and 5th Avenue in Brooklyn. Simon and his wife Sheila have built a partnership with the Sierra Club to promote organic waste composting. Perhaps the Garden's greatest gift is providing area children with the opportunity to express themselves through their gardening and artistic talents. The Children's Creative Workshop, now entering its fourth year, is one such program that is available to Park Slope's children.

Carolyn Greer has spent the last four and a half years with New York State Senator Marty Markowitz and has lived up to the Senator's mandate that his staff be responsive to the needs of his constituents. As the Senator's Director of Community Programming, she handled complaints, responded to issues and identified and addressed community needs. Carolyn Greer is a founding member of South Brooklyn Hockey, which has ice and roller teams, and serves on the board of the Russian American Kids Circus. She is the author of the PS 321 Newsletter and is the founder of the PS 321 Holiday Helper Project, an annual drive for new clothes that are donated anonymously to several hundred needy public school children.

As ROSAS' Co-President in 1993 and 1994, Roger C. Melzer documented the extensive damage being done to Prospect Park by unrestricted barbequing, organized community meetings to discuss the problem and worked to have regulations and enforcement imposed. He remains a strong advocate for more enforcement, better maintenance and more capital funding to preserve the natural aspects of Prospect Park. As a twenty-year resident of Park Slope, Roger has been a regular participant at Community Boards 6 and 7 meetings where his focus has been to ensure that city agencies provide service to residents in Park Slope and Windsor Terrace and to facilitate new initiatives as a means of resolving neighborhood problems.

All of today's honorees have long been known as innovators and beacons of good will to all those with whom they come in contact. Through their dedicated efforts, they have each helped to improve my constituents' quality of life. In recognition of their many accomplishments on behalf of my constituents, I offer my congratulations on their being honored by ROSAS.

INTRODUCTION OF MEDICARE MODERNIZATION #4 MEDICARE PERMANENT COMPETITIVE BIDDING AUTHORITY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Representative McDERMOTT, I am pleased today to introduce the fourth bill in my Medicare modernization package: permanent competitive bidding authority. As with the other bills in this series, competitive bidding will save money for Medicare, while also improving the quality of health services provided to Medicare beneficiaries. These modernizations are a template for meaningful Medicare reform that allows us to avoid radical, untried theories that could endanger the program's future.

The promise of managed care is coordinated, comprehensive, cost-effective health services. Medicare+Choice plans are not currently living up to this promise. For some time now, Medicare has over-paid Medicare+Choice plans. Current overpayments are estimated to cost Medicare and taxpayers $2 to $3 billion per year. This is because Medicare+Choice has attracted only the healthiest beneficiaries—people who would have cost next to nothing had they stayed in the traditional fee-for-service plan—leaving a much sicker population in the traditional program.

In addition, managed care plans are disenrolling beneficiaries who need expensive services, such as heart surgery, and then re-enrolling the beneficiary after the fee-for-service plan has paid the bill. The OIG estimates that in 1991 through 1996, Medicare spent $224 million for inpatient services furnished to beneficiaries within three months of their disenrollment. Had these beneficiaries not disenrolled, Medicare could have spent only $20 million in capitation payments. That's $204 million in savings Medicare could have realized. ''Cherry picking'' such as this has forced fee-for-service costs to rise.

Because Medicare+Choice payments are tied to fee-for-service cost, rather than the actual cost of providing care to beneficiaries enrolled in managed care, Medicare continues to over-pay health plans. De-linking Medicare+Choice payments from the fee-for-service program will enable Medicare to pay a more realistic price for managed care services. Fostering greater competition through competitive bidding will help to achieve this goal.

Competitive bidding would take place in both the managed care and fee-for-service Medicare programs. Under this bill, the Secretary of DHHS would have the explicit authority to select items, services, and geographic areas to be included in a bidding or negotiation process based on the availability of providers and the potential to achieve savings. To protect quality, the bill would require that providers meet specified quality standards in order to participate in the bidding process.

Competitive bidding is almost universal throughout the private sector and in many other areas of government contracting. However, HCFA is still forced to go through tortured demonstration processes to ''test'' this basic tool of capitalism.

At this moment, HCFA is trying to get three competitive bidding demonstration projects off the ground: two Medicare+Choice demonstrations, one in Phoenix and one in Saint Louis; and one fee-for-service demonstration for durable medical equipment (DME). Unfortunately, the industry is blocking HCFA's attempt because they know that competitive bidding will force them to charge a more realistic price. This is not about cutting services to beneficiaries or lowering quality standards. It's about helping the taxpayer so that society has the money to improve Medicare for everyone while extending the life of the program. Competitive bidding can work. It has worked in the public and private sectors for centuries. We should make it work for Medicare too.

As we search for ways to secure and improve Medicare, it is appropriate to consider increasing the efficiency of the program through competition. Introducing competition into the managed care equation will achieve greater efficiencies, higher quality, and cost savings, and will enable Medicare managed care to live up to its promise.

Following is a portion of an interview from the May/June 1999 issue of Health Affairs by Princeton professor Uwe Reinhardt with HHS Secretary Donna Shalala which describes how different it has been to make progress on this simple, basic, free enterprise approach to health care:

THE CONTROVERSY OVER COMPETITIVE BIDDING

Reinhardt: In my time, Medicare has been a pioneer in innovating with the DRG (diagnosis-related group)—based hospital payment system, which has been copied worldwide, and the Medicare physician fee schedule, which has been copied by private American payers. If we are ever going to really test managed competition by having health plans compete fairly for enrollees, only HCFA (the Health Care Financing Administration) can actually show the way, because the private sector has not yet done it so far. Do you share that view?

Shalala: I share that view, but the political system has to buy into it. For instance, we've announced a competitive-bidding demonstration in which we have some consensus among the experts as to where we ought to go and how to organize our experiment with managed competition. Phoenix and Kansas City are our two sites.

Reinhardt: HCFA has attempted such demonstrations in Baltimore and Denver but was forced to abandon both efforts by private interests that were opposed to them.

Shalala: Yes, in Denver we had bipartisan support to try it. But when we got specific and picked the places, we immediately had political opposition. However, Congress directed us (in the Balanced Budget Act [BBA] of 1997) to try again. We set up an advisory panel on which all of the political interests were represented. And now we're proceeding again.

Reinhardt: I suppose that we should never expect the managed care industry to voluntarily acquiesce to a competitive-bidding process because people instinctively don't like to compete. They prefer administered prices because such prices can be manipulated politically. Who is it, in general, that opposes competitive bidding?

Shalala: One source of opposition is the managed care industry. The companies in that industry believe that such a process will undermine their profits. So the private sector—the famed competitive marketplace—doesn't want competition. They keep saying things like, ''Health care is different; we can't predict our costs.'' We have to have a system that is more nimble, more flexible. Managed care plans would not oppose a competitive-bidding process if they could modify the package of benefits. But if HCFA locks them into a benefits package, they want to be able to negotiate the price, rather than making competitive bids.

INDIAN INTELLIGENCE INTERROGATES REPORTER AFTER VISIT TO AMERICA

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, India has once again shown true nature of its democracy by grilling a reporter who visited the United States. Journalist Sukhbir Singh Osan has exposed the corruption and the atrocities of the Indian government in newspapers and through his website, Burning Punjab. He visited the United States, Canada, and Great Britain to cover the Sikh 300th anniversary marches and speak on human rights. He met with my colleague from Indiana, Mr. Burton, and with a minister in the Canadian government. Their pictures appear on his website.

Mr. Osan returned to his home in Chandigarh before Indian intelligence officers showed up at his house to interrogate him for 45 minutes, claiming they were acting on instructions from the central government in New Delhi. This is not the first time the Indian government has gone after Mr. Osan. He has received anonymous threats and has been denied a law degree that he worked hard to earn because he had written news stories that the Indian government didn't like.

Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, brought this to my attention. I understand that Dr. Aulakh has notified the Committee to Protect Journalists in New York of Mr. Osan's mistreatment.

What happened to Mr. Osan is not just an isolated incident. Other reporters have been threatened for reporting stories critical of the Indian government. Clearly, there is no press freedom in India despite its loud and frequent boasts that it is ''the world's largest democracy.''

Does a democratic country harass reporters for covering stories that the government doesn't like? Would a democratic country incite 17 freedom movements within its borders? India is a democracy only for the Brahmin ruling class. It is also anti-American, working with such models of democracy as China, Libya, and Cuba to undermine U.S. foreign policy. It approached China and Russia trying to build a triangular ''security alliance'' against America.

We should treat India as we do other violators of religious freedom. That will help to end the kind of abuse that Mr. Osan and his fellow Sikhs suffer and bring real freedom to all the nations and peoples living within India's Borders.

I am placing the Burning Punjab story on Mr. Osan's harassment into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES GRILL SUKHBIR SINGH OSAN

Chandigarh.—True to their anti-Sikh stance, the Indian Intelligence Agencies have again started harassment of innocents. Punjab based journalist, Sukhbir Singh Osan, who recently visited Unites States, Canada and United Kingdom for the purpose of participating in a human right convention to read a paper on the subject ''Recent attacks on Christian community in India'' and covering the 300 year celebrations of the Khalsa community was grilled by the intelligence sleuths for more than forty-five minutes at his residence on May 11. When Mr. Osan asked the DSP [Intelligence Bureau] as to why he was questioning him about his visits abroad, the said DSP replied, ''Delhi wants to know all about it.'' When again asked whether there were any written instructions, he replied that ''we have specific instructions from Delhi''. However, nothing in writing was given to Mr. Osan.

A TRIBUTE TO LACKLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; RECIPIENT OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL AWARD

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincerest congratulations to Lackland Elementary School in San Antonio, TX, upon the notification of their receipt of the Blue Ribbon School Award.

Schools are awarded the Blue Ribbon School Award based on their performance in regards to several criteria, including: student focus and support; active teaching and learning; school organization and culture; challenging standards and curriculum; professional community; leadership and educational vitality; school, family, and community partnerships; and indicators of success.

Lackland Elementary joins three other schools in San Antonio and forty other Texas schools, all of which excelled in these areas and were rewarded with the Blue Ribbon School Award from the United States Department of Education.

To receive consideration for this prestigious award, schools must be recommended for national recognition by their individual state department of education or sponsoring agency. Nominations are then evaluated by a National Review Panel including the Department of Education, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Council for American Private Education and a select group of educators from around the country. The Secretary of Education then makes a final determination based on the recommendations of this panel.

In receiving this special recognition, I believe that Lackland Elementary School will inspire others to provide the level of quality education that this Blue Ribbon School Award merits. I am proud to represent a district and hail from a state that has clearly placed an emphasis on the education of our children.

TRIBUTE TO COLLIS P. CHANDLER

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Collis P. Chandler, Jr., a friend of mine and a true friend of the petroleum industry, who passed away May 5, 1999, at the age of 72.

Mr. Chandler was a man of good character who loved life, his family and the industry upon which he had such a great impact. In a

letter to her baby daughter describing grandfather Chandler, daughter-in-law, Anne, wrote eloquently telling her that many words described him, ''loving, generous, thoughtful, caring, intelligent, gifted, unique, witty, genuine. He was a man who made a difference. He was a man that changed the world and that, in the end, is all that one can ask from life.'' I wholeheartedly support Anne's representation of Mr. Chandler.

He was born on October 5, 1926 to Louise and Collis Chandler in Tulsa, Oklahoma. He served in the U.S. Navy during World War II. In 1948 he graduated from Purdue University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering.

Mr. Chandler joined Sohio Petroleum Company in 1948 working in Louisiana and Kansas. In 1954 he founded the first of The Chandler Companies—Chandler-Simpson, Inc.—in Denver, Colorado. He was Chairman of The Chandler Company and its subsidiaries: Chandler & Associates, LLC and The Chandler Drilling Corporation at the time of his death. His companies have drilled more than 1,200 test wells, resulting in oil or gas discoveries or significant field extensions that number more than 100.

Mr. Chandler was a past chairman of the National Petroleum Council and Natural Gas Supply Association. In addition, he also served as president of the Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association.

Over the past 30 years, he held an impressive record of leadership in the American Petroleum Institute. He served on the Board of Directors since 1965 and the Executive Committee since 1968. Mr. Chandler was a member of the Management Committee and has served on the Public Policy committee, and its forerunner, since 1978. In 1994, he received the American Petroleum Institute's highest award, The Gold Medal for Distinguished Achievement.

His numerous honors and awards are a testament to his lifetime of service to the oil and gas industry. He received the Secretary of Energy's ''Distinguished Service'' Medal; the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association's ''Independent of the Year'' Award; the Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association's ''Life Membership'' Award; and, the American Association of Petroleum Landmen's ''Distinguished Service'' Award.

His business activities outside of the petroleum industry have included membership on the Board of Directors of the Public Service Company of Colorado and the Colorado National Bank.

Mr. Chandler gave generously of his time and talents to his alma mater, Purdue University, serving as a past president of the Purdue Alumni Association and as a member of the Board of Directors. He also served on the Board of Governors of the Purdue Foundation. He was currently serving on the Board of Directors of ''Up With People.''

He was a current member of Castle Pines Golf Club, Denver Country Club, Burning Tree Club, Bethesda, Maryland, and the Thunderbird Country Club, Rancho Mirage, California.

He is survived by his wife, Patti, a son, Collis Chandler III of Denver, a daughter Mary Louise Henry of Lansing, Michigan; four stepdaughters, Mary DeSimone of Denver, Gerri Ann Bragdon of Arvada, Kathlyn Maureen Woodard of Dallas, Texas and Paula Ann Novak of Pensacola, Florida; ten grandchildren and four great-grandchildren. He was preceded in death by two sons; Thomas Grant Chandler and Robert Chandler.

Mr. Speaker, it is men like Collis Chandler who have made this country great. Mr. Chandler helped shape America by being a good solid American citizen who worked hard to implement the right values. He contributed to society because he saw needs and filled them. Thank you, Mr. Chandler.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1141, 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BARON P. HILL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1999

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today the House voted on the Conference Report of H.R. 1141, the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill. I voted against this bill and would like to explain my vote.

Some of the spending items in this bill were bona fide emergencies. One emergency is supporting our troops currently deployed overseas in Kosovo. I have voted several times to support our troops and the NATO operation in Kosovo. When our generals say they need 6 billion dollars to support our troops in Kosovo, I believe that is legitimate emergency spending.

I spoke recently on the floor of this House about the emergency many American farmers are facing at this moment. Farmers need credit right now to plant their crops and pay their bills. I am a member of the Agriculture Committee and represent thousands of southern Indiana farmers. I believe that getting our farmers adequate loans and credit should be one of our top priorities. I believe helping farmers stay afloat is also legitimate emergency spending.

But this bill spends billions of dollars on items that are not emergencies. For example, today's bill spends almost twice what our generals say they need to meet our troops' needs in Kosovo. I am a member of the House Armed Services Committee and understand that our military has many pressing needs. One of our military's most urgent needs is giving our soldiers pay and retirement increases. I will support increases in defense spending during the regular budget process. I believe that fiscal responsibility requires us to consider measures such as these during the normal budget process, where we make the often difficult decisions about how we spend our limited resources.

It is not fiscally responsible to reach into the surpluses in the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for government projects that we should be finding ways to pay for in the normal budget process. We only have a budget surplus this year if we count the surpluses generated by the Social Security Trust Fund. We should not be using the money in the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for needs that are not emergencies.

One of my top priorities in Congress is making sure that the Social Security program will be solid and solvent for future generations. Our government does not have many more pressing needs than saving Social Security. I will not vote for spending our Social Security funds on items that are not emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for the Supplemental Appropriations bill because the original purpose of this so-called ''Emergency'' bill was lost somewhere in the process. It became a way to spend billions of dollars outside of the budget process we have set up to control our spending. The final version of this bill was not fiscally responsible and I could not vote for it.

CELEBRATING THE DEDICATION OF THE LIMA FIREFIGHTERS MEMORIAL MUSEUM

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add a few words of praise for the dedication of the Lima Fire Fighters Memorial Museum.

The Lima Fire Department has provided outstanding basic fire fighting and safety services to the Lima community since its formation in 1865. The museum built in Lincoln Park in Lima OH, will preserve the history of the Lima Fire Department as well as all the technological changes they have implemented over the past 133 years

When the Lima Fire Department was first established in 1865, it was a volunteer organization consisting of seven men with their only equipment being six fire hooks. These hooks were used to pull burning thatch from the roofs of buildings. Over the years, however, the Lima Fire Department developed into a paid, highly trained force of 88 fire fighters and support personnel working in a three platoon system. They are housed at the Central Fire Station and four outlying stations. Equipment now includes seven pumpers, one aerial platform, two medic units and a staff car. Approximately 700 fire fighters have served the city of Lima as members of the Lima Fire Department.

More importantly, this museum will memorialize all fire fighters who have served the Lima Community and especially the four Lima fire fighters who have given their lives in the line of duty. They are John S. Wolf and John Fisher, both of whom died as a result of the Allen County Courthouse fire on January 7, 1929; Frank Kinzer, who died because of a fire on October 7, 1933, at the Ohio Music Company and Page Organ Company; and lastly, Cloyd R. Webb, who died as a result of the Marshall Sporting Goods fire on January 21, 1954.

I wish to offer my sincere gratitude to all who are serving or who served as Lima fire fighters. They perform a valuable and dangerous task for the Lima community during times of great need. I honor each and every fire fighter for their dedication, knowledge, and hard work and hope that the Lima Fire Fighters Memorial Museum will stand as a tribute to each of them for all time.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes:

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, today the House of Representatives considers an important bill to improve and strengthen U.S. leadership in space exploration. This bill, the ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act'' includes approval of funds for U.S. participation in the International Space Station, funds for aerospace and earth science research and funds for space science programs. These are all important programs and worthy goals. However, I rise to speak in support of an important technology for our future efforts to explore space: funding for research and develop into TransHab technology.

TransHab uses inflatable structure technology to package a much larger living and working volume in the equivalent Shuttle cargo size. In theory, the TransHab concept has more volume and radiation shielding when compared with the current Habitation module. TransHab could also serve as a technology demonstration for the human exploration of Mars. The NASA reauthorization bill currently prohibits NASA from making additional expenditures on any inflatable structure intended to replace current models on the International Space Station. However, the bill does leave the possibility for research and development of crew-related inflatable structures in FY01 and FY02.

I understand the financial concerns the Committee on Science has expressed regarding funding TransHab technology for the International Space Station. Ideally, I would like to see TransHab technology funded now for the station, but I agree that in a time when Congress is struggling to keep the federal budget balanced, all federal programs should receive scrutiny and careful consideration. However, I think that it is very important that the Committee continue to keep the door open on TransHab funding in the future. Those familiar with TransHab technology believe that this technology validates potential technology for future solar system exploration. TransHab technology could possibly mean a manned-exploration of Mars which could result in a wealth of scientific information previously unavailable.

I believe that scientific research is vital to the current and future prosperity of our nation. I think we owe it to ourselves, to our nation, and especially to our children to keep the dream of manned space exploration alive. TransHab technology is an investment in our future. To permanently close the door on such research and development jeopardizes this nation's preeminence in science and technology.

In my home state of Delaware, we are fortunate to have ILC Dover, a leader in the aerospace industry and a company that has proven themselves a model for providing aerospace technology in accordance with NASA's new focus: ''better, faster, cheaper.'' ILC Dover has been providing innovative and cost-effective technology since 1947. ILC Dover has helped to provide the technology that put a man on the moon and Pathfinder on Mars, and ILC Dover will continue to help provide technology that will help future space missions in exploring our world.

I am very proud of the research and development conducted by ILC Dover, and I am proud of the contributions ILC Dover has made to the U.S. Space Program. There is a strong commerical interest from committed, innovative companies in the aerospace industry such as ILC Dover in helping to develop TransHab technology. I am encouraged that the Committee has left the door open for TransHab research in development in FY01 and FY02, and I look forward to any future Congressional hearings on the issue.

LEGISLATION TO HONOR FORMER CONGRESSMAN KIKA DE LA GARZA

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to designate the U.S. border station located in Pharr, Texas, as the ''Kika de la Garza United States Border Station.'' The bill is identical to legislation I introduced in the last Congress. That bill was approved unanimously by the House. Unfortunately, no action was taken on the legislation by the other body. I am proud to reintroduce this bill honoring a great legislator, former Congressman Kika de la Garza.

Kika de la Garza was born in Mercedes, Texas on September 22, 1927. He earned his law degree from St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas in 1952. He served in the Navy from 1945 to 1946, and in the Army from 1950 to 1952. He served in the Texas House of Representatives from 1953 to 1965.

In 1964 he was elected to Congress, where he was sent back to Congress by the people of the 15th Congressional District of Texas for 16 terms. In 1981 Kika became the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. During his 14-year tenure as chairman, Kika compiled an impressive record of achievement and dedicated service to America's farming community.

Most notably, Kika went out of his way to foster a climate of cooperation, inclusiveness and bi-partisanship on the committee. Under his able leadership, the Agriculture Committee was able to form a consensus on a number of important and intricate agricultural issues.

In the 103rd Congress Kika played a lead role in the enactment of legislation revamping and streamlining the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Kika de la Garza guided through legislation that made many needed and important changes, without eviscerating those USDA programs that were effective and needed to help America's farmers and protect the public.

The bill, now law, made remarkable changes at USDA. Because of Chairman de la Garza's leadership and sage counsel, the bill represented the right way to ''reinvent'' government.

Throughout his 32-year career in Congress Kika never lost sight of the folks back home. He fought tirelessly for his constituents. He also proved to be an able and effective advocate for American farmers. In no small measure because of his leadership, American agriculture remains the envy of the world.

The former chairman is also an amateur linguist and a gourmet cook. On many occasions he conversed with foreign dignitaries in their native tongue. On a personal level, Kika is my good friend, and I am so proud to sponsor this legislation.

I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

HONORING NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL 122 FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute a group of remarkable students and educators. While we see many unfortunate examples of failing schools, it is refreshing to share good news about a public school that is succeeding. New York State public schools test all sixth-grade students for reading ability. Among all the schools in the State of New York, the sixth graders at P.S. 122 finished first in this reading test. Moreover, every sixth-grade student at P.S. 122 ranked at the highest level in reading.

P.S. 122's outstanding accomplishment on this test is considered a citywide triumph because the students overcame competition from more affluent suburban schools. The school attributes this success to its emphasis on exposing children to art, music and theater.

With a diverse student body, P.S. 122 is accomplishing an early goal of public education—preparing immigrants and their children with the necessary tools to build a new life in America. At P.S. 122, Hispanic students comprise almost a third of the student body with Asians making up additional 20%, and African Americans 10%. This School also serves numerous children from Italian, Greek, Indian, Native American, and other backgrounds. Forty percent of the students who succeeded so well in this standardized test began school with ''limited proficiency in English.'' Approximately 65% of the student at P.S. 122 meet the criterion for free school lunches.

The educators at P.S. 122 are to be strongly commended for their success. I particularly want to recognize the principle of P.S. 122, Mary Kojes, whose leadership helped inspire the best from the students who took the test. This spirit no doubt inspired, and continues to inspire, her students to strive for excellence. Mary Kojes and the extraordinary teachers of P.S. 122 have provided that New York City School students can reach the highest levels of achievement when they are properly prepared. The Students of P.S. 122 have also benefited from the support of the School District 30 Superintendent, Dr. Angelo Gimondo and his staff.

The real heroes of this story are the students of P.S. 122. This success demonstrates that hard work has clear and definite rewards. I asks my colleagues to join me in commending all those associated with P.S. 122.

MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED ACCESS TO CARE ACT

HON. DONNA MC CHRISTENSEN

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I along with 38 of my colleagues on the Congressional Black Caucus introduced H.R. 1860, the Medically Underserved Access to Care Act which seeks to address the needs of minorities in the managed care system. As a physician, I have seen the problems that minorities—both patients and healthcare providers—can face within the managed care system. This bill seeks to ameliorate some of these difficulties by proposing some concrete solutions to overcome these problems.

A key provision of H.R. 1860 would require managed care organizations to contract with providers in medically underserved communities who are ethnically representative of the population of those communities. This will help to ensure that these providers have the cultural sensitivity needed to interact with their patients in an understanding manner that will directly cater to their specific medical needs and concerns as minorities.

To make this lofty goal a reality, H.R. 1860 establishes a program of outreach grants to underserved communities that will help patients locate culturally sensitive providers within their managed care plan. The bill also creates a similar outreach grant program for doctors that will be operated through a national private non-profit organization in conjunction with the Department of Health and Human Services. The specific goal of this program will be to assist minority physicians and other health care providers to convert their practices and internal administrative procedures to best access the managed care system for both private insurance plans and Medicaid insurance plans.

Ultimately, this bill seeks to redress the many grievances that minority physicians and patients have expressed regarding the managed care system. Addressing the problems that minorities face within the managed care system will take us one step closer to realizing the goal of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to ensure that all Americans have access to quality care delivered in an appropriate manner.

I want to express my thanks to the National Medical Association and its President, Dr. Gary Denis, for their invaluable help in developing the language of this bill and assisting in getting it ready for introduction. I also want to thank my colleagues on the CBC for their support in joining me as cosponsors of this important bill.

H.R. 1858, THE CONSUMER AND INVESTOR ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT OF 1999

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, we hear the phrase quite often that ''we live in the Information Age.'' This is true because of advances in technology in recent years. Digital technology—and more specifically, the Internet—has brought a world of libraries and magazines and newspapers and on-line stock trading to consumers' living rooms.

And while technology played a critical role in paving the way for the Information Age, it's clear that access to the information itself is just as important. Consumers use the Internet to price shop, to compare mortgage rates, to buy stocks, and for a variety of other commercial activities. The underlying ingredient to all of these activities is information. Without it, electronic commerce would still be a twinkle in Bill Gates' eye.

It is therefore critical that Congress take great care when it enacts laws that relate to consumers' access to information. Along with my colleagues on the Committee on Commerce, Messrs. Dingell, Tauzin, Markey, Oxley, and Towns, I am introducing legislation that ensures that consumers and investors will continue to have full access to information when they surf the Web.

H.R. 1858, the Consumer and Investor Access to Information Act of 1999, provides new protection to publishers of electronic databases, while ensuring that public access to information will not be limited by publishers' asserting a proprietary right over facts and information, which historically have been part of the public domain. The bill's anti-theft protections will also protect institutions like the stock exchanges from hackers and pirates seeking to undermine the integrity of the data they disseminate to the public.

Mr. Speaker, we live in the Information Age. We must keep information—like stock quotes—readily available to consumers on the information superhighway. Millions of Americans depend on information they obtain over the Internet to help them make important investment decisions. This bill will ensure that consumers and investors continue to have access to this information.

Mr. Speaker, Americans should not have to pay tolls for public information obtained on the information superhighway. Facts and information should remain toll-free on the information superhighway. Facts and information like stock quotes have been, and under H.R. 1858, will continue to remain readily available to the public.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my statement, I am submitting for the RECORD a background piece on, as well as a section-by-section analysis of, H.R. 1858. I urge my colleagues to join me, along with the rest of the bipartisan leadership of the Committee on Commerce, in supporting this legislation.

H.R. 1858, THE CONSUMER AND INVESTOR ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT OF 1999

THE IMPORTANCE OF INFORMATION TO ELECTRONIC COMMERCE

Economists have long recognized that one of the great obstacles to the efficient operation of markets is imperfect information. A consumer might pay too much for an item because he or she was unaware of the lower price being charged for the item at another store, and the transaction cost of visiting all the stores to determine which charged the least exceeded the savings of buying at the least expensive store. This problem has become more significant as markets have become more complex. The need for information on which to base economic decisions is greater now than ever before.

One of the great virtues of electronic commerce is that it has the potential to provide its participants with much more information at much lower cost than is available in more traditional forms of commerce. This additional information will allow for the much more efficient operation of markets for capital, labor, and goods. If a small businessman is seeking a loan, the Internet will allow him to learn the terms offered by banks all over the country. If a computer programmer is looking for a job, the Internet will allow him to learn about opportunities in distant cities. And if a homeowner needs to buy a new refrigerator, the Internet will provide him with the prices in stores throughout the region. This information will obviously benefit both the purchaser and the seller of goods and services. We have seen some of these benefits in the last five years, and they will only accelerate in the years to come.

One of the most explosive areas of growth that consumers have benefitted from through the Internet is in the area of securities investing. According to a recent study, the number of households with people trading on the Internet has nearly tripled, to 6.3 million in the last 16 months. And the same study reported that 20 million households use the Internet for investment news, quotes and ideas. This access to information about the stock market has empowered investors and given them greater control over their finances. Studies have reported that investors feel increasingly secure about their investment decisions as they use the Internet to monitor their portfolios, follow news about their holdings and obtain other information about their investments.

Indeed, the Internet will make it so much easier for people to access information that they will be confronted with a new problem—too much information. Accordingly, people will need tools for locating and organizing the information into useful forms. Otherwise, the information will be overwhelming. Such tools already exist in the form of databases, search engines, and webcrawlers, and these tools are becoming more sophisticated to keep up the information that is flooding the Internet.

The basic information policy of this country—a policy that has existed since the writing of the Constitution—has served many communities, including the Internet and electronic commerce, extremely well. Our long-standing policy says that facts cannot be ''owned.'' Instead, they are in the public domain. Accordingly, a database publisher can visit the site of every bank in a state, extract data concerning each bank's loan programs, and construct a larger database with loan information for all the banks. Another database publisher can then extract some of that information, and combine it with other information—for example, loan programs from out-of-state banks, or customer service ratings of the banks)—to create a new, more useful database which promotes commerce.

This information policy facilitates electronic commerce at an even more fundamental level. The culture of science involves combining new data with existing databases to create more powerful research tools. Allowing scientists to reuse facts, rather than requiring them to ''reinvent the wheel,'' ensures that research moves forward. Research and development is the foundation of all commercial activity.

THE NEED FOR LIMITED LEGISLATION

Although the existing information policy generally functions well in the context of the Internet and electronic commerce, there is one potential problem. Digital technology, which makes the Internet and electronic commerce possible, also increases the likelihood of unfair competition in the database

publishing marketplace. Current law provides some protection against unfair competition. For example, the selection, coordination, and arrangement of facts in a database are often protected by copyright. In addition, databases may be protected by license, technological measures (e.g., encryption and watermarks), the state common law of misappropriation, trademark, and trade secret.

But notwithstanding these many legal remedies, there are complaints that systematic unauthorized commercial copying of databases, particularly comprehensive databases stored in digital form, may sometimes go unremedied because of gaps in current law. H.R. 1858, the Consumer and Investor Access to Information (CIAI) Act of 1999, is designed to plug a hole that exists in current law.

Because databases are items of commerce in their own right, and are critical tools for facilitating electronic commerce—indeed, in all commerce—Congress must assure that database publishers have sufficient protection against unfair competition. At the same time, the protection for databases must not go so far as to protect the individual facts contained in the database. These must be available for a variety of second generation uses. Otherwise, those engaged in second generation uses—from a value-added publisher, to a research scientist, to the consumer who compiles his own database when comparing characteristics of different cars—would have to either pay a license fee, or somehow ''re-discover'' the facts themselves. This would amount to ''a tax on information.'' Moreover, it would represent a radical departure from our information policy that has made us the most technologically advanced nation in world history.

Accordingly, Title I of H.R. 1858 prohibits a person from selling or distributing a duplicate of a database collected and organized by another person that competes in commerce with the original database. The legislation defines a duplicate of a database as a database which is substantially the same as the first database. Further, a discrete section of a database may also be treated as a database. Thus, H.R. 1858 prevents the distribution of pirated databases which could threaten investment in database creation. At the same time, it does not prevent reuse of information for purposes of creating a new database.

The issue of protecting databases is especially significant to the securities markets, an issue that is addressed in Title II of H.R. 1858. This is because of the proliferation and growing importance of on-line investing. Recent statistics have shown that on-line trading now accounts for nearly 1 out of every 7 equity trades (about 14%) and is growing rapidly, with an increase of over 34% in on-line activity in the last quarter over the previous quarter.

Having access to real-time stock quotes is essential to on-line investors. Investors cannot make informed buy-and-sell decisions without knowing the price of the stock they are trying to buy or sell. The way on-line investors get this information is generally through the website of their on-line broker. Investors typically do not pay for this service. The brokers who provide this information to their on-line investing customers, however, do pay a fee. They pay the stock exchanges for access to the ''feed'' of real-time stock quotes. (''Real-time'' stock quotes are to be distinguished from those provided on a delayed basis, for which stock exchanges typically do not charge a fee.)

While the Federal securities laws provide the regulatory structure under which the dissemination of securities transaction data to the public is governed, they do not provide protection for the exchanges or other market information processors against pirates of that market data. In order to protect the exchanges and other market information processors against hackers or others who would undermine the integrity of the data they disseminate or threaten their ability to disseminate that data, Title II of H.R. 1858 provides a limited cause of action that enables market information processors to stop, and collect damages from, a person who disseminates data that he has obtained from a market information processor without that market information processor's authorization.

Because market information processors provide market data to parties by means of contractual arrangements, and thus have the ability to seek redress under contract law in the event that a contracting party disseminates the market data in a manner that is noncompliant with the contract, the cause of action that the bill provides is limited to actions against parties with whom the market information processors do not have a contract or other agreement (such as hackers). Title II of H.R. 1858 also ensures that independently gathered real-time market data can be disseminated without triggering the bill's protections—thus ensuring that individuals who develop a new database that they have not gleaned from a market information processor will be free to disseminate that database.

Title II's limited scope provides necessary protection to market information processors, without creating a new property right over market data that would enable market information processors to inappropriately limit the dissemination of market data to public investors, such as on-line investors. These investors need market data, such as real-time stock prices, in order to make their investment decisions.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 1858

Section 1: Short Title. The short title of H.R. 1858 is the ''Consumer and Investor Access to Information Act of 1999.''

TITLE I—COMMERCE IN DUPLICATED DATABASES PROHIBITED

Section 101: Definitions. Section 101(1) defines a ''database'' as a collection of discrete items of information (information is defined in Section 101(3)) that have been collected and organized in a single place, or in such a way as to be accessible through a single source. The collection and organization must have required investment of substantial monetary or other resources, and it must have been performed for the purpose of providing access to those discrete items of information by users of the database. The term database does not include textbooks, articles, biographies, histories, scientific articles, other works of narrative prose, specifications, and other works that include items of information combined and ordered in a logical progression or other meaningful way in order to tell a story, communicate a message, represent something or achieve a result.

Section 101(1) also makes clear that a discrete section of a database may also be treated as a database. For example, if a directory of restaurants in the District of Columbia is organized by type of food, the section comprising Italian restaurants could constitute a database within the meaning of the statute, even though it is part of a larger database (i.e., the D.C. restaurant directory).

Section 101(2) defines ''a duplicate'' of a database as a database which is substantially the same as the original database, and was made by extracting information from the original database. A database need not be identical to another database in order to be considered ''substantially the same as'' the original database.

Section 101(3) defines ''information'' as facts, data, or other intangible material capable of being collected and organized in a systematic way. Works of authorship are excluded from the definition of information. Such works—both individually and collectively—are adequately protected by copyright. Section 101(4) defines ''commerce'' to mean all commerce which may be lawfully regulated by the Congress.

The definition of ''in competition with'' in Section 101(5) has two components. First, the database must displace substantial sales of the database of which it is a duplicate. Second, the database must significantly threaten the opportunity to recover a return on the investment in the collecting or organizing of the duplicated database. Thus, a duplicate of a database uploaded onto the Internet without authorization could be in competition with the underlying database (even if the Internet duplicate is available without charge) if it displaces substantial sales and threatens the opportunity to recover a return on the investment in the first database.

Section 101(6) defines two types of ''government databases.'' First, the term includes databases collected and maintained by the United States of America, or any agency or instrumentality thereof. Second, the term also includes a database that is required by Federal statute or regulation to be collected or maintained, to the extent so required.

Section 102: Prohibition Against Distribution of Duplicates. Section 102 sets forth the core prohibition against the sale or distribution to the public of duplicated databases. Under Section 102, it is unlawful for any person, by any instrumentality or means of interstate or foreign commerce or communications, to sell or distribute a database that is a duplicate of a database collected and organized by another person, and that is sold or distributed in commerce in competition with that other database. Section 102 is intended to achieve a necessary balance between (1) promoting fair competition in the database publishing market, and (2) ensuring consumers have unfettered access to facts and information.

Section 103: Permitted Acts. Section 103 sets forth a variety of permitted acts. Section 103(a) clarifies that nothing in Title 1 of the DFCA restricts a person from selling or distributing to the public a database consisting of information obtained by means other than by extracting it from a database collected and organized by another person.

Subsection 103(b) limits the application of this title to news reporting. It provides that nothing in the title shall restrict any person from selling or distributing to the public a duplicate of a database for the sole purpose of news reporting, including news gathering and dissemination, or comment, unless the information duplicated in time sensitive and has been collected by a news reporting entity, and the sale or distribution is part of a consistent pattern engaged in for the purpose of direct competition.

Subsection 103(c) specified that nothing in Title I shall prohibit an officer, agent, or employee of the United States, a state, or a political subdivision of a State, or a person acting under contract of such officers, agents, or employees, from selling or distributing to the public a duplicate database as part of lawfully authorized investigative, protective, or intelligence activities.

Subsection 103(d) provides that no person or entity who, for scientific, educational, or research purposes, sells or distributes to the public a duplicate of a database, shall incur liability under this title so long as the conduct is not part of a consistent pattern engaged in for the purpose of direct commercial competition.

Section 104: Exclusions. Section 104 provides for exclusions to Section 102's prohibition. Subsection 104(a)(1) provides that protection for databases under Section 102 does not extend to government databases, as such databases are defined in Section 101(6). Subsection 104(a)(2) clarifies that the incorporation of all or part of a government database into a non-government database does not preclude protection for the portions of the non-government database which came from a source other than the government database. Section 104(a)(3) provides that Title I does not prevent Federal, state, or local government from establishing by law or contract that a database funded by Federal, state, or local government shall not be subject to the protections of this title.

Subsection 104(b) excludes databases related to Internet communications. In particular, under Subsection 104(b), protection does not extend to a database incorporating information collected or organized to perform (1) the function of addressing, routing, forwarding, transmitting or storing Internet communications, or (2) the function of providing or receiving connections for telecommunications.

Most databases stored in digital form require computer programs for their use. Paragraph 104(c)(1) therefore provides that protection for databases under Section 102 shall not extend to computer programs (as defined in 17 U.S.C. §101), including computer programs used in the manufacture, production, operation or maintenance of a database. Further, any element of a computer program necessary for its operation is not protected.

At the same time, Paragraph 104(c)(2) explains that a database that is otherwise subject to protection under Section 102 does not lose that protection solely because it resides in a computer program. However, the incorporated database receives protection only so long as it functions as a database within the meaning of Title I (i.e., a collection of discrete items of information collected for the purpose of providing access to those discrete items by users), and not as an element necessary to the operation of the computer program.

Subsection 104(d) provides that protection for databases under Section 102 does not prohibit the sale or distribution to the public of any individual idea, fact, procedure, system, method of operation, concept, principle, or discovery. Finally, under subsection 104(e), provides that protection for databases under Section 102 does not extend to subscriber list information.

Section 105: Relationship to Other Laws. Section 105 explains the relationship of the DFCA to other laws. Subsection 105(a) makes clear that, subject to the preemption under Subsection 105(b), nothing in Title I affects a person's rights under the laws of copyright, patent, trademark, design rights, antitrust, trade secrets, privacy, access to public documents, misuse, and contracts. Subsection 105(b) preempts state laws inconsistent with the DFCA's prohibition in Section 102.

Section 105(c) provides that, subject to the provisions on misuse in Subsection 106(b), nothing in Title I shall restrict the rights of parties freely to enter into licenses or any other contracts with respect to the use of information. Subsection 105(d) makes clear that Title I of the DFCA does not affect the operation of the Communications Act of 1934, or the authority of the Federal Communications Commission.

Section 106: Limitations on Liability. Section 106 sets forth limitations on liability for violations of Section 102. Subsection 106(a) provides that a provider of telecommunications or information services (within the meaning of Section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153)), or the operator of facilities therefore, shall not be liable for a violation of Section 102 if such provider or operator did not initially place the database that is the subject of the violation on a system or network controlled by the provider or operator.

Subsection 106(b) limits the liability of a person for a violation of Section 102 if the person benefiting from the protection afforded by Section 102 misused that protection. Subsection 106(b) sets forth six non-exclusive factors a court should consider in determining whether a person has misused the protection provided by Section 102.

Section 107: Enforcement. Section 107 authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to take appropriate actions under the Federal Trade Commission Act to prevent violations of Section 102.

Section 108: Report to Congress. Section 108 directs the Federal Trade Commission to report to Congress within 36 months of enactment on the effect Title I has had on electronic commerce and the domestic database industry.

Section 109: Effective Date. Section 109 provides that Title I of H.R. 1858 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and shall apply only to the sale or distribution after that date of a database that was collected and organized after that date.

TITLE II—SECURITIES MARKET INFORMATION

Section 201: Misappropriation of Real-Time Market Information. Section 201 of H.R. 1858 amends Section 11A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by adding a new Subsection 11A(e), entitled ''Misappropriation of Real-Time Market Information.'' Subsection 11A(e) prohibits the misappropriation of real-time market information from a market information processor, establishes liability on the part of any person who violates the prohibition, and provides a market information processor with a variety of remedies against the violator. This provision expressly permits certain acts that are not included in the prohibition, namely independent gathering of market information and news reporting of market information. The subsection also limits the cause of action provided by the bill to apply only to parties with whom the market information processor does not have a contract regarding the real-time market information or other right the market information processor is seeking to protect.

Paragraph 11A(e)(1) imposes liability on any person who obtains, directly or indirectly, real time market information from a market information processor, and directly or indirectly extracts, sells, distributes or redistributes, or otherwise disseminates such real-time market data without the authorization of the market information processor. The prohibition in Paragraph 11A(e)(1) would not apply to a person who merely obtained, directly or indirectly, real-time market information from a market information processor, but did not disseminate the information in any way.

Paragraph 11A(e)(2) sets forth the remedies that a market information processor is authorized to assert against any person who misappropriates real-time market information in violation of Paragraph (1). In particular, under Subparagraph 11A(e)(2)(A), an injured person would be authorized to bring a civil action in an appropriate United States district court, except that any action against a State governmental entity may be brought in any court that has jurisdiction over claims against such entity. Subparagraph 11A(e)(2)(B) authorizes any court having jurisdiction of a civil action under Section 11A(e) to grant temporary and permanent injunctions, according to principles of equity and upon such terms as the court may deem reasonable, to prevent a violation of Paragraph 11A(e)(1). Under Subparagraph 11A(e)(2)(C), a plaintiff would be permitted to recover money damages sustained by the plaintiff when a violation of Paragraph (1) was established in a civil action. And under Subparagraph 11A(e)(2)(D), a court, in its equitable discretion, would be authorized to order disgorgement of the amount of defendant's monetary gain directly attributable to a violation of Paragraph (1) if the plaintiff is not able to prove recoverable damages to the full extent of the defendant's monetary gain.

Paragraph 11A(e)(3) would exclude two types of legitimate activity from the scope of the bill—the independent gathering of real-time market information and news reporting. Under Subparagraph 11A(e)(3)(A), no person would be restricted from independently gathering real-time market information, or from redistributing or disseminating such independently gathered information. A person would be considered to obtain real-time market information ''independently'' only to the extent that such information was not obtained, directly or indirectly, from a market information processor. In addition, under Subparagraph 11A(e)(3)(B), no news reporting entity would be restricted from extracting real-time market information for the sole purpose of news reporting, including news gathering, dissemination, and comment, unless the extraction was part of a consistent pattern of competing with a market information processor in the distribution of real-time market information. Thus, news organizations that limit their use of real-time market information to legitimate reporting of the news would not be subject to liability.

Paragraph 11A(e)(4) establishes the relationship of Subsection 11A(e) with a variety of other Federal and State laws that also may address the dissemination of real-time market information. Subparagraph 11A(e)(4)(A) provides that Subsection 11A(e) would exclusively govern the unauthorized extraction, sale, distribution or redistribution, or other dissemination of real-time market information and would supersede any other Federal or State law, whether statutory or common law, to the extent that such other Federal or State law is inconsistent with Subsection 11A(e). This subparagraph would not preempt State law that is not inconsistent with Subsection 11A(e) (e.g., State law governing trademark or trade dress). In addition, under Subparagraph 11A(e)(4)(B), Subsection 11A(e) would not limit or otherwise affect the application of any provision of the federal securities laws or the rules or regulations thereunder, and would not impair or limit the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Thus, the Commission's existing authority over distributors of market information, including its authority over fees charged for market information, would continue unchanged.

Subparagraph 11A(e)(4)(C) provides that the constraints that are imposed by Federal and State antitrust laws on the manner in which products and services may be provided to the public, including those regarding the single suppliers of products and services, would not be limited in any way by Subsection 11A(e). In addition, under Subparagraph 11A(e)(4)(D), the rights of parties to enter freely into licenses or any other contracts with respect to the extraction, sale, distribution or redistribution, or other dissemination of real-time market information would not be restricted. Thus, the bill preserves all rights under state contract law.

Paragraph 11A(e)(5) limits the actions that may be maintained pursuant to section 11A(e). Pursuant to Subparagraph 11A(e)(5)(A), a civil action under Subsection 11A(e) would have to be commenced within

one year after the cause of action arises or the claim accrues. And under Subparagraph 11A(e)(5)(B), a civil action for the dissemination of market information would be precluded if such information was not real-time market information. Thus, the bill does not limit in any way, or provide any cause of action regarding, the use and dissemination of delayed market data. Finally, Subparagraph 11A(e)(5)(C) precludes a civil action by a market information processor against any person to whom such processor provides real-time market information pursuant to a contract between the two parties, but only with respect to any real-time information or any right that is provided pursuant to the contract. Market information processors would continue to have available their contractual remedies regarding persons with whom they have a contract, but would not be afforded new remedies under Subsection 11A(e) against these persons with respect to rights covered by that contract.

Paragraph 11A(e)(6) defines several terms used in section 11A(e) that are not defined elsewhere in the Exchange Act. The term ''market information'' is defined in Subparagraph 11A(e)(6)(A) to mean information with respect to quotations and transactions in any security, the collecting, processing, distribution, and publication of which is subject to the Exchange Act. Under Subparagraph 11A(e)(6)(B), the Securities and Exchange Commission may, consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, prescribe by rule the extent to which market information shall be considered to be real-time market information for purposes of Subsection 11A(e), but in promulgating any such rule, the Commission must take into account the present state of technology, different types of market data, how market participants use market data, and other relevant factors. This requirement is designed to ensure that any rule that the Commission promulgates regarding real-time market data does not hinder access by investors to such data, and maximizes the access by investors to all market data, including real-time and delayed market data. In the absence of Commission action, the determination of whether market information is real-time market information would be left to the courts with jurisdiction over civil actions under Subsection 11A(e) to interpret the plain language of the term ''real-time.''

Finally, the term ''market information processor'' with respect to any market information is defined in Subparagraph 11A(e)(6)(C) to mean the securities exchange, self-regulatory organization, securities information processor, or national market system plan administrator that is responsible under the Exchange Act or the rules or regulations thereunder for the collection, processing, distribution, and publication of, or preparing for distribution or publication, of such market information.

Section 202: Effective Date. This section provides that the new Subsection 11A(e) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of H.R. 1858, and shall apply to acts committed on or after that date. Furthermore, no person shall be liable under Subsection 11A(e) for the extraction, sale, distribution or redistribution, or other dissemination of real-time market information prior to the date of enactment of this bill, by that person or by that person's predecessor in interest.

EXPOSING RACISM

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing efforts to document and expose racism in American, I submit the following articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WHITE MAN SENTENCED TO PRISON FOR PUNCHING WOULD-BE BLACK NEIGHBOR

BIRMINGHAM, AL (AP).—A judge sentenced a white man to 2 years in federal prison and ordered him to pay more than $30,000 for punching a black man who wanted to be his next-door neighbor.

Wendell Johnson, 33, was convicted in February of violating the Fair Housing Act by hitting Kenneth Ray Coleman, who suffered a broken nose in the assault.

''I want to apologize,'' Johnson, choking back tears, told Coleman during a hearing Wednesday. ''I know you went through a lot of hard times because of it.''

Coleman, 35 said he believed the apology was sincere and accepted it.

Johnson hit Coleman in the face last June after Coleman came to his house and asked where he could find the local water company.

Coleman testified he has since had breathing difficulties, and a doctor has recommended surgery to fix the problem. But, Coleman said, he lacks the $3,500 for the operation.

U.S. District Judge U.W. Clemon ordered Johnson to pay Coleman $30,911 for pain, suffering, lost wages and other expenses related to the assault. Johnson also was ordered to pay $1,300 to the Alabama Crime Victims' Compensation Commission.

Clemon said he would consider a request to let Johnson remain free during a possible appeal.

TAFT SCORES POINTS AT MEETING WITH BLACK DEMOCRATS WITH BC–OH

(by Paul Souhrada)

COLUMBUS, OH (AP).—The honeymoon continues for Gov. Bob Taft. Taft, who smoothed relations with labor leaders last month, scored points with black lawmakers during a wide-ranging meeting over issues important to minorities.

The members of the all-Democratic Ohio Legislative Black Caucus on Wednesday asked Taft, a Republican, for more money for Central State University, a more aggressive state affirmative action program and a commitment to appoint more minorities to state agencies.

''We had a very fruitful meeting with the governor,'' Sen. C.J. Prentiss, D-Cleveland, told reporters afterward.

Taft impressed the group with his sincerity, Prentiss said. Taft also found the meeting useful and said he wants to meet with the group again, said spokesman Scott Milburn.

Taft was particularly interested in looking for ways to increase literacy among schoolchildren, said Prentiss, president of the black caucus. She said she told Taft that her 18-member group was concerned that the cornerstone of his literacy program—the high-profile OhioReads campaign to recruit 20,000 volunteer reading tutors—falls short of what is needed.

Milburn said Taft assured the lawmakers that OhioReads was only the first step in the governor's effort to make sure all children learn to read.

Prentiss also pressed Taft to ask lawmakers for another $3.5 million for Central State, the only state-funded, historically black college in Ohio. The money would be used to expand the urban education program at the school in Wilberforce, for recruiting and to pay back debt from the school's financial troubles in the 1980s and early part of the 1990s.

Taft already asked for an extra $2 million for Central State, Milburn said. He wants to meet with Central State President John Garland before making any other moves.

Taft is interested in a suggestion from Rep. Otto Beatty, D-Columbus, to study how successful minority businesses are in getting state contracts, Milburn said.

The issue of minority set-asides has been at the center of conflicting rulings recently from the Ohio Supreme Court and a federal district judge. But until the matter is decided, Taft wants to resume Ohio's programs without raising new legal issues, Milburn said.

Taft also will consider another Beatty proposal: an order dealing with affirmative action statewide.

Taft might be interested in expressing support for reaching out to women and minority businesses and encouraging them to seek state contracts, but he opposes quotas, Milburn said.

Among the other ideas suggested by the legislators:—Adding more money for education to stop the spread of AIDS, particularly among young blacks and women.

Creating an independent watchdog agency to oversee state contracts.

Making sure that minorities and inner city residents get their fair share of the money from the state's settlement with the tobacco industry.

Including more minorities in state government jobs and on state boards and commissions.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS ASKS COURT TO RECONSIDER ITS HOPWOOD RULING

JIM VERTUNO

(BY AUSTIN, TX (AP).—The University of Texas has asked a federal appeals court to reconsider a decision that led to the elimination of affirmative action policies at the state's public colleges and universities.

School officials asked the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals on Tuesday to reconsider its so-called Hopwood ruling.

''This case addresses one of the most important issues of our time . . . and it deserves the fullest possible hearing and a most careful decision by the federal courts,'' said Larry Faulkner, president of the university.

The Hopwood ruling came in a lawsuit against the University of Texas law school's former affirmative-action admissions policy.

The ruling, which found that the policy discriminated against whites, was allowed to stand in 1996 by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Former Attorney General Dan Morales then issued a legal opinion directing Texas colleges to adopt race-neutral policies for admissions, financial aid and scholarships.

Legislators asked new Attorney General John Cornyn for a second opinion. His office helped university officials write the appeal submitted Tuesday.

According to University of Texas System Regent Patrick Oxford, the Hopwood ruling left Texas at a competitive disadvantage with other public universities in recruiting students.

The appeal argues that limited consideration of race in admissions is necessary to overcome the effects of past discrimination. It also says the school has a compelling interest in a racially and ethnically diverse student body.

A state Comptroller's Office study released in January showed a drop in the number of

minorities applying for, being admitted to and enrolling in some of the state's most selective public schools.

PROPOSAL WOULD MAKE OLE MISS PRIVATE

OXFORD, MISS. (AP).—A College Board member has proposed making the University of Mississippi a private institution as part of the settlement in the state's 24-year-old college desegregation case.

James Luvene of Holly Springs submitted the proposal, among others, to U.S. District Judge Neal Biggers Jr.

''Allowing Ole Miss to go private will help solve many funding problems as they exist today,'' Luvene said in the 10-page proposal.

Luvene said his proposal is designed to ''bring closure to our state's long and painful epoch of discrimination against black citizens and historically black institutions of higher learning.''

Immediately the plan drew opposition from lawmakers and Ole Miss.

''We're a great public university,'' said Ole Miss Chancellor Robert Khayat. ''We like being a public university and can only serve the state better.''

The desegregation lawsuit, known as the Ayers case, accused the state of neglecting its three historically black universities. Biggers is overseeing the desegregation of Mississippi's colleges.

Khayat said he is not familiar with any public American university ever going private.

Luvene recommended paying the Oxford college $151 million before making it private in 2000. He recommended that the University of Mississippi Medical Center in Jackson become independent and be called the State Institute of Health and Medicine.

Khayat also opposes that and said 72 of the 73 U.S. medical centers are tied to a parent university.

''It's just ludicrous what he (Luvene) is saying,'' said Sen. Terry Jordan, D–Philadelphia, an Ole Miss alumnus. ''They've all been state-supported and will continue to be.''

David Sansing, a retired Ole Miss historian, said, ''the likelihood of this happening is nil, zero.''

''This plan would open up an entirely new controversy that would rage for years. I'm just astounded by it,'' said Sansing.

Luvene said Ole Miss' nearness to Mississippi State in Starksville ''puts two of our three comprehensive institutions in a sparsely populated part of the state, causing unnecessary duplication.''

Luvene also has proposed that historically black Jackson State be given a law school, pharmacy school and an air traffic control program.

NEW JERSEY CONCEDES RACIAL PROFILING EXISTS

(By Thomas Martello)

TRENTON, N.J. (AP).—Complaints that state troopers target blacks and Hispanics along the heavily traveled New Jersey Turnpike are ''real, not imagined,'' according to a report issued by the state's attorney general.

The report, released Tuesday, concludes that even though the state police have no policy condoning the practice known as racial profiling, it does exist—and was fostered in part by ambiguous rules.

''There is no question racial profiling exists at some level,'' Gov. Christie Whitman said. ''These findings are distressing and disturbing. Minorities deserve the assurance they will be treated no differently than any other motorist.''

The report, commissioned by state Attorney General Peter Verniero, stresses ''the great majority of state troopers are honest, dedicated professionals.''

But the force's command structure needs to institute policy changes to end a culture that encourages using race as a reason to stop motorists, the report says.

While six out of 10 motorists stopped are white, minorities are far more likely to be subjected to searches and aggressive treatment by troopers, the report said. Statistics show that 77.2 percent of motorist searches were of blacks or Hispanics, and only 21.4 percent were of white motorists.

''Minority motorists have been treated differently than non-minority motorists during the course of traffic stops on the New Jersey Turnpike,'' the report says. ''We conclude the problem of disparate treatment is real—not imagined.''

The report came one day after two troopers were indicted on charges they falsified reports to make it appear that some of the black motorists they pulled over were white.

The U.S. Justice Department also has been investigating racial profiling allegations against New Jersey's state police. Similar accusations have been made in Florida, Maryland, Connecticut and elsewhere along the Interstate 95 corridor.

The findings in the report confirm what many civil rights activists said they have known for years.

''We do not believe that any reasonable person in New Jersey is surprised at all today to hear this acknowledgment,'' said The Rev. Reginald Jackson, executive director of the Black Ministers Council of New Jersey. ''Now, however, comes the hard and difficult part, and that is the process ending racial profiling.''

JUDGE APPROVES END TO RACE-BASED ENROLLMENT IN SAN FRANCISCO

(by Bob Egelko)

SAN FRANCISCO (AP).—A federal judge has ordered an end to 16 years of race-based enrollment in San Francisco public schools, approving a settlement of a lawsuit by Chinese-Americans who were denied admission to the city's preferred campuses.

Despite protests by blacks and Hispanics, U.S. District Judge William Orrick said racial admissions violate Chinese Americans' constitutional rights to equal treatment in choosing their schools. He approved the settlement on Tuesday.

The suit was filed in 1994 on behalf of one student who was denied admission to a magnet high school despite a high score on its entrance exam—higher than some non-Chinese students who were admitted—and by two who were turned away from neighborhood elementary schools.

The settlement repeals a limit of 45 percent of any racial or ethnic group at a single school and 40 percent at desirable ''magnet'' schools. Those limits were part of a 1983 consent decree, approved by Orrick, that settled a discrimination lawsuit filed in 1978 by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The district has until October to prepare a new enrollment plan for the fall of 2000 to maintain diversity in schools without assigning any student primarily because of race.

''Resegregation is inevitable,'' declared Robert Franklin, who said he lives in San Francisco so that his two children—a 7-year-old black girl and a 2-year-old white boy—can attend its schools. ''I want to keep them in an integrated, racially diverse public school.''

FORMAL CEREMONY WILL DECRY RACISM IN OREGON'S HISTORY

PORTLAND, OR (PA).—Bobbi Gary moved to Portland in 1942 and found a scene straight out of the old South.

Restaurants wouldn't seat her. Real estate agents wouldn't sell to her. And theaters would only let her sit in the ''buzzard roost'' seats—all because she is black.

Gary will recall those experiences when she travels to Salem on Thursday to hear Oregon's leaders formally acknowledge the state's discriminatory past.

The Day of Acknowledgment, timed to coincide with the 150th anniversary of a law that barred ''negroes and mulattos'' from the Oregon Territory, also will honor Gary and others who have struggled for racial justice.

Leaders of Oregon Uniting, the multiracial organization that proposed the Day of Acknowledgment, hope a ceremony formally recognizing the state's racist past will be a step toward racial healing.

Some who plan to witness the ceremony say they are ambivalent about it—pleased at the recognition, but skeptical about what it will accomplish.

''To acknowledge these things forces us to relive them,'' said Carl Flipper Jr., a North Portland economist who has rented a bus for more than 30 Portland blacks who will attend the ceremony. ''It's painful.''

Witnesses will bring different memories to the observance in the House chamber on Thursday.

Sue Shaffer, chairwoman of the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribes in Southern Oregon, will think about a massacre of American Indians outside Roseburg in the mid-1850s.

''I am hoping, and I said hoping, that events like this, days like this, acts like this, will help to bring up a consciousness across America of the rightful place of Indian people.'' she said.

Peggy Nagae, a former civil rights attorney and now a diversity consultant based in Eugene, said she will think about her parents, grandparents and others in the Japanese American community who were forced into internment camps during World War II.

And she will think about Minoru Yasui, a lawyer from Hood River who dared in 1942 to test federal curfew laws placed on Japanese Americans by walking the streets of Portland after dark.

Nagae, who helped him fight his arrest all the way to the U.S. Supreme court, remembers him as one of Oregon's heroes.

''The thing that always struck me about Yasui was that he was an ordinary person who did extraordinary things,'' she said.

Gary, an impassioned community activist who has fought discrimination for decades, recalls the day in the '40s when she and her future husband, Fred, went to a popular Portland restaurant. At first, no one would wait on them, she said. When a waitress finally did, the couple ordered steak, the most expensive item on the menu.

But when the food came, the steak was buried under so much salt and pepper that it was inedible. Before walking out, she scolded the waitress over the restaurant's obvious attempt to discourage them from returning.

Now a great-grandmother of two, Gary continues to fight battles on behalf of African Americans, children and the elderly. A saying that hangs on her dining room wall captures her resilience: ''Good things come to those who wait. But they come a lot sooner to those who act.''

It is that spirit that will propel her to Salem on Thursday. ''This is not exactly a joyous occasion,'' she said. ''It is something I feel is late in coming. But I'm glad to see it.''

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, through the following statement, I am making my financial net worth as of March 31, 1999, a matter of public record. I have filed similar statements for each of the nineteen preceding years I have served in the Congress.

ASSETS

REAL PROPERTY

Single family residence at 609 Ft. Williams Parkway, City of Alexandria, Virginia, at assessed valuation. (Assessed at 600,000). Ratio of assessed to market value: 100% (Encumbered): $601,300.00.

Condominum at N76 W14726 North Point Drive, Village of Menomonee Falls, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at assessor's estimated market value. (Unencumbered): 90,600.00.

Undivided 25/44ths interest in single family residence at N52 W32654 Maple Lane, Village of Chenequa, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at 25/44ths of assessor's estimated market value of $675,200: 383,636.36.

Total real property: $1,075,536.36.

COMMON AND PREFERRED STOCK

	No. of shares	Dollar value per share	Value
Abbott Laboratories, Inc.	12200	$46.81	$571,112.50
Airtouch Communications	148	96.63	14,300.50
Allstate Corporation	370	37.06	13,713.13
American Telephone & Telegraph	572.722	79.81	45,710.37
Ameritech	817.75	57.63	47,122.84
Bank One Corp.	3439	55.06	189,359.94
Bell Atlantic Corp.	1017.129	51.69	52,572.86
Bell South Corp.	1214.1252	40.06	48,640.89
Benton County Mining Company	333	0.00	0.00
BP Amoco	1802	101.00	182,002.00
Chenequa Country Club Realty Co	1	0.00	0.00
Cognizant Corp.	2500	57.38	143,437.50
Darden Restaurants, Inc	1440	20.63	29,700.00
Dunn & Bradstreet, Inc	2500	35.63	89,062.50
E.I. DuPont de Nemours Corp	1200	58.06	69,675.00
Eastman Chemical Co	270	42.06	11,356.88
Eastman Kodak	1080	63.88	68,985.00
El Paso Energy	150	32.69	4,903.13
Exxon Corp	4864	70.56	343,216.00
Firstar Corp	1030	89.50	92,185.00
General Electric Co	5200	110.63	575,250.00
General Mills, Inc	1440	75.56	108,810.00
General Motors Corp	304	87.00	26,448.00
Halliburton Company	2000	38.50	77,000.00
Highlands Insurance Group, Inc	100	10.56	1,056.25
Imation Corp	99	16.50	1,633.50
IMS Health	5000	33.13	165,650.00
Kellogg Corp	3200	33.81	108,200.00
Kimberly-Clark Corp	31418	47.94	1,506,100.38
Lucent Technologies	348	108.00	37,584.00
Media One	255	63.81	16,272.19
Merck & Co., Inc	34078	80.13	2,730,499.75
Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing	1000	70.75	70,750.00
Monsanto Corporation	8360	45.94	384,037.50
Morgan Stanley/Dean Whitter	156	99.94	14,590.25
NCR Corp	68	50.00	3,400.00
Newell Corp	1676	47.50	79,610.00
Newport News Shipbuilding	164.261	31.69	5,205.02
Nielsen Media	833	24.69	20,564.69
Ogden Corp	910	24.06	21,896.88
PG&E Corp	175	31.06	5,435.94
Raytheon Co	19	57.75	1,097.25
Reliant Energy	300	26.06	7,818.75
RR Donnelly Corp	500	32.19	16,093.75
Sandusky Voting Trust	26	87.00	2,262.00
SBC Communications	1028.98	47.19	48,554.99
Sears Roebuck & Co	200	45.19	9,037.50
Solutia	1672	17.38	29,051.00
Tenneco Corp	864.978	27.94	24,165.32
U.S. West, Inc	315.623	55.06	17,378.99
Unisys, Inc. Preferred	100	51.88	5,187.50
Warner Lambert Co	6804	66.25	450,765.00
Wisconsin Energy Corp	1022	26.06	26,635.88
Total common and preferred stocks and bonds			8,030,685.29

LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES

	Face value	Surrender value
Northwestern Mutual #4378000	$12,000.00	$40,531.58
Northwestern Mutual #4574061	30,000.00	97,104.33
Massachusetts Mutual #4116575	10,000.00	7,476.95
Massachusetts Mutual #4228344	100,000.00	168,011.88
Old Line Life Ins. #5–1607059L	175,000.00	32,226.01
Total life insurance policies		345,305.75

BANK & SAVINGS AND LOAN ACCOUNTS

	Balance
Bank One, Milwaukee, N.A. checking account	$10,432.36
Bank One, Milwaukee, N.A. preferred savings	23,054.13
Bank One, Milwaukee, N.A. regular savings	807.40
M&I Lake Country Bank, Hartland, WI, checking account	3,192.18
M&I Lake Country Bank, Hartland, WI, savings	342.93
Burke & Herbert Bank, Alexandria, VA, checking account	1,749,37
Firstar, FSB, Butler, WI, IRA accounts	68,699.09
Total bank and savings and loan accounts	$108,277.46

MISCELLANEOUS

	Value
1994 Cadillac Deville	$14,775.00

MISCELLANEOUS—Continued

	Value
1991 Buick Century automobile—blue book retail value	4,750.00
Office furniture & equipment (estimated)	1,000.00
Furniture, clothing & personal property (estimated)	150,000.00
Stamp collection (estimated)	52,000.00
Interest in Wisconsin retirement fund	212,054.00
Deposits in Congressional Retirement Fund	117,730.26
Deposits in Federal Thrift Savings Plan	109,326.92
Traveller's checks	7,418.96
20 ft. Manitou pontoon boat & 35 hp Force outboard motor (estimated)	45,000.00
17 ft. Boston Whaler boaat & 70 hp Johnson outboard motor (estimated)	7,000.00
Total Miscellaneous:	721,055.00
Total assets:	10,280,094.06

LIABILITIES

Nations Bank Mortgage Company, Louisville, KY on Alexandria, VA residence Loan #39758–77: $86,936.33.

Miscellaneous charge accounts (estimated): $0.00.

Total liabilities: $86,936.33.

Net worth: $10,193,968.06.

STATEMENT OF 1998 TAXES PAID

Federal income tax $108,494.00.

Wisconsin income tax, $24,027.00.

Menomonee Falls, WI property tax $2,140.00.

Chenequa, WI property tax, $15,036.00.

Alexandria, VA property tax, $6,820.00.

I further declare that I am trustee of a trust established under the will of my late father, Frank James Sensenbrenner, Sr., for the benefit of my sister, Margaret A. Sensenbrenner, and of my two sons, F. James Sensenbrenner III, and Robert Alan Sensenbrenner. I am further the direct beneficiary of two trusts, but have no control over the assets of either trust. My wife, Cheryl Warren Sensenbrenner, and I are trustees of separate trusts established for the benefit of each son under the Uniform Gift to Minors Act. Also, I am neither an officer nor a director of any corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin or of any other state or foreign country.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
Member of Congress.

BRACKET CREEP OVERBURDENS NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 1620, a bill to free the National Labor Relations Board from being overburdened because bracket creep that has forced them to accept cases from very small employers in this nation. Here is a copy of my ''Dear Colleague'' and a report from the Labor Policy Association that outlines the problem and why it is important to small businesses in America to correct this problem.

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC.

FREE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD (NLRB): HELP REDUCE UNNECESSARY BURDEN ON SMALL BUSINESS

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This Congress, Mr. Istook is introducing legislation to help the NLRB manage their huge caseload. Each year the NLRB requests additional funding to help them administer and manage their caseload. This legislative reform simply makes adjustments for inflation in the financial jurisdictional thresholds of the NLRB, most of which were set in 1959. The NLRB can still adjudicate special cases below these thresholds, just as they can do today. It is crucial that we provide the NLRB with this freedom. We urge you to cosponsor this bill. Two former NLRB Chairs support this change.

The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is the government agency designed to settle labor disputes between unions and management. In 1959, Congress passed a law to give NLRB jurisdiction over businesses based on gross receipts. Once a business passes that threshold of gross receipts, it is subject to intervention by the NLRB. Businesses below the threshold are subject to actions brought in state courts, instead of the NLRB.

Without an adjustment for inflation, businesses and the NLRB have been caught in ''bracket creep.'' as inflation has increased since 1959, the NLRB has acquired jurisdiction over much smaller businesses than was ever intended, escalating the expense and workload for the NLRB as well as for business. These now include very small businesses, for whom the cost of such intervention is unbearable. Up to 20% of the NLRB's workload now is these very small businesses. For example, NLRB has jurisdiction over non-retail businesses with gross receipts over $50,000, an inflation adjustment would raise that threshold to $275,773. NLRB has jurisdiction over retail business and restaurants doing more than $500,000 worth of business, but adjusting for inflation since 1959 would raise this to $2.7 million. Congress never intended to subject small businesses to such a have regulatory hammer.

The NLRB is powerless to change its jurisdiction without an act of Congress. So this legislation will do exactly that. By indexing the jurisdiction to the rate of inflation, the NLRB could again focus upon the larger businesses for whom the law was originally written. Small businesses have been severely burdened by dealing with the far-off NLRB instead of their local state courts (Examples on Reverse).

This bill's simple adjustment both frees NLRB deal with significant cases truly affecting interstate commerce, and also removes the problems very small business have with NLRB oversight (See Example on the Reverse). If you have any questions, please call Mr. Istook's office and speak with Dr. Bill Duncan at (202) 225–2182.

Tom DeLay, House Majority Whip; Bill Young, Chairman, Appropriations Committee; John Boehner, Chairman, Employer/Employee Relations Subcommittee; John Porter, Chairman, Labor, HHS, Education Subcommittee; Jim Talent, Chairman, Small Business Committee; Henry Bonilla, Member, Appropriations Committee; Ernest Istook, Member, Appropriations Committee; Dan Miller, Member, Appropriations Committee; Jay Dickey, Member, Appropriations Committee; Roger Wicker, Member, Appropriations Committee; Anne Northup, Member, Appropriations Committee; Randy ''Duke'' Cunningham, Member, Appropriations Committee; John Hostettler; Chris Cannon.

EXAMPLES OF SMALL BUSINESS NLRB CASES

Larry Burns, of Houston, Texas, (8 employees), had 2 charges filed against his business by the NLRB. One was thrown out, the other settled for $160 (1 days pay). Larry Burns spent $11,000 in attorneys fees and wasted time fighting the NLRB when these problems could have been solved cheaper and easier in state courts. Also, Mr. Burns, under state law, could have recovered ½ of his attorney's fees under loser pays (which helps eliminate frivolous charges).

Randall Borman, of Evansville, Indiana (4 employees). Three charges were filed with the NLRB. All were dismissed. He could have recovered all of his legal fees under Indiana state law. Instead he lost $7,500 in attorney's fees and lost revenue and had to lay off workers to cover this expense.

EXAMPLES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING NLRB CASES

Julian Burns, of Charlotte, North Carolina, (23 employees). His case should be heard by the NLRB. However, the NLRB's workload is so overloaded with cases from very small businesses that is took 2½ years to hear his case. Rather than getting his day in court, he settled for $10,000 after paying $35,000 in attorney's fees, and $250,000 for losses in manpower and reduced workforce, for a total cost of $295,000.

ACHIEVING NLRB BUDGET SAVINGS BY UPDATING SMALL BUSINESS THRESHOLDS[1]

The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB or Board) exercises exclusive jurisdiction over all labor disputes that are considered to be of significant national interest. The Board, itself, has set the standards for determining which labor disputes reach this threshold. Unfortunately, most of these standards are based on 1959 dollar figures that have not been adjusted for inflation over time. The result is that the Board's method for asserting jurisdiction has become outdated and should be changed to reflect present economic realities. Such a change could result in substantial savings to the U.S. Government.

The NLRB's jurisdiction, in both representation and unfair labor practice cases, extends to all enterprises that ''affect'' interstate commerce.[2] This expansive statutory grant of authority has been held by the Supreme Court to mean that the Board's jurisdiction extends to ''the fullest . . . breadth constitutionally permissible under the commerce clause.''[3]

Traditionally, however, the Board has never exercised its full authority. Since its establishment, the Board has considered only cases that, in its opinion, ''substantially affect'' interstate commerce. In 1959, Congress endorsed this practice in the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. The act specifically allowed the Board to ''decline to assert jurisdiction over any labor dispute . . . where . . . the effect of such labor dispute on commerce is not sufficiently substantial to warrant the exercise of its jurisdiction.''[4] Congress did not leave the Board total discretion, however. It instructed that the Board ''shall not decline to assert jurisdiction over any labor dispute over which it would assert jurisdiction under the standards prevailing upon August 1, 1959.''[5]

Thus, although Congress recognized that the Board needed to exercise discretion in interpreting the term ''affecting commerce,'' it clearly did not want the Board to establish lower thesholds than were already in place. In 1959, however, the Board's prevailing jursidictional thresholds were based on raw dollar amounts. The difficulty with this jurisdictional approach is that it fails to take inflation into account.

The problem with not adjusting jurisdictional thresholds is clearly illustrated in the following example. In 1959, the Board exercised jurisdiction over non-retail businesses that sold or purchased goods in interstate commerce totaling $50,000 or more annually. In other words, in 1959, $50,000 of interstate business ''substantially affected commerce.'' Today, the Board continues to exercise jurisdiction using the $50,000 threshold, but the effect on commerce of $50,000 today is not nearly what it was in 1959. The value of $50,000 today is equivalent to $9,065 in 1959. Thus, just as $9,065 did not warrant the Board's jurisdiction in 1959, $50,000 should not warrant the Board's jurisdiction today.

Since 1959, the Board has established separate thresholds for particular types of businesses that did not fall into the 1959 categories. Although these thresholds are more recent, they nonetheless suffer from the same major flaw—they fail to consider inflation.

Figure 1, below, list the Board's current jurisdictional thresholds for various business sectors along with the year in which those thresholds were established. These sums are then converted into their present value—making it clear that the Board's present procedure for asserting jurisdiction is both unrealistic and outdated. Consequently, 29 U.S.C. §164(c)(1) should be amended to reflect the present value of these jurisdictional thresholds.

A second flaw in basing jurisdiction solely on the volume of the employer's business is that such a method fails to consider the size of the bargaining units involved. As a result, the Board spends scarce federal resources pursuing relatively small benefits. Figure 2 clearly illustrates this position. In 1994, the Board expended nearly 20% of its representation effort on bargaining units of 9 persons or less. Yet, this 20% effort reached less than 2% of the total number of employees involved in representation elections that year (3,393 out of a total of 188,899). In other

[1] This analysis was prepared by the staff of the Labor Policy Association.

[2] 29 U.S.C. §160.

[3] *NLRB* v. *Reliance Fuel Oil Corp.*, 371 U.S. 224 (1963).

[4] 29 U.S.C. §164(c)(1). Parties involved in labor disputes that did not meet the Board's jurisdictional requirements were not left without recourse by Congress. The act specifically provided that agencies or state courts jurisdiction over these claims. 29 U.S.C. §164(c)(2). Of course, state courts would have to be empowered by state law to do so.

[5] 29 U.S.C. §164(c)(1).

words, the Board could have reduced its effort by 20% while maintaining 98% effectiveness had it declined to assert jurisdiction over these small units.

What is even more surprising is that the NLRB conducts elections in units as small as two workers. The Board refuses to release statistics on this point to the public, but such statistics would be available to the Appropriations Committee.

Leaving jurisdiction over these small business units to the states would be most efficient use of federal resources and could result in significant savings to the Federal Government.

FIGURE 1—PRESENT VALUE OF NLRB JURISDICTIONAL THRESHOLDS BY BUSINESS ACTIVITY

Business activity	Jurisdictional threshold	Present value
Non-retail enterprises; enterprises that combine retail and wholesale; and architectural firms (1959)	[1] $50,000	$275,773
Retail enterprises; restaurants; automobile dealers; taxicab companies; country clubs; and service establishments (1959)	[2] 500,000	2,757,732
Instrumentalities, links, and channels of interstate commerce (1959)	[3] 50,000	275,773
Public utilities; transit companies (1959)	[4] 250,000	1,378,870
Printing; publishing; radio; television; telephone; and telegraph companies (1959)	[5] 200,000	1,103,093
Office buildings; shopping centers; and parking lots (1959)	[6] 100,000	551,546
Day care centers (1976)	[7] 250,000	705,185
Health care facilities (1975):		
—nursing homes	100,000	298,327
—hospitals	[8] 250,000	745,818
Hotels and motels (1971)	[9] 500,000	1,981,481
Law firms (1977)	[10] 250,000	662,129

[1] Figure represents annual interstate sales or purchase. Siemons Mailing Serv., 122 NLRB 81 (1958); Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons, Inc., 192 NLRB 1049 (1965).

[2] Figure represents annual volume of business including sales and taxes. Red and White Airway Cab Co., 123 NLRB 83 (1959); Carolina Supplies and Cement Co., 122 NLRB 723 (1958); Bickford's, Inc., 110 NLRB 1904 (1954); Claffery Beauty Shoppes, 110 NLRB 620 (1954); Wilson Oldsmobile, 110 NLRB 534 (1954); Walnut Hills Country Club, 145 NLRB 81 (1963).

[3] Figure represents annual income derived from furnishing interstate passenger or freight transportation. HPO Serv., Inc., 202 NLRB 394 (1958).

[4] Figure represents total annual volume of business. Public utilities are also subject to the $50,000 non-retail threshold. Charleston Transit Co., 123 NLRB 1296 (1959); Sioux Valley Empire Elec. Ass'n, 122 NLRB 92 (1958).

[5] Figure represents total annual volume of business. Belleville Employing Printers, 122 NLRB 92 (1958); Raritan Valley Broadcasting Co., 122 NLRB 90 (1958).

[6] Figure represents total annual income. Mistletoe Operating Co., 122 NLRB 1534 (1958).

[7] Figure represents gross annual revenues. Salt & Pepper Nursery School, 222 NLRB 1295.

[8] Figure represents gross annual revenues. East Oakland Health Alliance, Inc., 218 NLRB 1270 (1975).

[9] Figure represents total annual volume of business. Penn-Keystone Realty Corp., 191 NLRB 800 (1971).

[10] Figure represents gross annual revenues. Foley, Hoag, & Eliot, 229 NLRB 456 (1977).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to Emergency Supplemental Appropriation conference report.

Senate passed Juvenile Justice bill.

House agreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4, Declaration of Policy to Deploy a national Missile Defense—clearing the measure for the President.

House Committee ordered reported the Legislative appropriations for Fiscal Year 2000.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5633–S5785

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1086–1101, and S. Res. 104. **Pages S5738–39**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 303, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to enhance the ability of direct broadcast satellite and other multichannel video providers to compete effectively with cable television systems, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–51) **Page S5738**

Measures Passed:

Juvenile Justice: By 73 yeas to 25 nays (Vote No. 140), Senate passed S. 254, to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by rehabilitation of juvenile criminals, and punish and deter violent gang crime, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S5633–42, S5683–S5732

Adopted:

By 79 yeas to 21 nays (Vote No. 133), Lott (for Smith (of Oregon)/Jeffords) Modified Amendment No. 366, to clarify provisions relating to pawn shops and special licensees. **Pages S5633–42**

By 51 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 134), Lautenberg/Kerrey Amendment No. 362, to regulate the sale of firearms at gun shows. **Page S5642**

By 75 yeas to 24 nays (Vote No. 137), Frist/Ashcroft Amendment No. 355, to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 to authorize schools to apply appropriate discipline measures in cases where students have firearms. **Pages S5684–91**

Harkin Amendment No. 368, to provide appropriate interventions and services to children who are removed from school, and to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting a crime committed by a child. **Pages S5691–95**

Hatch (for Helms) Amendment No. 369, to amend the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 to require a local educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to treat possession, on school property, of felonious quantities of illegal drugs the same as gun possession on such property. **Pages S5700–02**

Hatch (for Harkin) Amendment No. 370, to amend section 10102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to enable local educational agencies to establish or expand school counseling programs. **Pages S5700–02**

Rejected:

By 41 yeas to 56 nays (Vote No. 138), Bond Modified Amendment No. 345, to establish a commission to study the motion picture industry and make recommendations to Congress and the President to promote accountability in the motion picture industry in order to reduce juvenile access to violent, pornographic, or other harmful material in motion pictures. **Pages S5695–S5700, S5709**

By 48 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 139), Biden Amendment No. 371, to establish a 21st century community policing initiative. **Pages S5702–09**

Note: The following amendment was incorporated into the Hatch/Leahy Amendment No. 363 (Managers' Package), which was adopted on Wednesday, May 19, 1999:

Wellstone Amendment No. 356, to improve the juvenile delinquency prevention challenge grant program.

Satellite Home Viewers Improvement Act: Senate passed H.R. 1554, to amend the provisions of title 17, United States Code, and the Communications Act of 1934, relating to copyright licensing and carriage of broadcast signals by satellite, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof, the text of S. 247, Senate companion measure, and after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5775–80**

Hatch (for McCain) Amendment No. 372, to enhance the ability of direct broadcast satellite and other multichannel video providers to compete effectively with cable television systems. **Page S5778**

Hatch/Leahy Amendment No. 373 (to Amendment No. 372), to strike certain provisions amending title 17, United States Code. **Page S5778**

Hatch/Leahy Amendment No. 374, to make certain technical and conforming amendments. **Page S5778**

Hatch/Leahy Amendment No. 375, to modify the definition of unserved household, provide for a moratorium on copyright liability. **Page S5778**

Subsequently, S. 247 was placed back on the Senate calendar. **Page S5780**

Legal Representation Authorization: Senate agreed to S. Res. 104, to authorize testimony, production of documents, and legal representation in United States v. Nippon Miniature Bearing, Inc., et al. **Page S5780**

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations—Conference Report: By 64 yeas to 36 nays (Vote No. 136), Senate agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1141, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999. **Pages S5643–82**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

A point of order was made that certain provisions of the conference report were in violation of Section 206 of H. Con. Res. 68, Congressional Budget Resolution and, by 70 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 135), three fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to a motion to waive the aforementioned section with respect to the consideration of the conference report. **Pages S5655–59**

Treaty Approved: The following treaty having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, upon division, two-thirds of the Senators present and having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification was agreed to:

Amended Mines Protocol, with one reservation, nine understandings, and thirteen conditions. (Treaty Doc. 105–1A); **Pages S5780–85**

Department of Defense Authorization—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the consideration of S. 1059, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, on Monday, May 24, 1999. **Page S5785**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

Gary L. Visscher, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission. **Pages S5774–75, S5785**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Robert Clarke Brown, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority for a term expiring November 22, 2005. (Reappointment)

James B. Lewis, of New Mexico, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, Department of Energy.

Lewis Andrew Sachs, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

1 Department of Defense nomination in the rank of general and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. **Page S5785**

Messages From the House: **Page S5736**

Measures Referred: **Page S5736**

Communications: **Pages S5736–37**

Petitions: **Pages S5737–38**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5738**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S5739–64**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5764–65**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S5765–71**

Authority for Committees: **Page S5771**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5771–74**

Record Votes: Eight record votes were taken today. (Total—140) **Pages S5642, S5659, S5682, S5691, S5709, S5725**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 8:39 p.m., until 11 a.m., on Monday,

May 24, 1999. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5785.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2000 for foreign assistance programs, after receiving testimony from Madeleine K. Albright, Secretary of State.

CHILDREN'S INTERNET PROTECTION ACT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded hearings on S. 97, to require the installation and use by schools and libraries of a technology for filtering or blocking material on the Internet on computers with Internet access to be eligible to receive or retain universal service assistance, after receiving testimony from Mark James, Deputy Director, Intelligence Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, Department of the Treasury; Howard P. Berkowitz, Anti-Defamation League, Washington, D.C.; Peter H. Nickerson, N2H2, Seattle, Washington; and Mark Potok, Southern Poverty Law Center, Montgomery, Alabama.

COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH INDUSTRY

Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space concluded hearings on issues relating to the commercial space launch industry, after receiving testimony from Maj. Gen. Robert C. Hinson, Commander, 14th Air Force/Component Commander, United States Air Force Space Command; Keith Calhoun-Senghor, Director, Office of Space Commercialization, Technology Administration, Department of Commerce; Lori Garver, Associate Administrator for Policy and Plans, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Patricia Grace Smith, Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; D. Andrew Beal, Beal Aerospace Technologies, Inc., Frisco, Texas; Hoyt Davidson, Donaldson, Lufkin, and Jenrette Securities Corporation, New York, New York; John W. Douglass, Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc, Washington, D.C.; Gale Schluter, Boeing Company, Arlington, Virginia; Peter B. Teets, Lockheed Martin Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland; and Stephen G. Wurst, Space Access, Palmdale, California.

ALLEGED CHINESE ESPIONAGE

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee held open and closed hearings to examine damage to the national security from alleged Chinese espionage at the Department of Energy nuclear weapons laboratories, receiving testimony from Notra Trulock, III, Acting Deputy Director, Office of Intelligence, and Edward Curran, Director, Office of Counterintelligence, both of the Department of Energy; Neil Gallagher, Assistant Director, National Security Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and James Baker, Deputy Counsel for Intelligence Operations, Office of Intelligence Policy and Review, both of the Department of Justice.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

NATIONAL OILHEAT RESEARCH ALLIANCE ACT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation concluded hearings on S. 348, to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance training, research and development, energy conservation and efficiency, and consumer education in the oilheat industry for the benefit of oilheat consumers and the public, after receiving testimony from Donald Allen, E.T. Lawson, Hampton, Virginia, on behalf of the National Oilheat Research Alliance; and John Huber, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, Arlington, Virginia.

GASOLINE SULFUR STANDARDS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety concluded hearings on the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed sulfur standard for gasoline as contained in the proposed Tier Two standards for automobiles, after receiving testimony from Carol M. Browner, Administrator, and Robert Perciasepe, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, both of the Environmental Protection Agency.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 746, to provide for analysis of major rules, to promote the public's right to know the costs and benefits of major rules, and to increase the accountability of quality of Government, with an amendment;

S. 468, to improve the effectiveness and performance of Federal financial assistance programs, simplify Federal financial assistance application and reporting requirements, and improve the delivery of services to the public, with amendments;

S. 712, to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for highway-rail grade crossing safety through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps;

H.R. 858, to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, to extend coverage under the whistleblower protection provisions of the District of Columbia Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 to personnel of the courts of the District of Columbia, with an amendment;

S. 1072, to make certain technical and other corrections relating to the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act (36 U.S.C. 143 note; 112 Stat. 3486 et seq.);

S. 335, to amend chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, to provide for the nonmailability of certain deceptive matter relating to games of chance, administrative procedures, orders, and civil penalties relating to such matter, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Stephen H. Glickman and Eric T. Washington, each to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, Hiram E. Puig Lugo, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, and John T. Spotila, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

ESPIONAGE INVESTIGATION

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded closed oversight hearings on the national security methods and processes relating to the Wen-Ho Lee espionage investigation, after receiving testimony from certain protected witnesses.

AUTHORIZATION—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee resumed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, receiving testimony from Senators Cochran and Shelby; Cassandra D. Washington, Mississippi Educational Network, Jackson; Robert T. Coonrod, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Ralph Nadar, Commercial Alert, and Father Peter Weigand, St. Anselm's Abbey School, all of Washington, D.C.; Linda Wood, South Kingston High School, Wakefield, Rhode Island; Arthur White, Stamford, Connecticut, and Nedra Whitted, Chicago, Illinois, both on behalf of Reading Is Fundamental, Inc.; Diane Berreth, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Virginia; Phyllis Schlafly, Eagle Forum, St. Louis, Missouri; and Paul Folkemer, Channel One Network, New York, New York.

VETERANS PROGRAMS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded hearings on S. 555, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue payment of monthly educational assistance benefits to veterans enrolled at educational institutions during periods between terms if the interval between such periods does not exceed eight weeks, S. 695, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national cemetery for veterans in the Atlanta, Georgia, metropolitan area, S. 940, to provide a temporary authority for the use of voluntary separation incentives by the Department of Veterans Affairs to reduce employment levels, restructure staff, and S. 1076, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities, to enhance programs providing health care, education, and other benefits for veterans, to authorize major medical facility projects, to reform eligibility for burial in Arlington National Cemetery, after receiving testimony from Senator Conrad; Togo D. West, Jr., Secretary, Kenneth W. Kizer, Under Secretary of Health, Veterans Health Administration, Nora Egan, Deputy Under Secretary for Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, and Roger R. Rapp, Acting Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs, National Cemetery Administration, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs; Patrick T. Henry, Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, and John C. Metzler, Superintendent, Arlington National Cemetery, both of the Department of the Army; Jacqueline Garrick, American Legion, Dennis M. Cullinan, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Joseph A. Violante, Disabled American Veterans, Harley Thomas, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Rick Weidman, Vietnam Veterans of America, all of Washington, D.C.; and Peter S. Gaytan, AMVETS, Lanham, Maryland.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 1880–1903; 1 private bill, H.R. 1904; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 55, H. Con. Res. 110, and H. Res. 184, were introduced. **Pages H3459–60, H3462**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 905, to provide funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (H. Rept. 106–152);

H.R. 1378, to authorize appropriations for carrying out pipeline safety activities under chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, amended (H. Rept. 106–153, Pt. 1);

H.R. 17, to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to require the President to report to Congress on any selective embargo on agricultural commodities, to provide a termination date for the embargo, to provide greater assurances for contract sanctity, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 105–154, Pt. 1); and

H.R. 45 to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, amended (H. Rept. 106–155, Pt. 1). **Page H3459**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Quinn to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3395**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Father James Nock of Hartford, Connecticut. **Page H3395**

American Land Sovereignty Protection Act: The House passed H.R. 883, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands. **Pages H3402–25**

Agreed to:

The Young of Alaska amendment that extends the deadline for Congress to authorize Biosphere Reserves to 2003; **Page H3416**

The Vento amendment that prohibits Federal officials from entering into any international agreement concerning the disposal, management, and use of any U.S. lands unless authorized by law (agreed to by a recorded vote of 262 ayes to 158 noes, Roll No. 141); **Pages H3416–17, H3423–24**

The Young of Alaska amendment, to the Sweeney amendment, that specifies that the designation of a Biosphere Reserve shall not adversely affect State and local revenue; and **Page H3420**

The Sweeney amendment, as amended, that requires the management plan to ensure that the designation of a Biosphere Reserve shall not adversely affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs (agreed to by a recorded vote of 407 ayes to 15 noes, Roll No. 143). **Pages H3419–20, H3424–25**

Rejected the Udall amendment that sought to exempt Biosphere Reserves in Colorado from the provisions of the bill (rejected vote of 191 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 142). **Pages H3417–19, H3424**

H. Res. 180, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 240 ayes to 178 nays, Roll No. 140. **Pages H3398–H3401**

Earlier, agreed to the Hastings of Washington amendment to the rule that strikes ''833'' on page 2 and inserts ''883'' in lieu thereof. **Page H3399**

National Missile Defense Deployment: By a yea and nay vote of 345 yeas to 71 nays, Roll No. 144, the House agreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4, to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense—clearing the measures for the President. **Pages H3430–37**

H. Res. 179, the rule which provided for the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill was agreed to earlier by voice vote. **Pages H3426–30**

Late Reports: Committee on Appropriations received permission to have until midnight on May 21 to file two privileged reports on bills making appropriations for (1) Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and related Agencies and (2) Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. **Pages H3437–38**

Legislative Program: The Majority Leader announced the Legislative Program for the week of May 24. **Page H3438**

Meeting Hour—Monday, May 24: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, May 24 for morning-hour debates. **Page H3438**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, May 26. **Page H3438**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea and nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H3401, H3423–24, H3424, H3424–25, and H3437. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

Committee Meetings

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research and Specialty Crops continued hearings on Commodity Futures Trading Commission Reauthorization. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Hearings continue June 8.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Ordered reported the Legislative appropriations for fiscal year 2000.

KEY INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL ISSUES

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Held a hearing on key international financial issues. Testimony was heard from Robert E. Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury; Alan Greenspan, Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; and public witnesses.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

BUDGET PROCESS

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on the Budget Process. Testimony was heard from Representatives Nussle, Cardin and Minge; Jacob J. Lew, Director, OMB; Dan Crippen, Director, CBO; Rudolph G. Penner, former Director, CBO; and public witnesses.

ELECTRICITY COMPETITION

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power continued hearings on Electricity Competition, focusing on PURPA, Stranded Costs, and the Environment. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Hearings continue May 26.

AMERICA—THREAT OF BIOTERRORISM

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on the Threat of Bioterrorism in America: Assessing the Adequacy of Federal Law Relating to Dangerous Biological Agents. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Justice: Jim Reynolds, Chief, Terrorism and Violent Crime Section, Criminal Division; and Robert M. Burnham, Chief, Domestic Terrorism Section, National Security Division, FBI; the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: William Raub, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Policy; and Stephen M. Ostroff, M.D., Associate Director, Epidemiologic Science, National Center for Infectious Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and public witnesses.

FCC COMMISSION REFORM

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection held a hearing on Federal Communications Commission Reform: The States' Perspective. Testimony was heard from Irma Muse Dixon, Commissioner, District 3, Public Service Commission, State of Louisiana; William R. Gillis, Commissioner, Utilities and Transportation Commission, State of Washington; David W. Rolka, Commissioner, Public Utility Commission, State of Pennsylvania; Bob Rowe, Commissioner, Public Service Commission, State of Montana; and a public witness.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing on Academic Achievement for All: Increasing Flexibility and Improving Student Performance and Accountability. Testimony was heard from Representative Tanner; Bret Schundler, Mayor, Jersey City, New Jersey; William Moloney, Commissioner of Education, Department of Education, State of Colorado; and public witnesses.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources held a hearing on School Violence: What is Being Done to Combat School Violence? What Should be Done? Testimony was heard from Nelba Chavez, Administrator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; William Modzeleski, Director, Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, Department of Education; Charlie Condon, Attorney General, State of South Carolina; and public witnesses.

NATIONAL YOUTH CRIME PREVENTION DEMONSTRATION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Began markup of H.R. 102, National Youth Crime Prevention Demonstration Act.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, and Intellectual Property approved for full Committee action the following: H.R. 354, amended, Collections of Information Antipiracy Act; the American Inventors Protection Act; H.R. 1565, amended, Trademark Amendments Act of 1999; H.R. 1852, Multidistrict Trial Jurisdiction Act of 1999; H.R. 1761, amended, Copyright Damages Improvement Act of 1999; and H.R. 1225, United States Patent and Trademark Office Reauthorization Act, Fiscal Year 2000.

OVERSIGHT—STELLER SEA LIONS

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans held an oversight hearing on Steller Sea Lions. Testimony was heard from Andrew Rosenberg, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, Department of Commerce; Frank V. Kelty, Mayor, Unalaska, State of Alaska; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—COUNTY SCHOOLS 25% FUNDING STABILIZATION

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health held an oversight hearing on County Schools 25% Fund Stabilization. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—CALIFORNIA CENTRAL VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held an oversight hearing on California Central Valley Water Management. Testimony was heard from Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior; Mary Nichols, Secretary of Resources, State of California; and public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SECURITY

Committee on Science: Held a hearing on Security at the Department of Energy: Who's Protecting the Nation's Secrets. Testimony was heard from Bill Richardson, Secretary of Energy.

EASING TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND IMPROVING VEHICLE SAFETY

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Technology, hearing on Easing Traffic Congestion and Improving Vehicle Safety: ITS and Transportation Technology Solutions for the 21st Century. Testimony was heard from Kenneth Wykle, Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

VETERANS' MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Benefits held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1071, Montgomery GI Bill Improvements Act of 1999; and H.R. 1182, Servicemembers Educational Opportunity Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Nora Egan, Deputy Under Secretary, Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; representatives of veterans organizations; and public witnesses.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on National Cemeteries, including Arlington National Cemetery. Testimony was heard from Representative Chenoweth; Roger R. Rapp, Acting Under Secretary, National Cemetery Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Brian E. Burke, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army; Ray Boland, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, State of Wisconsin; Charles F. Smith, Assistant Secretary, Division of Veterans Affairs, State of North Carolina; Lt. Col. Robin L. Higgins, USMC (Ret.), Executive Director, Department of Veterans Affairs, State of Florida; and representatives of veterans organizations.

TRADE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS, DRUG FREE BORDERS AND PREVENTION OF ON-LINE PORNOGRAPHY ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered reported amended H.R. 1833, Trade Agency Authorizations, Drug Free Borders and Prevention of On-Line Pornography Act of 1999.

FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 1802, Foster Care Independence Act of 1999.

CUSTOMS SERVICE PASSENGER INSPECTION OPERATIONS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing on U.S. Customs Service passenger inspection operations. Testimony was heard from Raymond W. Kelly, Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation concluded joint oversight hearings with the House Committee on Government Reform's Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs on the Administration's fiscal year 2000 budget request for climate change programs and compliance with various statutory provisions in fiscal year 1999 appropriations acts requiring detailed accounting of climate change spending and performance measures for each requested increase in funding, after receiving testimony from Representative Knollenberg; Deidre A. Lee, Acting Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; Peter F. Guerrero, Director, Environmental Protection Issues, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, General Accounting

Office; T.J. Glauthier, Deputy Secretary of Energy; David M. Gardiner, Assistant Administrator for Policy, Environmental Protection Agency; Jerry Taylor, Cato Institute, and David M. Nemtzow, Alliance to Save Energy, both of Washington, D.C.; and William H. Lash, III, George Mason University, Arlington, Virginia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1999

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, to continue hearings on key international financial issues, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of May 24 through May 29, 1999

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, Senate will begin consideration of S. 1059, Department of Defense Authorization.

During the balance of the week, Senate expects to continue consideration of S. 1059, Department of Defense Authorization, and any other cleared legislative and executive business.

(On Tuesday, Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., for their respective party conferences.)

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Special Committee on Aging: May 24, to hold hearings to examine Health Care Financing Administration assessment's of home health care access, 1 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: May 26, to hold hearings to examine the live stock industry, including mandatory pricing and country of origin labeling, 9 a.m., SH–216.

May 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings on S. 935, to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to authorize research to promote the conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products, 9 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: May 24, Subcommittee on Defense, business meeting to mark up proposed legislation making appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for the Department of Defense, 1:30 p.m., SD–192.

May 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings on proposed legislation making appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for the Department of Defense, 2:30 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: May 25, to hold hearings on S. 798, to promote electronic commerce by encouraging and facilitating the use of encryption in interstate commerce consistent with the protection of national security, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

May 25, Subcommittee on Aviation, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for research and development programs for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, 2:15 p.m., SR–253.

May 26, Full Committee, to hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Communications Commission, 2 p.m., SR–253.

May 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings on S. 761, to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: May 25, to hold oversight hearings on state progress in retail electricity competition, 10 a.m., SD–366.

May 25, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, to hold hearings on S. 140, to establish the Thomas Cole National Historic Site in the State of New York as an affiliated area of the National Park System; S. 734, entitled the ''National Discovery Trails Act of 1999''; S. 762, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study on the inclusion of the Miami Circle in Biscayne National Park; S. 938, to eliminate restrictions on the acquisition of certain land contiguous to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park; S. 939, to correct spelling errors in the statutory designations of Hawaiian National Parks; S. 946, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer administrative jurisdiction over land within the boundaries of the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site to the Archivist of the United States for the construction of a visitor center; and S. 955, to allow the National Park Service to acquire certain land for addition to the Wilderness Battlefield in Virginia, as previously authorized by law, by purchase or exchange as well as by donation, 2:15 p.m., SD–366.

May 26, Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, to hold hearings on S. 510, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

May 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of David L. Goldwyn, of the District of Columbia to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (International Affairs), 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

May 27, Subcommittee on Water and Power, to hold hearings on S. 623, to amend Public Law 89–108 to increase authorization levels for State and Indian tribal, municipal, rural, and industrial water supplies, to meet current and future water quantity and quality needs of the Red River Valley, to deauthorize certain project features and irrigation service areas, to enhance natural resources and fish and wildlife habitat; S. 244, to authorize the construction of the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System and to authorize assistance to the Lewis and Clark Rural

Water System, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, for the planning and construction of the water supply system; S. 769, to provide a final settlement on certain debt owed by the city of Dickinson, North Dakota, for the construction of the bascule gates on the Dickinson Dam; and S. 1027, to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Deschutes Resources Conservancy, 2 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: May 25, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Liability, and Compensation Act of 1980 (Superfund), 10 a.m., SD–406.

May 26, Full Committee, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Liability, and Compensation Act of 1980 (Superfund), 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: May 25, to resume oversight hearings on the enforcement activities of the United States Customs Service, focusing on commercial operations, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: May 25, Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, to hold hearings on political and military developments in India, 10 a.m., SD–562.

May 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine issues relating to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, 2 p.m., SD–562.

May 26, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine a protocol to reconstitute the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with four new partners, 10 a.m., SD–562.

May 27, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the Chinese Embassy bombing and its effects on United States-China relations, 10 a.m., SD–562.

May 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of David B. Sandalow, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, 2 p.m., SD–562.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: May 25, business meeting to consider the Health Information Confidentiality Act; S. Con. Res. 28, urging the Congress and the President to increase funding for the Pell Grant Program and existing Campus-Based Aid Programs; the nomination of James Roger Angel, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation; and the nomination of Zalmay Khalilzad, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace, 9:30 a.m., SD–628.

May 26, Subcommittee on Employment, Safety and Training, to hold hearings to examine mine safety and health issues, 9:30 a.m., SD–628.

May 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Endowment for the Arts, 10 a.m., SD–628.

May 27, Subcommittee on Aging, to resume hearings on issues relating to the Older Americans Act, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Indian Affairs: May 26, to hold oversight hearings on Native American Youth Activities and Initiatives, 9:30 a.m., SR–485.

Select Committee on Intelligence: May 26, to hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

Committee on the Judiciary: May 24, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice Oversight, to hold oversight hearings on the Federal Bureau of Prisons, 3 p.m., SD–226.

May 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to review the Library of Congress' Copyright Office report on distance education in the digital environment, 10 a.m., SD–226.

May 26, Subcommittee on Immigration, to hold hearings to examine immigrant contributions to the United States Armed Forces, 10 a.m., SD–226.

May 26, Subcommittee on Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business: May 25, to hold hearings relating to education and business success, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem: May 25, to hold hearings to explore individual and community Y2K preparedness, and the media's role in providing Y2K information, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

House Chamber

Monday, Consideration of suspensions. No votes are expected before 6:00 p.m.

Tuesday, Wednesday and *Thursday,* Consideration of the following measures subject to rules being granted:

H.R. 1259, Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999;

H.R. 1833, United States Trade Representative and Customs Service Reauthorization Act;

H.R. 150, Education Land Grant Act;

Agriculture Appropriations Act;

Legislative Branch Appropriations Act; and

H.R. 1401, Defense Authorization Act.

Friday, The House is not in session.

Any Further Program Will Be Announced Later.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, May 26, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit, hearing to review the effects of electric deregulation on rural areas and an examination of legislative proposals, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, May 26, hearing and markup of the following bills: H.R. 629, Community Development Financial Institutions Fund Amendments Act of 1999; and H.R. 413, Program for Investment in Microentrepreneurs Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, May 25, Task Force on Social Security, hearing on International Social Security Reform, 12 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, May 25, Subcommittee on Health and Environment and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, joint hearing on Y2K and Medical Devices: Screening for the Y2K Bug, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

May 25, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Practices, hearing on H.R. 850, Security and Freedom through Encryption (SAFF) Act, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

May 26, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, to continue hearings on Electricity Competition, focusing on State Restructuring Efforts and Consumer Protection Issues, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

May 26, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on a Review of the Department of Energy's Deployment of DOE-Funded Environmental Cleanup Technologies, 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on Health and Environment, hearing on Medical Records Confidentiality in the Modern Delivery of Health Care, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, May 25, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families, hearing on Education Reform: Putting the Needs of Our Children First, 1:30 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing to Review and Oversight of the 1998 Reading Results of the National Assessment of Education Programs (NAEP)—The Nation's Report Card, 9:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, May 24, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on the Salary of the President of the United States, 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 26, Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans' Affairs and International Relations, hearing on Combating Terrorism: Proposed Transfer of the Domestic Preparedness Program to the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 27, full Committee, hearing on ''How Accurate is the FDA's Monitoring of Supplements Like Ephedra?'' 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, May 25, Subcommittee on Africa, hearing on the Ethiopia-Eritrea War: U.S. Policy Options, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 26, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing on Malaysia: Assessing the Mahathir Agenda, 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights and the Subcommittee on Africa, joint hearing on the Crisis Against Humanity in Sudan, 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, May 25, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, oversight hearing on Novel Procedures in FCC License Transfer Proceedings, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

May 25, Subcommittee on the Constitution, to mark up H.R. 1691, Religious Liberty Protection Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on H.R. 915, to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges, 10 a.m., 2226 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on the Constitution, hearing on H.R. 1218, Child Custody Protection Act, 9 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, oversight hearing on Electronic Communication Privacy Policy Disclosure, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on Crime, hearing on pending Firearms legislation and the Administration's Enforcement of Current Gun Law, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, oversight hearing on the Immigration and Naturalization Service's Interior Enforcement Strategy, 2 p.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, May 25, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 1753 (and S. 330), Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 1999, bill, S. 330, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

May 25, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on the Role of the National Forests in the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

May 25, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, oversight hearing on New NPS Methodology used to evaluate the achievement of natural quiet restoration standards in Grand Canyon National Park, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

May 26, full committee, oversight hearing on Use of Land and Money Mitigation Requirement in ESA Enforcement, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

May 27, Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans and the Subcommittee on Water and Power, joint hearing on H. Con. Res. 63, expressing the sense of the Congress opposing removal of dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers for fishery restoration purposes, 10:30 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, May 24, to consider the following: H.R. 1259, Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999; and a measure making appropriations for the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, May 25, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1655, Department of Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1999; H.R. 1656, Department of Energy Commercial Application of Energy Technology Authorization Act of 1999; H.R. 1742, Environmental Protection Agency Office of Research and Development and Science Advisory Board Authorization Act of 1999; H.R. 1743, Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air and Radiation Authorization Act of 1999; and H.R. 1744, National Institute of Standards and Technology Authorization Act of 1999, 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

May 26, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on EPA's High Production Volume (HPV) Chemical Testing Program, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, May 25, Subcommittee on Empowerment, hearing on ''Welfare To Work: What Is Working, What Is Next?'' 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

May 26, full Committee, hearing on ''Electronic Commerce: The Benefits and Pitfalls of Conducting Business Over the Internet'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on Government Programs and Oversight, hearing on the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, May 26, Subcommittee on Ground Transportation, oversight hearing on the Office of Motor Carriers and of Bus Safety, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

May 26, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing on the Administration's Harbor Services Fee Proposal, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, May 25, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on the impact of complexity in the tax code for individual taxpayers and small businesses, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

May 27, Subcommittee on Human Resources, hearing on the Effects of Welfare Reform, 10:30 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

May 27, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on the use and effect of unilateral trade sanctions, 11 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Monday, May 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the recognition of certain Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 1 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of S. 1059, Department of Defense Authorization.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, May 24

House Chamber

Program for Monday: Consideration of suspensions.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E1039
Bliley, Tom, Va., E1055
Bonior, David E., Mich., E1044
Boyd, Allen, Fla., E1046
Canady, Charles T., Fla., E1041
Castle, Michael N., Del., E1054
Christensen, Donna MC, The Virgin Islands, E1055
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1046
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E1045
Doolittle, John T., Calif., E1052
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1044, E1045, E1048
Everett, Terry, Ala., E1046
Gonzalez, Charles A., Tex., E1043, E1044, E1047, E1052
Goodling, William F., Pa., E1035
Green, Gene, Tex., E1045
Hayes, Robin, N.C., E1050
Hill, Baron P., Ind., E1053
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E1035, E1038
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E1041
Istook, Ernest J., Jr., Okla., E1061
Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E1035, E1040
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E1041, E1050
Kleczka, Gerald D., Wisc., E1039
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1044, E1045, E1049
Kuykendall, Steven T., Calif., E1050
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1046
Lipinski, William O., Ill., E1038
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1054
Meek, Carrie P., Fla., E1039
Morella, Constance A., Md., E1035, E1038, E1040
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E1041
Ose, Doug, Calif., E1036
Oxley, Michael G., Ohio, E1053
Packard, Ron, Calif., E1037
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E1046
Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E1037
Roukema, Marge, N.J., E1037
Scarborough, Joe, Fla., E1040
Schaffer, Bob, Colo., E1043, E1044, E1047, E1052
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E1060
Smith, Adam, Wash., E1040
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E1037, E1042, E1049, E1051
Stenholm, Charles W., Tex., E1042
Taylor, Gene, Miss., E1039
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1058
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1050
Traficant, James A., Jr., Ohio, E1054
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E1038
Weiner, Anthony D., N.Y., E1051
Weygand, Robert A., R.I., E1036
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1046

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $165.00 for six months, $325.00 per year, or purchased for $2.75 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.