

purposes of compliance by federal credit unions.

Mr. Speaker, my bill does not attempt to take on the entire issue of financial privacy. It is narrowly targeted to address only the problem of sharing information for purposes of telemarketing. However, it offers meaningful privacy protections that are urgently needed by consumers and which Congress can, and should, enact into law at the earliest opportunity.

I urge the Congress to adopt this important and needed legislation.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R.—

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Consumer Telemarketing Financial Privacy Protection Act of 1999".

**SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON THE SHARING OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FOR PURPOSES OF TELEMARKETING TO CONSUMERS.**

Section 603(d)(2)(A)(i) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(d)(2)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following:

“, and any communication of that information by the person making the report to any other person for the purpose of telemarketing to the consumer, if—

“(aa) it is clearly and conspicuously disclosed to the consumer the information that may be communicated to such persons and the consumer is given the opportunity, before the time that the information is initially communicated, to direct that such information not be communicated among such persons; and

“(bb) the information to be communicated does not include an account number or other form of access for a credit card, deposit or transaction account of the consumer for use in connection with any telemarketing to the consumer”.

**SEC. 3. ENHANCEMENT OF FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.**

Section 621 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking everything following the end of the second sentence; and

(2) by striking subsection “(e)” and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

“(1) The Federal banking agencies referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) shall jointly prescribe such regulations as necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act with respect to any persons identified under paragraph (1) and (2) of subsection (b), or to the holding companies and affiliates of such persons.

“(2) The Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration shall prescribe such regulations as necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act with respect to any persons identified under paragraph (3) of subsection (b).”.

**SEC. 4. REGULATIONS.**

The Federal banking agencies referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall issue joint regulations in final form to implement the amendments made by this Act. The Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration, not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, shall issue regulations in final form to implement the amendments made by this Act with respect to any Federal credit union.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2119—“THE YOUNG AMERICAN WORKERS’ BILL OF RIGHTS ACT”

**HON. TOM LANTOS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1999

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced comprehensive domestic child labor reform legislation—H.R. 2119, “The Young American Workers’ Bill of Rights Act.” I am delighted to report that this legislation has been cosponsored by 57 other Members of the Congress, including my distinguished fellow Californian, Congressman TOM CAMPBELL of San Jose, and our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN PORTER of Illinois, who is Co-Chairman with me of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus.

It is a shocking fact, Mr. Speaker, that the occupational injury rate for children and teens in this country is more than twice as high as it is for adults. A young person is killed on the job in this country every five days. A young worker is injured on the job every 40 seconds. These deaths and these injuries to our nation’s children are totally unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, as America prepares to enter the 21st Century, we must ensure that our children work under safe conditions. We must ensure that the work available to them does not limit their educational opportunities, but helps them achieve healthy and productive lives. The Young American Workers’ Bill of Rights will help to make certain that job opportunities available to our young people are safer and do not interfere with their education.

Unfortunately, the exploitation of child labor in our country is not a thing of the past. It is a national problem that continues to jeopardize the health, education, and lives of many of our nation’s children and teenagers. In farm fields and in fast-food restaurants all over this country, employers are breaking the law by hiring under-age children. Many of these youth put in long, hard hours and often work under dangerous conditions. Our legislation seeks to eliminate the all-too-common exploitation of children—working long hours late into the night while school is in session, and working under hazardous conditions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2119—The “Young American Workers’ Bill of Rights Act”—addresses two major aspects of child labor: the deaths and serious injuries suffered by our young workers and the negative impact which working excessive hours during school can have on a child’s education.

The legislation establishes new, tougher penalties for willful violations of child labor laws that result in the death or serious bodily injury to a child. Not only does the bill increase fines and prison sentences for such willful violation of our laws, but it will assure that the names of child labor law violators are publicized. Nothing will deter corporate giants more than negative publicity, and bad press is one of the few effective sanctions that are available to us.

Mr. Speaker, our legislation also increases protection for children under the age of 14 who are migrant or seasonal workers in agriculture. Current labor laws allow children—even those under 10 years of age—to be employed in agriculture. Farm worker children can work unlimited hours before and after

school, and they are not even eligible for overtime pay. At the age of 14, or even earlier, children working in agriculture can use knives and machetes, operate dangerous machinery, and be exposed to toxic pesticides. In no other industry are children so exploited as they are in agriculture.

H.R. 2119 also requires better record keeping and reporting of child labor violations, prohibits minors from operating or cleaning certain types of unsafe equipment, and prohibits children from working in certain particularly hazardous occupations.

Mr. Speaker, our legislation will reduce the problem of children working long hours when school is in session, and it strengthens existing limitations on the number of hours children under 18 years of age can work on school days. The bill would eliminate all youth labor before school, and after-school work would be limited to 15 or 20 hours per week, depending on the age of the child. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because the more hours children work during the school year, the more likely they are to take easier courses, and the more likely they are to do poorly in their studies. Studies have shown that children who work long hours also tend to use more alcohol and drugs.

Mr. Speaker, too many teenagers are working long hours at the very time that they should be focusing on their education. It is important for children to learn the value of work, but education, not minimum-wage jobs, are the key to these young people’s future. Our legislation is an important step in focusing attention back upon education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join as cosponsors of this legislation. The future of our nation depends upon the strength of our young people. It is important that we assure a safe place to work and that we be certain that work not interfere with education.

HONORING MEGAN ROONEY,  
LeGRAND SMITH SCHOLARSHIP  
WINNER OF CONCORD, MI

**HON. NICK SMITH**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1999

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let it be known, that it is with great respect for the outstanding record of excellence she has compiled in academics, leadership and community service, that I am proud to salute Megan Rooney, winner of the 1999 LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This award is made to young adults who have demonstrated that they are truly committed to playing important roles in our Nation’s future.

As a winner of the LeGrand Smith Scholarship, Megan is being honored for demonstrating that same generosity of spirit, intelligence, responsible citizenship, and capacity for human service that distinguished the late LeGrand Smith of Somerset, Michigan.

Megan Rooney is an exceptional student at Concord High School and possesses an impressive high school record. Megan’s involvement in student government and school activities began her freshman year and continued through her senior year. She served as President of the student body and Vice-President of S.A.D.D. Megan excelled athletically as well on the basketball and softball teams.

Therefore, I am proud to join with her many admirers in extending my highest praise and congratulations to Megan Rooney for her selection as a winner of a LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This honor is also a testament to the parents, teachers, and others whose personal interest, strong support and active participation contributed to her success. To this remarkable young woman, I extend my most heartfelt good wishes for all her future endeavors.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
SHOULD PURCHASE FREE  
WEIGHT STRENGTH TRAINING  
EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURED IN  
THE UNITED STATES, NOT COM-  
MUNIST CHINA

**HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 10, 1999*

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the United States has long been the leader in manufacturing. Our ingenuity and efficiency drove our economy from a largely agrarian society to the bustling industrial powerhouse that it is today. However, over the years, many foreign countries with government controlled economies have steadily cut into our markets because their subsidized products clearly have an economic advantage in our open markets.

While I applaud efforts of the United States government to level the playing field by controlling the flood of subsidized imports, I cannot condone the actions by our government that facilitate the continued import of these cheap products. I encountered these troubles during the 103rd Congress when I shepherded legislation through the Congress requiring the U.S. Coast Guard to purchase buoy chain manufactured in the United States because an overabundance of their purchases relied on foreign sources. Today, a similar problem is occurring when the Department of Defense purchases free weight strength training equipment.

Despite having quality, domestically manufactured products available to provide our troops, various installations of the United States Armed Services are purchasing free weight strength training equipment manufactured in foreign countries, predominantly in the Peoples Republic of China. As a result, many of our troops are training with equipment that not only is manufactured by a Communist government that has worked to undermine the national security of the United States, but also may be manufactured with slave labor.

These cheap, lower-grade Chinese products are imported by American fitness companies and sold to our government under domestic labels at the expense of our domestic manufacturers. Consequently, American producers have suffered.

Buy American legislation was enacted to protect our domestic labor market by providing a preference for American goods in government purchases. This Act is critical to protecting the market share of our domestic producers from foreign government-subsidized manufacturers. However, the Buy American Act is not always obeyed.

According to an audit conducted last year by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, an astonishing 59 percent of the

contracts procuring military clothing and related items did not include the appropriate clause to implement the Buy American Act. This troubles me because many of our domestic producers are the ones that suffer.

Despite this audit and the subsequent instruction by the Defense Department to its procurement officials that the Buy American Act must be adhered to, to date, at least five defense installations provide predominantly foreign made free weight products for their personnel to weight train. Unfortunately, I believe this may signify a trend in purchases of foreign manufactured free weights under the Department of Defense.

For this reason, I tried offering an amendment that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from procuring free weight equipment used by our troops for strength training and conditioning if those weights were not domestically manufactured. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee did not rule this amendment in order.

As a result, I offered a second amendment that would require the Inspector General to further investigate the Defense Department's compliance with purchases of the Buy American Act for free weight strength training equipment. However, I think it is important to note that while this approach could successfully highlight the problem, it would only delay the process, thereby, further punishing our domestic producers.

No one can argue that the physical fitness of our troops is vital. It is well known in the Pentagon that when you're physically fit, you're also mentally prepared for any conflict. It is the cornerstone of readiness. In fact, a recent survey of nearly 1,000 Marine Corps Times, cited fitness as the number one program offered under the Morale, Welfare and Recreation program.

In addition, the importance of using free weights to train our military cannot be understated. The Marine Corps Times article further demonstrated the need for free weights by explaining that access to free weights was the number one requested activity by deployed units and the second most popular request by units about to be deployed; second only to E-mail access. Clearly, the demand for free weights is present.

However, the fact that some of our troops use Chinese manufactured weights when a higher quality domestic product is available, I find remarkable.

Although the Department of Defense may have taken steps to curb Buy American Act procurement abuses in the aftermath of the Inspector General's report on clothing procurement, I am concerned that widespread abuses of foreign free weight procurements may continue unless Congress acts to end this practice.

I believe Congress needs to protect our domestic interests by ensuring that U.S. manufacturers are insulated from cheap imports being sold to the United States government, and that our troops train with a high quality product manufactured in the United States, not Communist China. Accordingly, it is my intention to prohibit our military from spending U.S. tax dollars on free weight strength training products that are produced by a Communist government that has little respect for our national security and human rights.

RETURN UNSPENT  
CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE FUNDS

**HON. TIM ROEMER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 10, 1999*

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce important, bipartisan legislation to require Congressional office funds be returned directly to the Department of the Treasury at the end of the year to help pay down the national debt. I offer this legislation with Representatives Fred Upton, Dave Camp and 52 original cosponsors.

At this time, Congress is making tough decisions about federal spending as we debate the appropriations legislation for Fiscal Year 2000. We are working hard to keep the overall spending levels within the caps implemented by the Balanced Budget Amendment, which I cosponsored and voted for in 1996. We are making difficult choices and sacrifices, and it is appropriate for Members of Congress to lead by example.

That is why I have introduced this legislation to show American taxpayers that Congress is tightening its own belt by returning money allocated to Members for official expenses, staff salaries and mail funds. I have introduced this bill in each of the past three Congresses and the language of my legislation has been attached to each Legislative Branch Appropriations bill dating back to fiscal year 1996.

This year, I have modified my legislation. Since both the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget have forecast budget surpluses for the current fiscal year, my bill no longer requires Congressional office savings to be redesignated for deficit reduction. Instead, the bill requires unexpended funds contained in the Members' Representational Allowance (MRA) account—formerly known as the official expenses, clerk hire and franking accounts—to be applied toward reducing the federal debt. In the event that the United States returns to a budget deficit, the legislation specifically requires the Treasury to apply any remaining Congressional office funds to deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues have shared my concerns and frustrations that money saved by Members of Congress was not applied to deficit reduction or reducing the federal debt before my legislation was enacted. Rather, funds were simply "reprogrammed" for other budget items, thereby defeating the frugal intentions of many Members. The unspent funds would remain available for reprogramming for the following three years, including the year for which those funds were appropriated. At the end of the three years, unspent money immediately reverted from the House account to the General Fund of the U.S. Treasury.

My legislation would ensure that taxpayers truly benefit from savings accrued by Members, who in turn would receive the credit they deserve for not spending their entire office allowance. Since I have served in Congress, I have saved more than one million dollars. There are many Members who have worked just as hard not to spend as much as they were entitled to spend based on their official allocation.

In fact, an analysis of Congressional spending conducted by the National Taxpayers