United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1999 No. 95

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 30, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES T. WALSH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Don Borling, Pastor, All Saints Lutheran Church, Orland Park, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

O Lord of all life, we come before You as people of peace. Our tasks are awesome. Our calling to serve is precious and, at the same time, very humbling.

Lord, help us always to walk in the shoes of those who brought us here, the factory worker and the artist, the lawyer and the school custodian, the farmer and the cook.

We are the human family, bound together by a spirit with no boundaries, and yet a spirit as real and as simple as the air we breathe every day.

Our world aches for peace. So help us be the instruments of Your healing.

May we be firm but gentle, just and forgiving, full of resolve, and yet always open to the varied dance of Your many voices.

With Your guidance, Lord, we can serve with joy, come to work each day with the goodness of the human spirit in our hearts.

Help us to see the world we serve with fresh vigor, renewed purpose, and the determination to make a difference. It is an honor to be here.

O Lord of all life, thanks for sharing this journey with us.

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 Pennsylvania (Mr. MASCARA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MASCARA 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After the first 1-minute speech concerning the guest chaplain, the Chair will recognize up to 15 one-minutes on each side.

WELCOMING REVEREND DON BORLING, PASTOR, ALL SAINTS LUTHERAN CHURCH, ORLAND PARK, ILLINOIS

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise and take this opportunity to welcome to the Chamber Pastor Don Borling, his wife Jude, son Jeremy, daughter Cassie from Orland Park, Illinois, from All Saints Lutheran Church, my home church where I grew up, starting at age 14. In fact, exactly 25 years ago tomorrow, Pastor Don Borling arrived at All Saints Lutheran Church to guide all of us, to give us inspiration, to provide for us the word of God. I want to thank him today for coming and being our guest chaplain.

Mr. Speaker, we have had debate in this Chamber over the last many weeks since some of the tragedies involving young people in this country. And it comes to mind my own personal journey and, as a young teenager, the inspiration, the guidance, and the love that a pastor such as Don Borling gave to me as a young person. I do not know if that would work for everybody, but I can tell my colleagues that the inspiration that he gave me and the influence that he had on my life is something that has been as profound as any of my immediate family.

And so, as we continue to labor today to figure out ways to solve the problems that face our young people, I would just commend to my colleagues that being a mentor, being an inspiration from one person to another, making the kind of connection that we need to make with young people is something that Don has taught me; and I would commend that to my colleagues.

COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT

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

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider landmark legislation amending Depression-era banking laws. This bill will bring the banking, securities, and insurance industry regulations in line with the 21st century marketplace. These changes will create greater efficiency and consumer choices.

However, one element of this industry that does not reform is the Community Reinvestment Act, known as CRA.

Printed on recycled paper.

CRA has provided for increased loans to distressed communities, expanded homeownership opportunities, and has helped small businesses develop and flourish.

In recent years, two-thirds of all small business loans were made under CRA. It has also provided for a sharp increase in mortgage loans to low and moderate income families.

CRA investments are good investments. Financial institutions recognize the importance of serving their communities. The Community Reinvestment Act is a good, profitable business for banks and the community. I call on my colleagues to support CRA as an important part of financial services reform.

CUBAN RAFTER INCIDENT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the inscription on the Statue of Liberty refers to our great country as the Mother of Exiles, which requests ''give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses * * * of your teeming shore.''

However, yesterday, the U.S. Coast Guard in South Florida took actions against Cuban freedom seekers which call into question our U.S. commitment to these principles. Not only was it not in the fine tradition of this agency, but it raises grave concern over the treatment of those seeking asylum from brutal dictatorships, such as the Castro regime in Cuba.

The first symbol of liberty these refugees come into contact with is the U.S. Coast Guard. Is their first impression to be unwarranted acts of aggression which violate their human rights?

The Coast Guard has literally saved the lives of thousands of refugees, and yesterday's acts were not in line with that fine history. I have spoken to the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard about this matter, and he has assured me that an immediate investigation of the specific actions is already underway.

I look forward to the briefing that senior officials of the Coast Guard and other agencies will provide us with today to ensure that this will never happen again.

AMERICAN WORKERS ARE GETTING PINK SLIPS

(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, yesterday General Motors closed its plant in Flint, Michigan. Another 3,600 American manufacturing jobs gone.

Meanwhile, General Motors plants all over the world remain open. Think about it. While foreign workers are building American cars, American workers are getting pink slips. Beam me up.

I do not blame General Motors. I blame our trade policy. Our trade policies are killing jobs and killing investment.

The question I have today: If our trade policy is so good, why does Japan not do it? Why does China not do it? My colleagues, think about that.

I yield back what manufacturing jobs we have left in America.

REPUBLICANS WANT TO GIVE EXTRA MONEY COLLECTED BY GOVERNMENT BACK TO TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, under a Republican Congress, our economy is projecting huge budget surpluses over the next 10 years. And I do not mean liberal Democrat style surpluses. I mean real surpluses that do not count and include the Social Security Trust Fund.

The debate has begun already as to what to do with the extra money now being collected by the Government. The Republicans want to give it back to the people who earned it in the first place—the taxpayers. But the liberals do not see it that way. They want to spend it. As I speak, they are coming up with huge new Washington programs even before the surplus has actually come in.

So that is our choice. Congress can spend it, or we can give it back in form of tax relief to the families that earned it. Republicans want the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off working families' money. This is a battle we will be proud to wage as we go forward in the next few weeks.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud this morning to talk about one of those programs that the President announced yesterday that we need to do, and we should have done it many years ago.

Studies have shown across this country in congressional districts prescription drugs on the average cost twice as much for senior citizens as they do for other most favored customers. It affects people like in my district 85-year-old constituent who relies on Social Security as her primary source of income and she has medical conditions that require her to spend $260 a month on prescription medication. She has already sold her car, sold her furniture to pay for these prescription drugs; and yet she cannot continue to afford it for $3,000 a year.

The President yesterday announced a program that will not help as much as maybe I would like to, but it goes further than what we have today. With the budget as good as it is, maybe we ought to pay something back to those senior citizens who have built this country into what it is and not make them spend $3,000 a year of their Social Security money for prescription medication.

In her case, it would actually almost cut her prescription cost in half, the President's program would do. And so, that is what we need to do.

Sure, I would like to have tax cuts. But let us take care of those folks who have built this country and made it what it is today.

REPUBLICANS WANT TO KNOW WHAT FICA MAN IS DOING WITH ALL THE MONEY

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, what does the FICA man do with the FICA taxes taken out of a worker's paycheck?

Most workers assume, as I used to, that the taxes collected from the worker's paycheck for Social Security and Medicare were actually spent on Social Security and Medicare. Well, it turns out that is not exactly the case.

The FICA man has been engaging in some very funny business with our seniors' Social Security and Medicare money, and more and more seniors are learning the harsh truth about the way our Government is running the Social Security Trust Fund.

The FICA man collects the money and uses it to fund all kinds of things, things which have nothing to do with Social Security or medicare. Republicans want to know what the FICA man is doing with all that money. We want to put an end to the practice of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund anytime Washington feels like it.

''But wait,'' my Democrat colleagues will say, ''Social Security was designed to operate like that.''

Exactly. And that is what we want to change.

FEDERAL RESERVE DECIDING HOW HIGH, HOW MUCH, HOW OFTEN TO RAISE INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, the Federal Reserve is ensconced in their marble palace downtown meeting in secret, eating a catered breakfast off of fine china, all paid for by the taxpayer.

They are deciding how high, how much, how often to raise interest rates to combat inflation that does not exist.

They are about to raise the rates on credit cards for tens of millions of Americans, auto loans for tens of millions of Americans, mortgages for tens of millions of Americans?

Why? Because they said they are worried about the stock bubble on Wall Street.

□ 1015

But instead of using their awesome power to go directly at the speculators and the rampant speculation on Wall Street, they are going to take a whack at Main Street in the hope that the pain and the message exacted on average consumers filters up to the speculators on Wall Street. This is a bizarre new twist in economics.

It is time to pull back the curtain of secrecy and reveal the profundity of the Federal Reserve working in the interests of the privileged few at the expense of the majority in this country.

HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT—THE SEQUEL

(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, today a sequel to the speech I gave the other day about the seven habits of highly ineffective government. Mr. Speaker, there are more habits:

Number one, create programs and regulations which duplicate already existing programs at the State level. Much of what the Federal government does falls into that category.

Number two, make promises that cannot be kept. If we are not careful, Medicare and Social Security could qualify here.

Number three, do not reform programs that could go bankrupt until there is a crisis. We are still waiting for the President's Social Security reform.

Number four, never hold programs accountable for what they fail to achieve. Title I education funding has yet to raise student achievement.

Number five, refuse to reform programs going bankrupt but rather vilify those who attempt to save them. Anyone remember Mediscare?

Number six, pretend that only Democrats want to solve problems. No elaboration necessary here.

Number seven, declare that the era of big government is over, yet continue expanding big government as much as possible.

SENIORS SHOULD NOT HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN PAYING THEIR RENT AND BUYING THEIR MEDICATIONS

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent advances in modern medicine, especially in the area of pharmaceutical innovation, have yielded extraordinary benefits for all Americans, but especially for our seniors. In fact, over one-third of all the medicines approved by the FDA in the last decade have targeted diseases that are common in the elderly; and while these medicines are good and beneficial for our seniors and all Americans as a whole, the fact is that some of these drugs are very expensive. Those seniors that depend on Medicare for their health coverage are especially affected by the high costs of medications because the Medicare program in most cases does not cover the cost of prescription drugs.

This past week I sat in a living room in my district in South Hackensack, New Jersey, and heard from seniors about the financial hardships they must endure to pay for their medications. Mr. Speaker, America's seniors should not have to choose between paying their rent each month or buying the medications that will save or extend their lives. I commend President Clinton for raising the level of national debate on prescription drugs for America's seniors, and I urge all of my colleagues to rise to this challenge for the seniors of today and for the seniors of tomorrow.

THE SURPLUS BELONGS TO THE TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the latest government economic report estimates that the budget surpluses over the next 15 years will be larger than expected, much larger than expected. While the other side is busy celebrating the new opportunities to expand the Federal bureaucracy and create new Washington programs, conservatives are asking more fundamental questions about the budget surplus: To whom does it belong? Once that question is answered, it is easier to answer the question about what should be done with it.

The surplus belongs, of course, to the taxpayers. Note the surplus does not belong to all Americans, it belongs to the people who sent the money to Washington to begin with.

Now, if the Democrats have their way, that money will be spent. Many Democrats will talk about using it for debt reduction, but history does not inspire confidence. Anyone who claims that the liberal tax and spenders will not spend the surplus is invited to give me just one example of an instance when it did not happen.

THE COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice in support of the Community Reinvestment Act. Since 1977 this act has been instrumental in countering discrimination in lending practices. As we consider H.R. 10 this week, we should strengthen this successful program.

The CRA requires that financial institutions give back to the communities in which they reside. In the 22 years of its existence loans to African Americans have increased 72 percent, loans to Hispanic families have increased by 45 percent. These impressive statistics along with CRA's track record of assisting low income families participate in the American dream of home ownership and entrepreneurship should be enough evidence to protect and expand it in the House banking bill. Neighborhoods that only two decades ago were in decline are now showing signs of new life.

Mr. Speaker, the CRA encourages fair business practices, reinvigorates communities and creates jobs, all things this Congress should support.

HOWARD COUNTY SUMMER THEATER: 25 YEARS OF GREAT PRODUCTIONS AND WORTHY CAUSES

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this summer will mark the silver anniversary of the Howard County Maryland Summer Theater. This outstanding all-volunteer organization, which annually donates the proceeds from its productions to worthwhile humanitarian causes, was founded 25 years ago by a dedicated group of citizens who wanted their children and others to have a theatrical outlet during the summer. These individuals, Elsie Best, Jean Grenon and Hazel Philbrick, had the vision and commitment to make a wonderful theatrical opportunity available to Howard County residents.

Since its founding, the theater has presented 25 productions and has contributed more than $17,000 from its family-oriented musicals to local organizations assisting the homeless and the elderly as well as children effected by divorce, abuse and illness. In 25 years more than 15,000 people have attended the Howard County Summer Theater. Hello, Dolly will open this July 16. It is my sincerest wish that the theater will continue to enjoy impressive community-wide support this season and well into the future.

I want to extend my best regards to all those affiliated with the Howard County Summer Theater, especially to the theatrical pioneers who made it possible over the past 25 years and to those who are dedicated to keeping a good thing going. Congratulations and God's blessing.

TOP PRIORITIES

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, provide prescription drug coverage for seniors, give middle class tax cuts and eliminate the Federal debt are well-rounded and thoughtful. Saving Social Security and Medicare and extending their solvency needs to be a top priority of this Congress. Prescription drug coverage for seniors is a critical part of any modern health program. Treatment with medication is cost effective when compared to treating late stage ailments with surgery or other in-patient care. Our seniors who struggle every day for their prescription drugs should not have to choose between paying for food and paying for medication. A prescription drug benefit will prepare Medicare and our seniors' health care for the 21st century.

Fortunately, we are in a position to accomplish these goals due to a strong economy and a once in a generation Federal surplus. Providing prescription drug coverage for seniors as well as providing tax relief for working families is sound and responsible. This opportunity must not be squandered; it must not be wasted. We need to provide for seniors for their future.

PUT OUR FINANCIAL HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, ask a liberal what he would do to get rid of the budget deficit, and he or she will say: Raise taxes. Ask a conservative the same question, and he or she will say: Cut spending. That in a nutshell is how we got from a huge budget deficit to the current budget surplus we now enjoy. President Clinton choose the liberal way when he raised taxes in 1993, the largest tax increase in history. Republicans took over the majority in Congress in 1995 and have tried to cut spending and limit the amount of new big government spending programs proposed by the liberals. Two different visions, two different paths to achieve the common goal of a balanced budget.

Republicans forced the President to submit a balanced budget after his first two budgets contained $200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. We are grateful that the President finally agreed to work with Republicans to put our financial house in order. Lower mortgage interest rates, lower credit card payments and more job creation have resulted from the change from budget deficits to budget surplus. Good fiscal discipline will help save Social Security and Medicare.

THERE WILL NEVER BE A BETTER TIME TO CUT TAXES

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, according to the numbers as we just heard that were released this week, the OMB has decided that there is going to be a surplus of some $1 trillion over the next 15 years. This is good news, and it provides Congress with an historic opportunity to improve the standard of living of our Nation by giving tax relief.

The President said in a Rose Garden ceremony Monday: Our new budget framework will use part of the surplus to provide substantial tax relief. The average American has to work 129 days or to May 11 before they get through paying their taxes. Last year, tax revenues grew by 9 percent. That is twice, twice as fast as the economy grew.

Now there are several tax cut plans that we could talk about, but the one that I would favor is one I introduced in this House, is to cut taxes across the board. It is the fairest and the simplest way. It stops the proposal, it stops the practice, rather, of picking winners and losers among overtaxed Americans and allows everybody who pays Federal income taxes to keep more of their hard-earned money.

Mr. Speaker, with the economy growing and the Federal Government running a giant surplus, there will never be a better time than now to cut taxes.

IT TAKES A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS TO GET THE JOB DONE

(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, President Clinton ran an ad in his first presidential campaign back in 1992 in which he said he wanted to end welfare as we know it. Then what happened? Well, he had a Democrat-controlled Congress for the first 2 years of his term, and what did they do on welfare reform? Nothing.

The American people decided it was time for a change in 1994, just 2 years later, and elected a Republican majority in the House for the first time in 40 years. The Republican Congress passed welfare reform; the President vetoed it. And then we passed it again, and then he vetoed it a second time. We finally passed it a third time shortly before the election, and the President finally signed it into law, and then he took credit for it.

The liberals had ranted and raved that welfare reform, because it passed, we would see people starving in the streets. Well, just about everybody now agrees that the welfare reform has been one of the greatest success stories in years. Millions of people who were stuck, who were trapped on welfare are now working and supporting themselves and their own children instead of relying on their fellow taxpayers to support them.

Mr. Speaker, it took a Republican Congress to get the job done.

PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, there is a philosophical difference between the Congress and the White House. It will be difficult to reach any kind of agreement on the size and scope of government.

Republicans want to move in one direction, and the liberals in the White House in another direction. Republicans want a smaller Federal Government. The President is fighting to expand the government. Republicans want to cut unnecessary wasteful Washington spending. The President wants to increase spending, throwing money at any kind of problem. The Republicans want the 2000 census to be conducted in accordance with the Constitution, which states clearly there shall be an actual enumeration because everyone counts. The President wants to rig the census by allowing political appointees to oversee sampling or, in other words, take another poll. Republicans want to pass a tax cut for working Americans. The President is opposed. Republicans want to protect the surplus. The President wants to use it for new Washington spending.

With such sharp differences in vision, it is no surprise that negotiations will be slow and difficult. But here in Congress we will work hard for the Republican vision of lower taxes and less government, giving working Americans more freedom and a little extra room in their family budget.

CLINTON/GORE ACTIONS TO UNDERMINE THE IMPORTANCE OF PARENTS

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when information reached me that the Clinton administration is working hard at the United Nations to undermine and to utterly trash the role of parents throughout the world, I was outraged. Five years ago at the Cairo Population Control Conference AL GORE led an unsuccessful effort to get abortion on demand throughout pregnancy declared an international right. Now Bill Clinton and AL GORE's hand-picked negotiators at this week's 5-year follow-up meeting on the Cairo conference are at it again. They are formally pushing to delete from the proposed implementation document the only two references urging, quote, respect for the rights, duties and responsibilities of parents in the critical areas of sex education and reproductive care for adolescents.

□ 1030

Ironically, while these anti-parent proposals are being aggressively pushed at the U.N., the House is poised to take

up legislation to protect minor children from abortion through parental notification or consent. Despite broad support for the bill and wide recognition of the unique importance of parents, this administration is threatening to veto this legislation.

Now, by their delegates' activities at the U.N., Bill Clinton and AL GORE are demonstrating that they are not satisfied with undermining parental rights at home. They want to impose this policy on foreign nations abroad.

ANGELO BERTELLI BIOGRAPHY

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Angelo Bertelli died on Saturday at the age of 78 years old. Angelo Bertelli was one of the great football players in the history of college football in America, and he played at Cathedral High School in Springfield. He was the son of Italian immigrants, and people like Nick Buoniconti and Joe Scibelli followed in that tradition at Cathedral High School as well. At Cathedral, he not only was a star in football, but he won all-State honors in baseball and hockey as well and served as senior class president.

He entered Notre Dame, became college football's first T-formation quarterback under Frank Leahy.

The T-formation became an immediate success and the legendary sports writer Grantland Rice called him the T-formation magician.

He was voted to all-American teams in 1942 and 1943; and in the year 1943, he won the Heisman Trophy.

He became a captain in the Marine Corps. He fought in Iwo Jima and Guam. He earned a bronze star and the purple heart. After World War II, he became a successful businessman in New Jersey; and he was elected to the College Football Hall of Fame in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to have known Angelo Bertelli and to have known him as a perfect gentleman, a great father, a terrific brother and a wonderful husband, and an extraordinary citizen and a patriot.

Last year, he gave me the opportunity to watch him as he addressed the football banquet at Cathedral High School for a team that had won the State championship. Angelo Bertelli never lost the special qualities that endeared him to America, and we regret his passing.

PRICE CONTROLS DO NOT WORK

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my Democratic colleagues who are demonizing yet another entire industry; this time the pharmaceutical industry, the companies who produce life-saving drugs and truly miraculous drugs which allow us to live longer and healthier lives. Sometimes one just has to wonder if liberals have worked a single day in the real world, the world of commerce, the world where jobs are created and results are the only thing that count.

For many drug companies, we can break down how much money goes into the manufacture of a pill: 2 percent for ingredients; 5 percent for labor; 3 percent for distribution; 5 percent for profits and the remaining 85 percent research, development, taxes, regulation and litigation.

Price controls have been tried many times. They never work, never work. Every time they are tried, they are a miserable failure. They lead to shortages, inferior products, black market and goods which never make it to the market. I despair at the thought that this lesson has never been learned. Let us not try price controls.

IT IS TIME TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF OUR REFUGEE SYSTEM AND IMMIGRATION POLICY

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I apologize but I just had to come up and make a statement about something that one of my colleagues was addressing, the issue of the Cuban immigrants who were basically forced to be accepted within the United States shores. It was one of the interesting situations where we had a group of people in a boat that were directed to stop by the Coast Guard and a few of them jump overboard and violate the direction and swim ashore and get to stay on U.S. soil permanently under a refugee status, while those who played by the rules, at least took direction, technically were not supposed to stay here. The absurdity of the situation is that then somebody has a demonstration protesting the fact that those who abide by the rules have to go back to Cuba, and they reverse the policy and say all of them can stay.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we address the issue that our refugee system and our immigration policy do not follow common sense. I know this is not politically correct to talk about, but frankly I think that common sense is always politically correct; that we have people that want to come to this country legally, play by the rules, want to enter legally and they are told they cannot, while we reward those who are breaking the rules and coming into our country illegally.

Mr. Speaker, I ask us to correct this issue and address it here on the House floor.

THE B-E-S-T AGENDA

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this year the Republican Party has introduced and been pushing for the BEST agenda. B is for best, strongest military; E is for excellence in education, with local control, not Washington control; S is for saving Social Security; and T is for reducing taxes through spending reductions.

Now, part of our planning under Social Security protection is the lockbox concept. What the lockbox says is that Congress will no longer mix Social Security money with general operating money. Just as businesses cannot mix pension plans with operating expenses, the U.S. Government needs to do the same thing. Put Social Security funds in a lockbox so that it will be there for retirement.

That bill passed the House on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, Republicans and Democrats. Now it is in the other body. Hopefully they will bring it to the floor. It has been 70 days that they have drug this thing out. Now the President is in support of it. I ask the other body to please pass the lockbox and protect Social Security for the future.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 233 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 233

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1218) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALSH). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a closed rule for H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It provides for consideration of H.R. 1218 in the House with 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled between the chairman and

ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the Child Custody Protection Act is important to any parent who has a teenage daughter. As we all know, the people of several States have recently decided that a parent should know before their child has an abortion. We all hope that our teenage daughters have the wisdom to avoid pregnancy but if they make a mistake, a parent is best able to provide advice, counseling and love. Also, more than anyone else, a parent knows their child's medical history.

For these reasons, my home State of North Carolina requires a parent to know before their child checks into an abortion clinic.

Last month, the House Subcommittee on the Constitution heard chilling testimony about how lawbreaking citizens risk children's lives by taking them from their parents for out-of-State abortions. The testimony was chillingly similar to a hearing last year before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, at which Joyce Farley, a mother from Pennsylvania, told the tragic story of her 13-year-old daughter.

Four years ago this summer, a stranger took Ms. Farley's child out of school, provided her with alcohol, transported her out of State to have an abortion, falsified medical records at the abortion clinic and abandoned her in a town 30 miles away, frightened and bleeding.

Why? Because this stranger's adult son had raped Joyce Farley's teenage daughter, and she was desperate to cover up her son's tracks. Even worse, this all may have been legal. It is perfectly legal to avoid parental abortion consent and notification laws by driving children to another State. This is wrong and it has to be stopped.

According to the Reproductive Law and Policy Center, a pro-abortion group in New York, thousands of adults across the country carry children over State lines to get abortions in States without parental notification laws. So-called men in their 20s and 30s coerce teenage girls to have abortions out of State and without their parents' knowledge. The Child Custody Protection Act will put a stop to this child abuse. If passed, the law would make it a crime to transport a minor across State lines to avoid laws that require parental consent or notification before an abortion.

Right now a parent in Charlotte, North Carolina, must grant permission before the school nurse gives their child an aspirin, but a parent cannot prevent a stranger from taking their child out of school and up to New York City for an abortion.

Give me a break. This is nonsense and it has to be stopped. Let us do something to help thousands of children in this country. Let us pass the Child Custody Protection Act and put an end to the absurd notion that there is some sort of constitutional right for an adult stranger to secretly take someone's teenage child into a different State for an abortion.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying legislation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this closed rule for H.R. 1218 offered by my friends in the majority. Efforts on our side of the aisle to obtain an open rule to provide consideration of several thoughtful and important amendments were rebuffed.

The objectionable nature of this process is compounded by the substance of the underlying bill, the so-called Child Custody Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation creates more danger than it would ever prevent and is an affront to the notion not only of individual liberty but to the issue of States' rights which so many of my friends who support this bill will champion on every other occasion.

The decision made by a young woman whether to terminate a pregnancy is one we all hope would be made in close consultation with family members who love her and care for her, but this is not a perfect world. We cannot ignore the fact that there are homes which lack stability, where decisions of such gravity are not made by a loving and caring environment and, in fact, are often tainted by dread and fear. Often, a young woman who is forced to make this most difficult decision has no parent with whom to consult and has no viable option other than to depend on a trusted figure who is not her mother or father.

Indeed, we are jeopardizing grandmothers, grandfathers, sisters, brothers, spiritual advisors, and anyone from giving this young woman comfort.

For this Congress to attempt to criminalize the actions of the one and perhaps the only individual in that young person's life on whom she can depend is more than unfortunate and should be soundly rejected.

Mr. Speaker, there is no stronger advocate than I for measures to reduce unwanted pregnancies and to give women every assistance that she and the child which she decides to bring into the world will need to be nurtured and cared for. Nor, Mr. Speaker, will one find any stronger advocate for the protection of the health care, safety and confidentiality, nor for the fundamental right of choice which the courts have recognized and upheld.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress not to criminalize the acts of other family members in an attempt to help someone that they dearly love and who needs them desperately.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as we know, will make it a Federal misdemeanor for a non-parental adult to transport someone else's daughter, underage daughter, across State lines for the purposes of obtaining an abortion.

□ 1045

Presently 24 States in our Union have passed parental consent or notification laws in order to protect minor girls from irreparable harm that can be caused to them. Yet, with complete and total disregard for the law, many adults choose to willingly circumvent those State laws, placing young, vulnerable girls in serious danger as they undergo potentially fatal abortions.

Without the Child Custody Protection Act, rapists, sexual abusers, and other violators can continue to exploit our Nation's underage daughters, help them disobey State laws, and then continue to rape and abuse them.

No one knows the medical history of their child better than a parent. No one can best detect how a child will react to distress but a parent. No one knows how to best provide counsel and comfort but a parent. The Child Custody Protection Act will protect a parent's right to parent, and it will protect and enforce existing State laws that are being violated.

Mr. Speaker, this morning we will hear from the minority in Congress about the ways in which they think this bill violates a constitutional right. But what they do not tell us is that by not passing this law, we will continue to defend and accept violators of local State laws.

Opponents of this bill will also let us know how it was misnamed. They believe that this should be the Teen Endangerment Act because of the supposed risk it places upon young girls, but they will surely not tell us about the serious risks that young girls are placed in when obtaining secret abortions. They will not tell us of the many, many girls who suffer severe complications from abortions or reactions from medications they are receiving, and about the girls who, in rare instances, actually die.

They will argue that a 13-year-old minor girl who finds herself with an unplanned and unwanted pregnancy is perfectly capable and mature enough to make the same decision that her more mature and older counterparts are making. This, of course, is absurd. This bill is commonsense legislation. The Child Custody Protection Act will

protect the inherent right of every parent. It will put an end to strangers taking someone else's daughter across State boundaries.

No one is able to temporarily kidnap your daughter to have her tonsils removed or for any other simple surgery, not even to have her ears pierced. Then why then should a potentially fatal abortion be the exception? I urge my colleagues to consider the many girls who, while in a confused and vulnerable state, will be exploited by opponents of this bill and by the abortion industry today.

On their behalf and on behalf of their parents, I ask my colleagues to seriously consider voting yes to this important pro-family commonsense legislation.

It is true that 85 percent of American families support the Child Custody Protection Act. Whether pro-life or pro-choice, Americans believe that a parent should be involved in major decisions that can have long-lasting consequences on the lives of their daughters. The Child Custody Protection Act will provide grounds for stronger family ties and for family involvement.

By enforcing parental consent or notification laws in the 24 States where they exist, it will stand to demonstrate that we will not tolerate violators of local laws, that we care about the welfare of our children, and that we look to foster parental involvement in all aspects of the lives of our children.

The truth is that more than half of the underage girls who will be affected by this legislation are typically escorted by boyfriends or men who have impregnated the minor.

I would like to call attention to the posters that I have where out-of-State abortion clinics are advertising no parental consent required, no waiting period, no age restriction, and these are advertisements that have appeared in Pennsylvania phone books for an abortion clinic in another State, in Delaware.

There is another abortion clinic that advertises for an abortion clinic in Maryland. They put in big capital letters, ''No parental consent.''

We remember the Joyce Farley case in Pennsylvania, where her 13-year-old daughter was raped. The mother of the rapist, a complete stranger, took Joyce Farley's daughter out of school one day without permission, drove her to New York City, where she obtained an abortion, and a botched abortion, at that. As a result, the Farley daughter of this 1995 case suffered serious complications, endured many hospital visits, and was subjected to incredibly high medical bills.

The Farley case, Mr. Speaker, is one of many which indicates the legislation is needed for cases like this and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to getting support from my colleagues for this important bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed this morning because it has always been my understanding that the more we can educate both our colleagues and, as well, the American public on the principles of our opposition, and, as well, the more we can help to enhance legislation to make it a responsible legislative initiative in keeping with constitutional provisions, the more we should attempt to do so.

I rise in opposition to the rule because it is a closed rule, and for no other reason I can imagine other than a political reason, amendments of value were kept out of this legislation.

This legislation is called the Child Custody Protection Act, which gives us the impression that it is to protect children or young people or young women. Young women have the same right to choose constitutionally as others. The amendments that would have been offered to this legislation would have protected children, if that is the name of this legislation, but the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) would have emphasized the exception to this bill that refuses to allow young women to seek an abortion outside of the State in the situation where the life or the serious health of the minor is at stake, similar to that that is constitutionally protected.

It would also have included protection, if we had had an open rule, to exempt ministers and rabbis, grandmothers, aunts or uncles, or an elder sibling to give that young woman someone else in case she is being abused in the home.

It would have then, of course, provided an opportunity, in the Conyers amendment offered as a substitute, it would make it a Federal offense to use force or threat to transport a minor across State lines for an abortion. The penalty would be a fine and imprisonment of 5 years.

None of these amendments were allowed in for an open and full debate, and I am disappointed. This is a serious step that this House might make today. It would be denying or undermining the constitutional privileges of a minor who is in trouble. It would eliminate their opportunity to seek counseling from a variety of people.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do a legislatively positive job, we need to be inclusive. We should have had an open rule. I stand in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this closed rule for H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act of 1999. In its present form, I am strongly opposed to this bill because it would criminalize any attempt by a caring adult to assist a young woman in obtaining abortion services across state lines. By adopting a closed rule, the Committee has allowed a potentially dangerous bill to come to the floor for a vote.

It is still the law of the land that minors may obtain abortion services. This Child Custody Protection Act is simply another effort to undermine the right of choice for a young woman by imposing dangerous and unnecessary restriction to abortion services.

THe people who would help a young woman by offering her transport across state lines are those who are there to lend physical support during a time of crisis, confusion and emotional pain. Relatives, close friends, and even clergy members who offer assistance should not be subject to criminal fines and sanctions.

More than 75% of minors under 16 years old already involve one or both parents in their decision to have an abortion. However, there is the population of young women (30%) who cannot go to their parents for fear of violence or for fear of being turned away.

I offered several amendments that would have exempted certain people from the prohibitions of this Act. These people included religious leaders, aunts, uncles, first cousins and godparents. I joined my colleague Representative NADLER for an amendment that would have exempted grandparents and older siblings from the criminal penalties as well.

Unfortunately, these amendments were not adopted and now, we will jail these caring adults like grandparents for helping young women or we will see an increase in the number of illegal or unsafe abortions. If this bill passes, we will force young women who seek to get an abortion out of state to go alone.

I offered another amendment that would have called for a General Accounting Office Study to keep track of the impact of this bill on the number of illegal abortions and the casualties that result. This amendment was also not made in order.

This closed rule does not protect any children—this bill should be called the ''Teen Endangerment Act.'' This bill isolates minors from family members, friends and other responsible adults. I urge my Colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we all know parents would do anything to protect their children from harm. Congress should honor that commitment and help parents by passing the rule for H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. This is a good bill and a fair rule. Both should be passed.

H.R. 1218 would make it a Federal offense for an individual to knowingly transport a minor girl across State lines for the purpose of obtaining an abortion without her parents' consent, and to circumvent the 20 States which currently have parental notification consent laws.

Evidence shows that a majority of school-aged girls who become pregnant were impregnated by adult males. This by itself is a form of sexual child abuse recognized by statutory rape laws. This child abuse is compounded if unrelated adults seek to avoid rape charges or accountability by manipulating these girls into having an abortion in another State without their parents'

knowledge and in violation of State laws.

This is not a vote about whether we agree with parental consent notification laws. This is a vote about whether we respect existing State law and want to eliminate a loophole which encourages child sexual abuse. It is a good rule. Vote yes on the rule.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 233, I call up the bill (H.R. 1218) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 1218 is as follows:

H.R. 1218

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 ''Child Custody Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. TRANSPORTATION OF MINORS IN CIRCUMVENTION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO ABORTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 117 the following:

''CHAPTER 117A—TRANSPORTATION OF MINORS IN CIRCUMVENTION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO ABORTION

''Sec.

''2431. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion.

''§ 2431. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion

''(a) OFFENSE.—

''(1) GENERALLY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), whoever knowingly transports an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years across a State line, with the intent that such individual obtain an abortion, and thereby in fact abridges the right of a parent under a law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision, in force in the State where the individual resides, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

''(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, an abridgement of the right of a parent occurs if an abortion is performed on the individual, in a State other than the State where the individual resides, without the parental consent or notification, or the judicial authorization, that would have been required by that law had the abortion been performed in the State where the individual resides.

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—(1) The prohibition of subsection (a) does not apply if the abortion was necessary to save the life of the minor because her life was endangered by a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

''(2) An individual transported in violation of this section, and any parent of that individual, may not be prosecuted or sued for a violation of this section, a conspiracy to violate this section, or an offense under section 2 or 3 based on a violation of this section.

''(c) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—It is an affirmative defense to a prosecution for an offense, or to a civil action, based on a violation of this section that the defendant reasonably believed, based on information the defendant obtained directly from a parent of the individual or other compelling facts, that before the individual obtained the abortion, the parental consent or notification, or judicial authorization took place that would have been required by the law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision, had the abortion been performed in the State where the individual resides.

''(d) CIVIL ACTION.—Any parent who suffers legal harm from a violation of subsection (a) may obtain appropriate relief in a civil action.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

''(1) a law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision is a law—

''(A) requiring, before an abortion is performed on a minor, either—

''(i) the notification to, or consent of, a parent of that minor; or

''(ii) proceedings in a State court; and

''(B) that does not provide as an alternative to the requirements described in subparagraph (A) notification to or consent of any person or entity who is not described in that subparagraph;

''(2) the term 'parent' means—

''(A) a parent or guardian;

''(B) a legal custodian; or

''(C) a person standing in loco parentis who has care and control of the minor, and with whom the minor regularly resides;

who is designated by the law requiring parental involvement in the minor's abortion decision as a person to whom notification, or from whom consent, is required;

''(3) the term 'minor' means an individual who is not older than the maximum age requiring parental notification or consent, or proceedings in a State court, under the law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision; and

''(4) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and any commonwealth, possession, or other territory of the United States.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 117 the following new item:

''117A. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion ..... 2431''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the prime sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me the time. He has done an extraordinary job in helping to pass this legislation and promoting it, especially in the Committee on the Judiciary last year and again this year. I thank him for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as all of us know, abortion is perhaps one of the most life-altering and life-threatening, obviously, of procedures. It leaves lasting medical, emotional, and psychological consequences, and, as noted by the Supreme Court, particularly when the patient is immature.

Although Roe v. Wade legalized abortion in 1973, it did not legalize the right of persons other than a parent or a guardian to decide what is best for a child, nor did it legalize the right for strangers to take the lives of our children and place them in danger, potentially fatal danger.

Many may be familiar with the Child Custody Protection Act, a bill which makes it a Federal misdemeanor to transport an underage girl across State lines, because we had this discussion last year, and we know that it is commonsense legislation because these people want to circumvent State or local parental notification laws for the purposes of obtaining an abortion for a minor girl.

Last year I introduced this legislation. It passed the House with almost a two-thirds majority. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to consider the bill for a vote. This year the bill is up before us again as H.R. 1218. With the support of 130 congressional cosponsors who have spoken in favor of the bill, we are very hopeful that once again we will be able to pass this bill.

In our society, Mr. Speaker, there are many rules and regulations aimed at ensuring the safety of our Nation's youths through parental consent and notification and through parental guidance.

At my alma mater, Southwest Miami High School, for example, as in many of our schools throughout our Nation, a child cannot be given an aspirin to relieve a simple headache or cramp unless the school has been given consent, signed consent, by at least one parent or guardian. In some States a minor cannot operate a vehicle until the age of 18.

Most schools require parental consent in order to take minors on field trips, and in many schools parents have the ability also to decide whether or not their children should be enrolled in sex education class. Both the field trip and these classes require parental notification and consent.

Every one of these principles emphasizes that parents should be the ones

involved in those decisions because they can seriously affect their children. The decision of whether or not to obtain an abortion, a life-altering, potentially fatal, and at all times serious medical procedure, should be no exception to these rules.

I find it ironic how anti-tobacco groups and Members of Congress are outraged over a cigarette ad that entices a young person to smoke, yet remain silent on this issue of whether a minor should be taken across State lines to have an abortion performed. They call for hearings and conferences and they spend millions of dollars on ads and lobbying efforts in order to consumer legislation to keep minors from being harmed by tobacco. Yet, these very same individuals remain absolutely silent when ads such as the ones that I am going to explain in a second are placed in our public yellow pages.

□ 1100

These ads lure young girls to directly disobey the law. They promote civil disobedience and entice vulnerable children with dangerous slogans such as the ones that we see here, ''No parental consent needed.'' This is a Yellow Page advertisement that appeared in the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Yellow Pages for an abortion clinic, not in Pennsylvania, but in Maryland. So they placed this ad in another State because, in that State, there is a parental consent or notification law; and they say, do not worry, no parental consent is needed for another State.

This other advertisement, Mr. Speaker, comes from the Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Yellow Pages. Although the ad appears in Pennsylvania, the abortion clinic is in Delaware. In big capital letters, in bold, they say proudly, ''No age restriction. No parental or spousal consent. No waiting period.'' So the first thing they put there is ''No age restriction.''

Well, my legislation, the bill before us, the Child Custody Protection Act, would end this exploitation of our Nation's minor girls from violators who recklessly disregard the law.

By making a circumvention of State parental or notification laws a Federal misdemeanor, this bill will not only help uphold the laws of our country, but it will give back the parents the right to parent. It will strengthen family bonds; and, most importantly, it will ensure that America's youth have a safer, healthier, and brighter future.

By ensuring passage of this legislation, we will really prove to the American people that Congress does indeed work hard to protect both parents and children and protect our families.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act of 1999. This bill criminalizes any good-faith attempt by a caring adult to assist a young woman in obtaining abortion services across State lines.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to again acknowledge the passion which the proponent of this legislation has come to the floor of the House. I think it is important to enunciate the fact that many of us who are pro-choice consider ourselves as well pro-life, to encourage the life of the living and to ensure that there is a recognition that, constitutionally, women have a right to make personal decisions on these very sacred and important issues.

What this legislation does, by calling it the Child Custody Protection Act, is simply another effort to undermine the right of choice for a young woman by imposing dangerous and unnecessary restrictions to abortion services.

This bill would make it more difficult for minors living in States with parental notification or consent laws to obtain an abortion by making it a Federal crime to transport minors across State lines. More than 75 percent of minors under 16 years old already involve one or both parents in this enormous decision, one which they wish they did not have to make, to have an abortion.

In those cases where a young woman cannot involve her parents in the decision, there are others who would help by offering physical and emotional support during a time of crisis, confusion, and emotional pain. A minor should be able to turn to a relative, close friend, and even clergy members for assistance.

Supporters of this bill claim that judicial bypass, a procedure which permits teenagers to appear before a judge to request a waiver of the parental involvement requirement, is a preferred alternative. However, many teens do not make use of it because they do not know how to navigate the legal system.

Let me for a moment, Mr. Speaker, place one in the position of a young female teenager going into an enormously challenging and frightening circumstance of a courtroom. Mr. Speaker, we have already noted several instances where judges have looked on this young woman and said that they are too immature to ask for a judicial waiver, a bypass. In fact, we have cases where judges repeatedly have denied instances where teenagers have had enough courage to come into the courtroom. This is not the kind of atmosphere where one is going to get the most open decision. Many teens are embarrassed and afraid that an unsympathetic or hostile judge might refuse to grant the waiver.

Also, the confidentiality of the teen is compromised if the bypass hearing requires use of the parents' names. In small towns, confidentiality may be further compromised if the judge knows the teen or her family. This happens frequently.

There are various reasons why a young woman could not go to her parent for guidance. Some family situations are not conducive to open communication, and some situations are violent. For a young woman who needs to turn to someone other than a parent, this law creates severe hardships. In fact, this law may do more damage than it may do helping the young person.

The need to travel across State lines may be necessary in States where abortion services are not readily available. This may be because of various State restrictions or distance. Some young women may seek services outside of their home State because the closest abortion provider may be across State lines.

I have offered or did offer several amendments that would have exempted religious leaders, aunts, uncles, first cousins, and godparents. I joined the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for an amendment that would have exempted grandparents and older siblings from the criminal penalties as well, some responsible adult that could counsel that young person and provide comfort for them, to give them the opportunity to make a reasoned and balanced decision, not to be cowering in back alleys using coat hangers of yesteryear and destroying their lives.

For a reason that I hope all of us could understand, these young people are frightened. Something has happened to them that may be they did not want to happen. For all we know, they could have been abused by a parent. This is not unknown that someone in the family has abused them, and, therefore, they could not go to a parent.

Or as in the young woman by the name of Becky, they could have had a loving parental situation where they loved the parent very much, and the parent loved them. They were too ashamed to go and tell their parent that they were pregnant. Because of their shame, they went to a back alley abortionist, became infected and died.

The autopsy report indicated that Becky had died from a botched abortion. Becky was about 17 years old. Her parents testified before the Committee on the Judiciary begging us not to pass this legislation. They would have wanted Becky to have been able to go across State lines and to secure a safe abortion because they would have had Becky with them today.

I also offered an amendment that would have called for a General Accounting Office study to keep track of the impact of this bill on the number of illegal abortions and the casualties that result. What is going to be the impact of this bill? Are we going to see an enormous increase in aborted or illegal abortions that would bring about the loss of life?

These amendments were not made in order. It is unfortunate because family members such as grandparents and siblings should not be jailed for assisting a scared grandchild or younger sister in time of need. Young women should

be encouraged to involve an adult in any decision to terminate a pregnancy. This is just a federalized chilling effect to inhibit and to deny young women the counseling and comfort of someone whom they have confidence in.

This is not going to diminish abortions, Mr. Speaker. This is only going to take away the rights of young people, young women who could, in fact, start their lives all over again. I hope that my colleagues will defeat this bill. This bill would isolate young women from trusted adults by placing criminal sanctions for providing basic comfort and advice.

I ask my colleagues to not support this legislation. I would ask them to stand on behalf of the young people who are so much involved in this crisis all the time and realize that their lives were in jeopardy by legislation that is well-intentioned but serves no purpose because it takes away from them the very rights that are provided to them by the laws of this land.

I stand in strong opposition to this bill, H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act of 1999. This bill criminalizes any good faith attempt by a caring adult to assist a young women in obtaining abortion services across state lines. This Child Custody Protection Act is simply another effort to undermine the right of choice for a young woman by imposing dangerous and unnecessary restrictions to abortion services.

This bill would make it more difficult for minors living in states with parental notification or consent laws to obtain an abortion by making it a federal crime to transport minors across state lines. More than 75 percent of minors under 16 years old already involve one or both parents in their decision to have an abortion.

In those cases where a young woman cannot involve her parents in the decision, there are others who would help by offering physical and emotional support during a time of crisis, confusion and emotional pain. A minor should be able to turn to a relative, close friend, and even clergy members for assistance.

Supporters of this bill claim that judicial bypass, a procedure which permits teenagers to appear before a judge to request a waiver of the parental involvement requirement, is a preferred alternative. However, many teens do not make use of it because they do not know how to navigate the legal system.

Many teens are embarrassed and are afraid that an unsympathetic or hostile judge might refuse to grant the waiver. Also, the confidentiality of the teen is compromised if the bypass hearing requires use of their parents' names. In small towns, confidentiality may be further compromised if the judge knows the teen or her family.

There are various reason why a young woman could not go to her parents for guidance. Some family situations are not conducive to open communication and some situations are violent. For young women who need to turn to someone other than a parent, this law create severe hardships.

The need to travel across state lines may be necessary in states where abortion services are not readily available. This may be because of various states restrictions or distance. Some young women must seek services outside of their home state because the closet abortion provider may be across state lines.

I offered several amendments that would have exempted religious leaders, aunts, uncles, first cousins and godparents. I joined Rep. Nadler for an amendment that would have exempted grandparents and older siblings from the criminal penalties as well. I also offered an amendment that would have called for a General Accounting Office Study to keep track of the impact of this bill on the number of illegal abortions and the casualties that result. These amendments were not made in order.

It is unfortunate because family members such as grandparents and siblings should not be jailed for assisting a scared grandchild or younger sister in a time of need. Young women should be encouraged to involve an adult in any decision to terminate a pregnancy.

I hope that my colleagues will defeat this bill. This bill would isolate young women from trusted adults by placing criminal sanctions on providing basic comfort and advice. Please vote against this dangerous bill.

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership on this legislation and for her thoughtful explanation of the purpose of the bill that is now before the House.

It is important that all the Members of the House understand just how this bill will operate and what it will accomplish. Unfortunately, a great deal of misinformation has been put forth in opposition to this legislation by those who object in principle to any State law providing for parental consent or notification when a minor girl seeks to obtain an abortion. It is important that we cut through all this misinformation and focus on what the bill actually does.

H.R. 1218 amends Title I of the United States Code by criminalizing the knowing transportation across the State line of a girl under 18 years of age with the intent that she obtain an abortion, in abridgement of a parent's right of involvement under the law of the State where the child resides.

Under the bill, a violation of the parental right occurs when an abortion is performed on the minor in a State other than the minor's residence and without the parental consent or notification or the judicial authorization that would have been required had the abortion been performed in the minor's State of residence.

The Child Custody Protection Act gives the parents of the minor girl a civil cause of action if they suffer legal harm from a violation of the bill.

The bill ensures that neither the minor herself nor her parents may be prosecuted or sued for a violation of this bill. It also provides an exception for the life of the mother. In addition, the bill provides an affirmative defense to any prosecution or civil action where the defendant reasonably believed, based on information obtained directly from the girl's parent or other compelling facts, that the requirements of the parental involvement laws of the girl's State of residence had been satisfied.

Thus, H.R. 1218 only addresses those who covertly take young girls out of their home State for abortions in disregard of protective State laws and parental rights. This bill is a reasonable and carefully drafted solution to a serious nationwide problem that has been carefully documented.

Now, the House will hear arguments today that this bill will endanger the lives of young girls. That is simply false. Indeed, the opposite is true. It is when young girls are secretly taken for abortions without their parents' knowledge that they face serious risk to their health and well-being.

An abortion is a serious and often dangerous medical procedure. When an abortion is performed on a girl without the physician having full knowledge of her medical history, which is usually only available from a parent, the risk to the young woman greatly increase. Moreover, minor girls who do not involve their parents usually do not return for follow-up treatment, which can lead to dangerous and indeed deadly complications.

During the subcommittee's hearing on this bill, we heard from one mother whose daughter was secretly taken away from an abortion and suffered serious complications from the botched procedure. Her daughter required additional surgery after the abortion which could only be performed with her mother's consent. What an irony. What an irony. The law allowed the minor to be taken out of State for an abortion without any parental involvement, but scrupulously required parental consent for the medical treatment that was necessitated by the botched procedure.

As Dr. Bruce Lucero, a prominent abortionist and abortion rights advocate, wrote in a New York Times op-ed piece during the last consideration of this bill by the Congress in the last Congress, teenage girls who have abortions without consulting their patients face greater risk to their health than those who consult with their parents. It is the parents who have fullest access to relevant information concerning the girl's health, and it is the parent who is in the best position to see that any complications are promptly and effectively treated.

The House will also hear arguments that the bill needs a health exception. Once again, that is simply wrong. The bill specifically provides that it would not apply if the abortion was necessary to safe the life of the minor.

Now, if the concern is about health risk of a non-life-threatening nature, then the best course of action is involvement of the parents for the reasons I have just expressed. If there is some compelling reason why the girl

cannot tell her parents, then she always has the ability to seek an expeditious judicial review which all valid State parental involvement laws are required to permit.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, today the House will hear arguments that the parents are not really the people who should have the right to consent to their minor child's abortion but that such consent ought to be given by the parents, someone standing in stead of the parents, the grandparents, the aunts and uncles, the cousins, siblings, ministers, rabbis, or godparents or anybody else. It is these folks who should have the right to take someone else's child out of the State for the purpose of obtaining an abortion.

Now, these types of arguments against the bill are really objections to the underlying State parental notice and consent laws and the Supreme Court decisions that have upheld those laws. Those who disagree with parental notice and consent laws and the Supreme Court decisions who have validated them ought to take the matter up with the States and the Supreme Court.

Now, the opponents of this bill seek to analyze it as though it were a prohibition on the right of adults to travel to engage in activities that are legal in the State to which they travel but not legal in their State of residence. This analysis widely misses the mark. This is not a bill which is aimed at the right of adults to travel. This is a bill which is aimed at the protection of minors.

It is axiomatic, and the Supreme Court has repeated it time and time again, that the power of the State to control the conduct of children reaches beyond the scope of its authority over adults. The court has also time and again stated that it is, and I quote once more, it ''is cardinal with us,'' that is the courts, ''that the custody, care and nurture of the child reside first with the parents, whose primary function and freedom includes preparation for obligations the States can neither supply nor hinder.''

□ 1115

Thus, as the court has said, constitutional interpretation has consistently recognized that the parents' claim to authority in their own household to direct the rearing of their child is basic to the structure of our society.

Now, this bill squarely fits within this constitutional tradition regarding the rights of parents. It simply seeks to assure effective enforcement of State laws designed to protect the right of parents and the welfare of children. And the opponents of this bill have a problem with those underlying laws. I think it is safe to say that all of those who oppose this bill fall among those who do not like any sort of parental involvement, parental notice or parental consent law.

As the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) has noted, across the country a child cannot even be given aspirin at school without her parent's permission, yet strangers can take children across State lines for abortions in circumvention of parental protection statutes. While the abortion industry believes anyone should have the right to take minor girls across State lines for secret abortions, the American public disagrees by a margin of roughly 9 to 1. According to a recent national poll, 85 percent of voters questioned said that a person should not be able to take a minor girl across State lines for an abortion without her parents' knowledge.

This bill, thus, reflects the strong opinion of the American people, and I would suggest that the Members of this House should listen to the voice of the American people on this subject, should reject the arguments that come forth from those who want to deprive the parents of any right to involvement in such a critical decision, and we should move forward to pass this important legislation and send it to the Senate. I urge the Members to vote in favor of H.R. 1218.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I just want to say a few words in opposition to this bill, and I do so because it is lacking in some very important qualities that we all would hope to see in legislation that deals with this subject.

First of all, the bill does nothing to prevent young women from having abortions. It simply puts them at risk, higher risk, for physical harm.

Secondly, the bill does nothing at all to educate young women about teenage pregnancy and about the need for responsible family planning.

Furthermore, it does nothing to reduce the overall number of abortions, a shared goal of everyone in this House and on both sides of this debate.

While we in Congress would like to be able to legislate good parent-child relationships in every family, we ought to know that that is simply beyond our reach. We cannot do it. The truth is most minors do, in fact, involve a parent in the difficult decision to end an unplanned pregnancy, and they should always be encouraged to involve them. Many young women, however, live in households where a parent is absent or, in some cases, even abusive. What we are saying to these young women in this difficult time and under these difficult circumstances is that they are on their own; they are prohibited from enlisting the support or counsel of a trusted friend, another adult or relative.

This legislation sends a terrible message to young women that not only is the Congress willing to trample on their constitutional right to medical privacy, it wants to make abortion more dangerous for them. Since the bill contains no prohibition whatsoever against women traveling across State lines to avoid a State's consent requirement, it will lead to more women traveling alone to obtain abortions or to seek unsafe abortions locally wherever they may live.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply a bad piece of legislation. The bill's intention may be to increase parental involvement in the difficult decision to seek an abortion, but in reality it will not do so. It will only isolate young women who cannot go to their parents during such a difficult time.

Instead of attempting to legislate good family relationships, we here in the House and the Congress should spend more of our time and resources on reducing the necessity of abortions through teenage pregnancy prevention programs and improving access to information and family planning. This is a piece of legislation that is well-intentioned, I am sure, but the effects of it would be counterproductive, dangerous and disastrous to many, many women across our country.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, today there are over 20 States that require consent or notification of at least one parent before a minor girl can obtain an abortion, and my home State of Nebraska is one of those, albeit the law is under continuous attack in the courts and our State legislature. The American people overwhelmingly support parental involvement and condemn the practice of taking young girls out of State to get an abortion without informing their parents. This bill is designed to help those States enforce their own laws.

Perhaps it is because of my 8 years as a city councilman on the Omaha City Council that I strongly believe in the rights of local governments and the States to formulate their own policies and support Federal policies that protect State and local rights.

It is important that we understand what this legislation does not do. This bill does not create a new Federal law regulating abortion. This is not a Federal consent law. States have the right to require parental notification, and we can help them protect young minor girls at a time when they most desperately need the help and involvement of their parents. These children need attention prior, during, and after this serious procedure. Parental notification can help and it should be given a chance to work. This bill allows States to protect children, promote strong family values and help young girls make wise decisions.

Yes, I believe in States' rights and the rights of my home State of Nebraska to protect young girls in our State, but I am also, as a father, protective of parental rights and the sanctity of parents' involvement in their children's lives and vice versa. So I urge a ''yes'' on H.R. 1218.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a passionate defender of the rights of women.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong opposition to the bill.

The legislation we are considering today would prohibit anyone, anyone, including a step-parent, grandparent, or religious counselor from accompanying a young woman across State lines for an abortion. In my judgment, my colleagues, this is a dangerous, misguided bill that isolates our daughters and puts them at grave risk. That is why the President has threatened to veto it.

Under this legislation, young women who feel they cannot turn to their parents when facing an unintended pregnancy will be forced to fend for themselves without help from any responsible adult. Some will seek dangerous back-alley abortions close to home; others will travel to unfamiliar places seeking abortions by themselves.

Thankfully, my colleagues, most young women, more than 75 percent of minors under age 16, already involve their parents in this very difficult decision to seek an abortion. That is the good news. And as a mother, as a grandmother of four and about 7/8ths, one is arriving in August, I hope, as we all hope, that every child can go to her parents for advice and support. But, unfortunately, not every child is so lucky. Not every child has loving parents. Some have parents who are abusive or simply absent.

Now, I believe that those young women who cannot go to their parents should be encouraged. We want to encourage them to go to another responsible adult, a grandmother, an aunt, a Rabbi, a minister in what can be a very, very difficult decision. Already more than half of all young women who do not involve the parent in the decision to terminate a pregnancy choose to involve another adult, including 15 percent who involve another adult relative. That is a good thing. We should encourage the involvement of responsible adults in this decision, be it a step-parent, an aunt or an uncle, religious minister or a counselor, not criminalize that involvement.

Unfortunately, what this bill does is impose criminal penalties on adults, like grandmothers, who come to the aid of their granddaughters. We tried to address this problem at the Committee on Rules by exempting close familiar relatives from criminal liability under the bill. But, unfortunately, that amendment, much to my amazement, it was hard for me to believe, was denied. As a result, this bill will throw grandmothers in jail for assisting their granddaughters.

What will the police do? Are they going to set up granny checkpoints to catch grandmothers helping their granddaughters? Will we have dogs and search lights at State borders to lock up aunts and uncles? I suppose so.

Mr. Speaker, I am a grandmother of four, and I believe grandparents should be able to help their grandchildren without getting thrown in jail. As much as we might wish otherwise, family communication, open and honest parent-child relationships cannot be legislated. When a young woman cannot turn to her parents, she should certainly be able to turn to her grandmother or a favorite aunt for help. Unfortunately, this legislation criminalizes that involvement.

And so this bill tells young women who cannot tell their parents, just do not tell anyone else. Do not tell a grandparent, do not tell an aunt. No one can help them; they are on their own. As a result, young women will be forced to travel out of State by themselves or remain in-State and obtain an illegal abortion.

Parental consent laws do not force young women to involve their parents in an hour of need. We know that it can do just the opposite. Indiana's parental consent law drove Becky Bell away from the arms of her parents and straight into the back alley. Parental consent laws do not protect our daughters, but they can kill them. They do not bring families together, but they can tear them apart. And so I ask, why can we not do more in this body to bring families together, to keep our young people safe?

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we should make abortion less necessary for teenagers, not more dangerous and difficult. We need to teach teenagers to be abstinent and responsible. We need a comprehensive approach to keeping teenagers safe and healthy. We do not need a bill that isolates teenagers and puts them at risk.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and myself on the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Task Force. Let us work with our young people. Let us help them gain self-esteem. Let us see what works out there and try to prevent unwanted pregnancies and prevent teen pregnancies. Let us reduce the need for abortion. Let us work together on this. We can work together, pro-choice, pro-life, Democrat and Republican, to reduce the need for abortion. But my colleagues, let us not put our young people at risk.

□ 1130

I want to say again, I would hope that every mother, every mother, could have a relationship with her child so, number one, there is no need to have an abortion. But if that child should be put in this position, I would hope that child would come to me, would come to a mother, I would hope my granddaughter would come to me, again, let us hope, before it is necessary.

But if it is, I want to be there to help, not to feel that we grandmothers are going to be thrown in jail if we try to help and leave these children so isolated that they may make an unwise move and get this procedure where it may not be qualified.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

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

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of the Child Custody Protection Act. I want to thank my colleague the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for reintroducing it again this year.

This is an important bill, and it is an important bill that all Members should support regardless of whether they are prochoice or whether they are prolife, as I am.

I will tell my colleagues from a personal experience about my daughter, Katharine, who just finished her junior year in high school. Quite frankly, I cannot even begin to tell my colleagues how many parental consent forms I had to sign even just this year. The most recent was for a physics field trip. Then there was the soccer form. Probably my worst experience was trying to get permission for my daughter, Katharine, and my older daughter, Tori, to use their inhalers for their exercised-induced asthma, which comes about simply through playing sports. And it was a nightmare. But I will tell my colleagues, it was a nightmare that I accepted, and that was very important.

Nobody can doubt that this constant flood of consent forms is bureaucracy at its best. But I do not mind because it is just one more way for me to stay involved with my children and involved in their lives, which is to me the most important responsibility that I have in life.

So if we, as parents, are involved in those types of decisions regarding our children at school, how can anyone even question the need for us to be involved in such a potentially life-threatening decision like having an abortion?

The need for this type of legislation is particularly clear, particularly in my home State of Missouri, which already has a parental consent law.

A recent article in the St. Louis Post Dispatch focused on the problem of teens crossing from Missouri into Illinois to obtain abortions without parental consent. I bring the attention of my colleagues to this blown-up ad that was recently in the Yellow Pages in a phone book in St. Louis. But the article in the Post Dispatch points out that one of the larger abortion clinics in Illinois actually does advertise on Missouri radio stations and it says ''No parental consent required.''

I even went into the home page last night and pulled out a copy of their

home page, which does say right here ''Parental consent is not required for a minor to have an abortion at the Hope Clinic.''

This is a predatory market, my colleagues, and it targets vulnerable young girls, and it really emboldens those who would impress these young girls into doing something they might live to regret all of their lives.

I am fortunate that my children talk to me, and I realize the need to have support for our young girls. But there is too much pressure from boyfriends and the like to just simply go have an abortion.

It is critical, Mr. Speaker, that we have the Child Custody Protection Act. It is common-sense legislation, and it protects parental rights. But, more importantly, it safeguards the well-being of America's young girls.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this passage.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the example used by my good friend and colleague on the idea of clinics' advertisements. But that evidences the weaknesses of the legislation.

I would be happy to target unscrupulous abortion clinics if that is the case to narrow their advertising standards and their advertising approaches. I frankly believe, as well, that we do not target teenagers or entice them to do things they would otherwise not do. But the emphasis of this bill is to lock up loving and caring adults who want to be loving and caring to a teenager who finds herself in trouble under legitimate laws of this land of the right to choose, locking up grandmothers, locking up ministers and rabbis, locking up cousins and aunts.

Frankly, this is a cruel scheme to do a back-door curbing of abortion. The bill's backers, as the New York Times says, ''can show no compelling justification for giving different treatment to State residents and nonresidents seeking medical services.''

We are not promoting unscrupulous abortion clinics. What we are trying to do is simply say a young woman who may have been abused by a relative in her family, a stepfather, a father, deserves to have a private way of counseling with someone or a private way of seeking an abortion that does not include going into a cold courtroom and being denied on a judicial waiver.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we can do many things, but this solution is not the best solution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this sadly misnamed Child Custody Protection Act. This bill does not encourage young women to ask a trusted adult for much-needed assistance. Instead, this bill will cause some young women to face decisions about their pregnancy alone.

Parental involvement in a minor's decision about her pregnancy is, of course, the ideal. For most teens it is the reality. But some teenagers, for various reasons, simply cannot or will not confide in a parent. This bill will make criminals of some grandmothers, aunts, or other relatives that help pregnant teenagers exercise their legal rights. This bill would endanger the health and lives of young women who, for a variety of reasons, including fear of abuse, are unable to involve a parent in their decision-making. This bill is about politics, not sound legislation.

We should be talking today about what we can agree on, how to involve adults in the decision-making process. We should look at policies that work, like the Adult Involvement Law that exists in my home State of Maine.

The Maine Adult Involvement Law recognizes that parental involvement and guidance is the ideal for young women facing decisions regarding a pregnancy. However, when parental involvement is not possible, teens should not be alone. Maine's Adult Involvement Law allows young women to turn to a trusted adult for advice and counsel. A young woman considering an abortion may turn to a parent or another family member, such as an aunt or grandmother or a judge or a counselor. And a counselor would cover a number of different types of people: A physician, a psychiatrist, a psychologist, a social worker, a member of the clergy, physicians' assistants, nurse practitioners, a guidance counselor, registered nurse, or a licensed practical nurse.

The counselor must discuss with the young woman all of her options, including adoption, parenting, and abortion. In Maine, all minors seeking an abortion must receive counseling even if that young woman has the consent of another adult. This provides the maximum guidance and support for the young woman.

The Child Custody Protection Act is designed to restrict the young woman's access to abortion, not to ensure the involvement of an adult in her decision-making process. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the so-called Child Custody Protection Act.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond briefly to the point that has been made about the assistance that young women might receive from people other than their parents.

Any grandmother, any friend, any cousin, any godparent who wishes to help a young woman in a situation such as has been described where it is impossible to talk with the parents, for whatever reason, can help that young lady go through the constitutionally required judicial bypass process.

That is something the Supreme Court has established. The Supreme Court has required that all parental involvement laws contain a judicial bypass mechanism that must be made available. That is the way they can render assistance within the framework of the law that provides for the respect for parents and the family unit. That bypass is there; and that is the route that they should follow, rather than taking a girl, without her parents' knowledge, across State lines for an abortion in a State other than her State of residence.

There is a solution to the problem that opponents of this bill keep raising. They want to deny the reality of that solution. But that does not make it go away.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of the Child Custody Protection Act and commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership and the other 130 Members who have cosponsored this legislation. It is time that we speak up for the safety of our young daughters, as well as the rights of their parents.

I served in the Pennsylvania Legislature when we passed the Parental Consent Law. There are about 20 States that have parental involvement laws. Some parental notice, some parental consent. In Pennsylvania, we require consent of one of the two parents. And in case there is a breakdown between the parents and the child, we have a judicial bypass where the child can go before, in a confidential setting, a judge to get a decision.

This law was designed because of a case that happened in Pennsylvania in 1995 where a 12-year-old young girl was impregnated by an 18-year-old male and then the mother of that male took that 12-year-old girl to a neighboring State, New York, without her parents' knowledge or consent, for a secret abortion.

Now, my colleagues, this is outrageous where, in America, a stranger can take a minor child whose parents who know the medical history, know the psychological make-up of their child, without their knowledge or consent.

There was a study in California of 46,500 teenage school-age moms. Guess what they found? Two-thirds of them were impregnated by adult males. The median age was 22 years old. In many cases, it is these males who are taking the young girls across State lines for abortions, not grandmothers. It is adult males who are exploiting young women so that people will not know what happened.

In Pennsylvania, I went to the capital phone books and pulled out a couple of Yellow Pages. Here is one entitled ''abortion.'' Here is a clinic in Maryland advertising, ''no parental consent,'' to get around our State law. Here is one from my district in Lancaster. ''Age restriction, parental or

spousal consent, none.'' That is in Delaware, this abortion clinic.

I say to the people who are outraged about these ads to teens about smoking, where is their outrage about these ads for teens for abortion? This is a medical procedure that could be life-threatening. We cannot even have a child get their ears pierced or an aspirin from a nurse or a field trip without parental consent. Where is the logic?

Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney General of Pennsylvania said, ''by supporting and protecting the rights of parents across the Nation, those of us in law enforcement will be able to protect vulnerable children.'' Let us protect them with this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me again emphasize that I am willing to join my colleagues in legislating initiatives against unscrupulous abortion clinics advertising and, as well, any enticement to young people to do something that they would not want to do. This is not this kind of legislation. This is a legislation that undermines a young woman's right to choose and the ability to counsel with someone other than her family for this terribly, terribly important and tragic decision that she may have to make.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the American Academy of Pediatrics that includes the Society for Adolescent Medicine, dated June 14, 1999, that opposes this legislation. I think these two entities certainly have great involvement with our children.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS,
June 14, 1999,

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HYDE: On behalf of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), representing 55,000 pediatricians nationally, and the Society for Adolescent Medicine (SAM), representing 1,400 adolescent health professionals, we are writing in opposition of H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. Assuring adolescent access to health care, including reproductive health care, has been a long-standing objective of the Academy. The problematic nature of this bill is in it's potential to restrict a patient's access to care by making it a federal offense to transport a minor across state lines if this circumvents the state's parental involvement laws.

The AAP and SAM firmly believe that parents should be involved in and responsible for assuring medical care for their children. While parental involvement is desirable and should be encouraged, it may not always be feasible, and the Academy and SAM believe it should not be legislated. Adolescents who cannot rely on a parent to help them through the trauma of a pregnancy and who may need to go to an adjoining state for termination are precluded from receiving supportive care during a traumatic time in their lives. It is in these situations that adolescents would be limited in their options for receiving care.

Our ultimate goal is to provide access to health care that is in the best interest of the adolescent. Pediatricians hope and strongly encourage adolescents to communicate with and involve their parents or other trusted adults in important health care decisions affecting their lives, including those regarding pregnancy or pregnancy termination. Studies show that a majority of adolescents voluntarily do so. However, studies also indicate that legislation mandating parental involvement does not achieve the intended benefit of promoting family communication. It may increase the risk of harm to the adolescent by delaying access to appropriate medical care.

The American Academy of Pediatrics and the Society for Adolescent Medicine urge you to oppose the Child Custody Protection Act.

Sincerely,

JOEL J. ALPERT, MD, FAAP,
President, American Academy of Pediatrics,
LAWRENCE S. NEISTEIN, MD,
President, Society for Adolescent Medicine.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would make the tragic situation of teen pregnancy even worse.

I believe that adolescents should be encouraged to seek their parent's advice when facing difficult circumstances. And when young people do go to their parents in trying times, most often their parents offer love, support, direction and compassion. Most young women do turn to their parents even when faced with something as emotional and private as pregnancy. Even with States without parental consent laws, the majority of all pregnant teenagers do tell their parents.

Unfortunately, though, there are times when a pregnant teenager cannot go to her parents. This is precisely the time when they most need the involvement of a trusted adult. But under this bill, if an adult tries to assist a young woman by traveling with her across State lines, that adult becomes a criminal. It does not matter if the adult is her sister, brother, grandmother, minister, rabbi, they would still be criminals in the eyes of Federal prosecutors. In my home State of Wisconsin, we take into account the fact that young people sometimes cannot turn to a parent and must turn to another trusted adult in trying times. In Wisconsin, young women may obtain consent from grandparents, adult siblings or another trusted adult.

Crossing State lines to obtain an abortion is not uncommon. Women usually seek the medical facility that is closest to their home, but due to a lack of facilities in many areas, the closest facility may be across a nearby State border. Eighty-six percent of all counties in the United States do not have any health care facility at all that provides abortion services. Congress has not made it illegal to cross State lines to buy guns, to gamble or to participate in any other legal activity. Why should we make an exception here?

What if the teenager has been subject to physical or sexual abuse by one of her parents? What if the pregnancy is the result of incest? There is no exception in this bill for minors who have experienced physical or sexual abuse in their own homes, nor is there an exception for a young woman who might be subject to grave physical abuse if she were to confide in her parent or parents.

Mr. Speaker, we want all children to confide in their parents, we want a society with strong families, but let us not forget those children in our society who are victims of incest or child physical abuse. Let us encourage those children, too, to reach out to an adult rather than deal with a crisis pregnancy without anyone to talk to.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, many, many States—I am particularly proud of my own State of Texas—have laws that protect the children, as they should have. And they have laws that honor the parents' rights with respect to the children.

When mom and dad come home from the hospital and they have got that precious baby in their hands, they bring the baby home, they accept the lifetime commitment, they care for the baby, they hold the baby, they kiss and hug, treat the baby's little wounds, counsel the baby, advise the baby, instruct the baby, pray over the baby and sometimes discipline the baby. And if grandma and auntie, uncle, sister and brother want to visit, honor, enjoy, play with the baby, it is a wonderful experience in a family. But if grandma colludes with the baby to tell mom and dad a lie when the baby has broken mom and dad's rules, grandma is out of line. Grandma should honor the mother and the father as they accept their responsibilities for the baby. If grandma finds the baby in a serious state of distress at the age of 15 because of some foolishness with that pretty boy down the block, grandma has got a responsibility to the baby and to the mom and dad to honor the mom and dad's devotion to that child and to help that child be in the company, honestly confessing their hurt and their wrong to the people who love and care most. Grandma has no right to take that child across the State line, circumvent the State laws and dishonor her own children. No, grandma does not get a dispensation here. Grandma should have the decency to love that baby and honor her own children as that baby's parents. It is wrong. It is wrong to believe that I have the right to intercede against mom and dad's love and devotion because I want to get the child off the hook.

We have taught our children, ''You will do wrong, you will make mistakes, you will put yourself in harm's way, you will bring harm to yourself. Bring your hurts to me. I will care for you.''

In my own case when my little baby Kathy was born, my dad looked on me and said, ''Dick, when you start that

parenting, you'll do it all your life.'' I do that. Most of us do. Some parents unhappily are not kind to their children. Incest does occur. There are laws about that and grandma would have the decency to take the child and the errant parent to the proper authorities within the State and get it corrected and protected. Do you think grandma taking her across State lines to abort that wrong is going to protect that child in the future?

It is not right to love yourself or love somebody more or love some abstract devotion to abortion rights more than the safety and security of that child and the honor of the parents. This is a good bill. It is a good bill that keeps the only commandment with a promise, that commandment that says honor your father and your mother so your lives may be good on this earth.

Let us vote this bill up and let us honor the parents and let us protect the babies.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to emphasize that this country has many familial situations and many of our young people live with their grandparents.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague for her leadership on this critical issue. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Child Custody Protection Act. Last year we addressed this bill. And although it passed this House, it died in the Senate. Further, the President has made his position very clear. He will veto this legislation if it crosses his desk.

There are so many other issues that we could be working on to truly help children and strengthen America's families. I urge my colleagues to work together to make a real difference in the lives of our youth instead of focusing on this bill which is not needed and would only serve to weaken the child-parent relationship.

This bill as we know it, the Child Custody Protection Act, would make it a Federal crime for anyone other than the parent to transport a minor across State lines with the intent to obtain an abortion. It also punishes the so-called violators of this bill with a fine of up to $100,000 and 1 year in prison. With almost 50 States already requiring parental notification or adult notification through the legal system, if a minor seeks an abortion, there is no need for H.R. 1218.

Regardless of whether the parent-child relationship is abusive or not, most States have already required that a child tells a parent if she wants to obtain an abortion. H.R. 1218 does not improve the parent-child communication. It only serves to create a greater divide between the parent and children and that child on an incredibly personal and difficult decision that remains legal in this country.

H.R. 1218 also ignores the blended and nontraditional families that have become the norm in America today. More than half of all marriages today are remarriages. Children with different parents are often a part of that mix. We are seeing more and more minority children being raised by grandparents. In fact, when I hold district events for parents, the room is filled with grandparents.

This legislation offers no language recognizing the important parental role that grandparents are playing in the absence of parents. It would punish grandparents and members of the clergy who often serve as an invaluable counselor for young adults faced with such important decisions.

H.R. 1218 would isolate these young women during a period when the advice and kind understanding of an adult is most needed. As a mother and grandmother who cares deeply about strengthening families through good communication and loving support of children regardless of the mistakes that they make in their effort to grow into mature and independent adults, I ask my colleagues to vote against this piece of legislation. It will not help women, it will not help families, and most certainly it will not help anyone to prevent unwanted pregnancies.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in favor of the Child Custody Protection Act. This bill would make it unlawful to transport a minor across State lines to circumvent a State law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision.

South Carolina is one of several States that have laws requiring one parent to approve an abortion of a minor. Let me make it clear that this law does include any legal guardian. It is not excluding grandparents who are legal guardians. The Child Custody Protection Act would not impose a similar parental consent law on States neighboring my State but, rather, would simply ensure that the laws of my State would be respected.

Laws requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision confirm the essential role of parents in key decisions for our children. For the sake of children, these laws should not be circumvented. The Supreme Court has observed, ''The medical, emotional and psychological consequences of an abortion are serious and can be lasting. This is particularly true when the patient is immature.''

All across this country our children cannot take an aspirin at school without parental notification or authorization. They have to have a signed permission slip to go on a simple field trip. Yet in many places in our Nation, a young girl does not have to tell a family member before she has an abortion. Some States have rightfully acted to give parents the responsibility for decision-making for their minor children. The parental consent notification laws of States like South Carolina should not be bypassed. This bill would simply enforce our laws and reassert the importance of children.

Mr. Speaker, I have two daughters. It is very hard for me to believe that some in this room think that they should have the right to secretly take one of my daughters across the State line to get an abortion without telling me. We cannot tolerate that in this country. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the Child Custody Protection Act.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yielding myself 30 seconds, I listened to the previous proponent on the floor. I just raise the question that we have often been chastised for federalizing laws in this country. He has already argued that States have laws. That is why I find the folly in this legislation. It is not helping; it is hurting.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Child Custody Protection Act, making it a Federal offense for anyone other than a minor's parents to transport that minor to another State so that that minor may obtain an abortion. This legislation prohibits anyone, including grandparents, stepparents, religious counselors or any other family member from accompanying a young woman across State lines for such a procedure.

Parental involvement is obviously ideal and currently some 75 percent of minors under age 16 seek the advice and help of their parents when faced with an unintended pregnancy and the prospect of obtaining an abortion. These young ladies are fortunate enough to have loving, understanding parents that they can talk to. But not all teenagers are that fortunate.

For those teenagers who believe they cannot involve their parents, they are left with no one else to turn to, no one to counsel them, including consideration of alternatives to an abortion. Should this bill pass, young women would be forced to make such a difficult decision alone, for fear of putting a family member or a trusted adult in danger of committing a Federal crime. We owe it to these young women to allow them the opportunity to involve someone they can trust in in making that important decision.

□ 1200

Most teenagers who do not involve their parents do involve an adult in such a decision, with some 15 percent talking with a stepparent, grandparent or sibling. It is far more preferable to

teach our young people to practice abstinence and to be responsible, making abortions unnecessary. That would be far better than passing legislation which holds concerned family members and trusted adults criminally responsible for helping these young women who are confronted with a very difficult decision.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for having yielded this time to me.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting the argument by my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle in opposition to this bill. They use words like: ''Let's get together.'' However ''let's'' never includes parents. And, ''We need to help young ladies.'' However ''we'' never includes parents. Clearly, this is not about adult women, it is about young girls and, in some cases, children.

As my colleague said, it is illegal for a school nurse to give a high school student two aspirin without parental consent. Schools obtain permission slips for parents to take students on field trips. It is even illegal for high school students to participate in many high school sports without parental permission, but it is not illegal for a complete stranger to transport a teenaged girl or even a 12-year-old girl across State lines to circumvent State laws so that she can have an abortion without her parents' knowledge.

There has been a lot of talk about loopholes over the last weeks. If this is not a loophole, there is no such thing as a loophole. The Child Custody Protection Act will close a Mack-truck-sized loophole by prohibiting anyone from transporting someone else's daughter across State lines for the purpose of circumventing a State parental consent notification law.

Many want us to believe this is about a nice little grandmother. This is not. It is about an employee of an abortion industry or a sexual predator who wants to cover up the rape of a young girl under the age of 18. No one should be able to make mockery of legal State parental consent laws.

This is not whether or not a woman has a right to choose. This is about a young girl's rights to be involved with her parents and the parents' rights to be involved with their children.

Anyone who opposes this loophole I believe is an extremist, and anyone who does not support this is out of touch with the American people. If my colleagues do not like parental consent laws, they should go to the State capitals where they live and fight to repeal them, but do not oppose a common-sense measure such as this. I urge all my colleagues to support families, to support children and to support women in fighting this measure.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a member of our leadership.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

I rise today in strong opposition to this bill. We all believe that young women should turn to their parents for guidance and for support, and do my colleagues know what? Most do. Unfortunately, Congress is unable to legislate strong and healthy family relationships, and there are times in some families where a young person cannot turn to her parents for fear of physical abuse, and the so-called Child Custody Protection Act would leave those young women with nowhere to turn.

The Republicans claim that they want to protect young women from sexual predators forcing them across State lines. This is a worthy goal. We all share this goal. But nowhere in this legislation does it specify that it is illegal to use force or threat of force to transport a minor across State lines to obtain an abortion and avoid parental consent laws. This is a key omission, and without that distinction the bill would make it illegal for any adult other than a parent from taking a young woman out of State for an abortion, which I would like to point out is a legal medical procedure.

It means that a young woman who is in a time of tremendous emotional need would be unable to turn to a stepparent, a grandmother, an aunt, an older sister, or even a trusted member of the clergy, without placing that person at risk for breaking the law.

I might add that the Republicans in the committee would not make an exception for the case of incest. They voted down a waiver or an exception for incest. Now do my colleagues want to tell me that an incestual relationship is one with a loving parent and that is the person that a young woman ought to turn to? My God, what are we trying to do here? The Child Custody Protection Act would only isolate a young woman in time of greatest need.

Let me just say that do not play out, and I say this to some of my colleagues, do not play out your own personal philosophies which people respect, but do not do that at the risk of jeopardizing the health, the safety of young women. This is not our job. Do not turn grandmothers, trusted adults into criminals in this country. I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided bill.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a practicing physician for many years, I have always been aware of the fact that if a minor child came to see me in the emergency room with an illness or a injury, I could not treat that child without the consent of a parent, I could not give pain relieving medications, I could not stitch a laceration. Indeed, I could be prosecuted for assault by treating a child without the consent of a parent.

But, amazingly, in many States those same minor children, a minor female who cannot get basic medical care without their parents' consent, can have an invasive surgical procedure legally, an abortion, a surgical procedure with the attendant risks of hemorrhage, infection, sterility and, yes, even death can legally be obtained in some States. What is even more disturbing is that in the majority of cases these minor children have been impregnated by men over the age of 18, a crime called statutory rape in most States.

Now many States have correctly addressed this problem by passing legislation requiring the consent of a parent, and those laws have been upheld in the courts, but, unfortunately, many States have not passed these types of legislation, and what has developed is the unconscionable situation where minor females are being carried across State lines without the knowledge or consent of their parents for the purpose of obtaining an abortion. This bill correctly addresses this problem by making it illegal to circumvent State laws by carrying a minor child across State lines, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation and vote for its passage.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this so-called Child Custody Protection Act. Last year, the far right majority here in this Congress wanted to make it a crime to help a pregnant young woman, and now it is the same story over again. What we really should be doing is helping our teens. Teens need people that they can count on when they are really in a serious situation. In situations where parents are abusive or absent this bill would make it criminal for a young woman to turn to a trusted adult, a family member, for help.

Let us face it. Some teenagers will have sex without parental consent, and we all know that teenagers can continue a pregnancy, receive prenatal care and deliver a baby without parental consent. Teens can also give the baby up for adoption without parental consent.

The only thing that is prevented from doing is deciding to end a pregnancy. This bill does one thing. It seeks only to further isolate young women who dare not or cannot involve their parents. Remember, one-third of our young women who do not notify their parents of a pregnancy have been victims of family abuse and violence. This bill is all wrong. Instead of criminalizing freedom of choice, we should be providing our teens with better education, better health care and support services.

Mr. Speaker, this bad legislation died in the Congress last year because it was not good for young women. Once again, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Child Custody Protection Act.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) in support of the legislation.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama; and I am proud to stand here today with the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and my other colleagues who have done an admirable job promoting the Child Custody Protection Act.

There is a great injustice taking place as we speak. In 28 States minor girls are being taken across State lines for abortions just so parental consent or notification laws can be avoided. For a child to receive an aspirin at school or to be involved in a class field trip, they must gain prior consent from a parent. But for a dangerous and sometimes fatal procedure a child, yes, a child, can be transported across State lines without a simple notification of their parent.

This is criminal, and this practice has to stop. We must remedy this injustice against States who have decided that parents have a right to know when their child's health is threatened. To add insult to injury, literally, the abortion industry actually encourages such interstate activity and most definitely profits by it. In many States, abortion clinics even advertise in the phone book of these nearby States, and they advertise no parental consent required. If that is not a criminal act, then I do not know what is.

So I urge my colleagues today to vote for the Child Custody Protection Act. A vote for this bill is a vote to respect State law. A vote for this bill is a vote to ensure that parents living in those 22 States get to maintain their right to know about their child's welfare; and, most importantly, a vote for this bill is a vote for the safety of our children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me just say to my good friend from Texas, Becky Bell is dead. Becky Bell is dead because Indiana had a parental consent law, and Becky Bell did not have the resources and the nuturing, comforting familial situation, a loving family and loving parents, did not have the resources to go and get a safe abortion. She is dead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act which could more appropriately be called: The Teen Endangerment Act.

Specifically, I rise to speak against the criminal sanctions this bill would impose on grandmothers, aunts and clergy, responsible adults a child might turn to if they feel uncomfortable talking to their parents or they have a reason they cannot talk to their parents. This law punishes the 1 million American teenagers who become pregnant each year, and it punishes the adults who seek to assist these children in their time of need.

Proponents of this bill would say these teens could go to a judge for a judicial bypass. To this I say, if they cannot tell their parents, how can they tell a judge? Can my colleagues imagine how intimidating this would be to a young woman? How would she even know where to find a judge?

The fact is, young women who do not and cannot tell their parents have important reasons such as their parents are alcoholics, they are emotionally or physically abusive, or the pregnancy is the result of incest. If we pass this bill, what do we tell people like Keishawn, an 11-year-old who was raped by her father? What do we tell the family of Becky Bell, who died from an illegal abortion because a State law prevented her receiving the help? I know what we can tell Keishawn's Aunt Vicky: ''We should have sent you to jail for helping this child.'' And we should tell Becky Bell's family: ''We know that a similar law killed your child, but we are going to make it Federal anyway.''

□ 1215

We who oppose this bill encourage young women to involve their parents when they face this monumental crisis, when we consider the fact that most young people will talk to their parents but then there are those who cannot. So if we pass this law, what we are doing is making the most difficult decision that a young person would ever have to make more painful, more lonely and more difficult for them.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT).

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

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank most especially the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) who has brought forth this bill, which I think is a very good one. I think it is one that we ought to pass, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

It seems like we can agree on an awful lot of things today. We all want more education, better health care for our young people and we all want to make sure that there are fewer abortions out there, but yet we cannot agree on this, I think, very simple issue.

Frankly, I have sat here and listened to the debate and I hear a lot of talking around in circles and I still cannot understand why we do not agree on this amendment.

We have a problem here. We have State laws that set higher standards in some cases than other States on abortions. They require parental consent. Right now we have a problem situation where there are older people taking school-aged children, girls that are 12, 13, 14 years old, across the State lines into those other States and having those abortions done, all without parental consent.

I think for the most part we agree that should not happen, but we are hearing this circle talk today that well, maybe in some cases it is appropriate that we can take these young teenagers across State lines because they are involved in an incestuous relationship.

Let me get this straight. There is a parent in an incestuous relationship with a young girl. So their answer is they want to be able to secretly take that young girl across the State line and get an abortion and act like nothing happened. They do not go to a parent but they go to a trusted friend, an aunt, somebody in the religious area; but nothing happens.

That does not make sense. What should occur in that case is that they ought to go to that trusted friend, that grandmother, that aunt and then follow the law, follow the process, go to court and get a bypass, get a court to approve that, go to a judge that that person would know about. If they know enough to get across State lines, they would know enough to go to a judge and go in the private chambers, not in public court and get that bypass.

By the way, while there, tell that judge that the father is abusing that child in a sexual relationship so that that will not happen again. To me, that makes a lot of sense here.

We hear about grandmothers and aunts and trusted friends going to jail. We hear terms like spotlights and roadblocks and back alley abortions, things that really are not appropriate to this level in this debate, I hope. Those trusted friends, those grandparents and those aunts and uncles are protected under this law by that bypass procedure. The grandparents, even if they are occupying the status of a parent, if they are a guardian or standing in the status of loco parentis under the law, they serve as a parent. So a parent is a much broader definition than just simply mother and dad. If there is no mother and dad, there is the guardian out there that has this ability under the law to take that child across State lines to obtain that abortion, if that is necessary.

It just seems to me we agree on most of the issues that we are talking about today and it is just this one issue of incest or a parent that someone cannot talk to, but the bypass procedure very clearly provides a regular order or process to have this done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this deceptively titled Child Custody Protection Act. This bill pits desperate young women against responsible, caring adults. This bill drives young women into isolation at a time when they are most in need of help. This bill not only violates teens' constitutional rights but also seriously endangers their lives.

The last speaker said that it would not really be true that we would have back alley abortions, and people could simply go to a friendly judge.

I submit most of the speakers on the other side of this aisle have never stood in the shoes of being a vulnerable and scared young woman who is the victim of incest or who is the victim of child abuse. I submit that that is a decision that is very, very hard for them and it is a decision that has led many young women like Becky Bell, who we have heard of, like Spring Adams who we have heard of, and others to go to back alley abortions because they are scared.

We want them to go to trusted adults. We want them to report incest and we want that to be prosecuted, but in the meantime we do not want to deny safe and legal abortions to young women who for whatever reason, we may not even know it, cannot go to the adult. We do not want to criminalize bus drivers or grandmothers or others who have legitimate reasons for taking these young women across State lines.

Many of us ran for Congress on platforms of States' rights, and we are all in favor of States' rights all the time here in Congress, unless, of course, they violate our personal social agendas and then we are all for the Federal Government usurping those States' rights.

This bill is unconstitutional. It removes the rights of States to legislate around a safe and legal procedure, and that is abortion. Lawrence Tribe, the preeminent legal scholar, has opined that this bill is unconstitutional, and here is what he has said. This amounts to a statutory attempt to force this most vulnerable class of young women to carry the restrictive laws of their home State like the bars of a prison that follow them wherever they go. Such a law violates the basic premises upon which our Federal system is constructed and therefore violates the Constitution of the United States.

I urge a no vote on this ill-conceived legislation and I urge everyone in this chamber not to put their own values and views on these vulnerable young women. Have some compassion. Understand some of them may not, for whatever reason, be able to go and do what we would all hope they would do, which is to talk to their parents and talk to their parents before they undertake a decision like this. Please vote no.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the Chair concerning the amount of time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) has 22 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there was an emotional plea to have some compassion and understanding for the young ladies who find themselves in this horrible spot. I would also encourage my colleagues to have that same compassion and understanding for those young ladies, but also for the parents and for the law because the best way to handle hard problems in society is to have laws that make some sense and have a procedure.

Every State law that requires parental notification has a procedure to have the young ladies' needs addressed and that people can, in fact, go to a judge and seek relief.

I have stood with victims, I have not been in their shoes, of people who have been raped by their parents, who have been abused by their parents, and as a prosecutor I felt a real desire and need to prosecute those people. As a Congressman, I feel a real desire and need to uphold the law where the law has been passed in a duly constitutional fashion.

What the other side is doing is they do not like parental notification statutes. Well, just go back home and lobby the legislature. If they do not like the law back home, go home and change it; but when a law that is passed by a State that affects a minor's interest, whether it is abortion or anything else, do not let people conspire, regardless of the family relationship or the business interest, to cheat the State out of a law that they duly passed. If we do it here, where is it going to stop? Because someone has a view of abortion different than the State in question, do not allow people to go around and cheat the States out of the laws that were duly passed. If one does not like it as a Member of Congress, go home and talk about it.

This statute addresses a real problem. There are ads being run in this country to lure people across State lines to perform abortions, and they talk about the fact that a person does not have to get parental notification. Avoid that State law; go find somebody to bring them over here and we will do something that the State has a different view of across the border.

For those of us in Congress who really do respect the role of the States and really do respect State rights and parental rights, we need to come to the aid of the people who find themselves in this dilemma. What good does it do for a State legislature to pass a law if people can avoid it and Congress remains silent?

Stand up for people who are trying to follow the law.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for yielding me this time, and also for her consistent leadership on behalf of America's families.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1218. This bill, as we have heard, makes it a Federal crime for anyone, other than a parent or a guardian, to transport a minor across State lines. This is another attempt to limit the choices available to young people in crises. This bill closes doors rather than opens doors of opportunities for young people and their families, a general support system.

Also, it closes the opportunity to consider possible options. Of course it makes sense for a child, a girl, to consult with her parents about something as momentous as sexual activity and the surprising pregnancy that sometimes follows. In States that have no mandatory parental involvement, 60 percent of the parents know about their daughters pregnancy. We could only wish that all parents had the trust of their children and that the remaining 40 percent could turn to their parents for counsel. However, we know that sadly not all children feel that they can safely turn to a parent, especially where sexual activity is concerned.

Many young girls are being raised by their grandparents, their aunts and their uncles. Why should we criminalize extended family members or members of the clergy or a trusted adult when they try to help young women facing crisis pregnancies? Under this legislation, grandparents, aunts and uncles and members of the clergy could be prosecuted and jailed for traveling across State lines to obtain reproductive health services for young women. This is wrong.

The fact is, many young girls do not have a mother or a father at home to talk to. Those who support this bill do not value extended families which so many girls are part of. Why do the supporters of this bill feel that it is right to discriminate against such a large number of young girls in this country?

It is amazing to me that the majority of those speaking on behalf of this bill are men who really do not have the experience of a young girl's trauma.

This legislation really does limit reasonable options. It would force young people in a period of turmoil, with the clock relentlessly ticking, to turn to illegal or self-induced abortions or to pretend or wish away their pregnancies with sometimes horrendous results, as we constantly learn from news reports.

So I urge my colleagues not to legislate relationships, not to legislate personal behavior. Please vote against this Child Custody Protection Act. It is bad policy and it is discriminatory.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BACHUS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are all struggling to do the right thing, and we are confronted with a case where we have a 14- or a 15-year-old girl. She is pregnant, unwanted pregnancy, as she would say, as we would say, and she is considering an abortion.

Who do we involve? Well, the First Lady of the United States has said it takes a village to raise these young ladies. But do we go out and choose anyone in the village? That is what the critics seem to be saying: Anyone will do. It does not have to be the parents. It can just be anyone that happens along.

We have heard that a compassionate bus driver might be the person.

□ 1230

We have been told that the grandmother is usually the person. We are told about these aunts. But in fact, who is this so-called trusting adult that is taking this young 14- or 15-year-old girl across lines? What member of the village is it that we are substituting for the parent and their involvement and their love?

Quite simply, it is the boyfriend. We do not have to speculate on that. The Department of Health and Human Services reported to this very Congress in 1995 and said in two-thirds of the cases when 15- and 16-year-old girls are pregnant it is a male adult, and the medium age of that male adult is 22 years old. It is not the grandmother that is impregnating them, it is not the loving aunt, and it is not the compassionate priest, it is the boyfriend.

There is a study of 46,000 schoolchildren in California. Two-thirds of them were impregnated by adults; again, average age 22. Let me tell the Members what that study said. It said the differences in ages between the young girl and the father who impregnated her at the very least suggest very different life experiences, and bring into question issues of pressure and abuse.

Another study a year earlier said, ''Obviously, these males are vulnerable to statutory rape charges and have a strong incentive to pressure the young girl into obtaining an abortion.'' That is what the California study said. That is what our own Health and Human Services study said. It is not about the grandmother, it is about the boyfriend.

Finally, the study said that 58 percent of these so-called trusting adults who we are all concerned about today, 58 percent of them who take the young girl across State lines, who are they? Who in the village are they? They are the boyfriend. We have a choice to make. Do we choose the parents or the boyfriend?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not for one moment grant what one of the speakers said a few moments ago, that we are agreed on most things, that we are only disagreeing on incest. I do not grant that the real purpose of this bill is to help anybody.

The real purpose of this bill is to make it as difficult as possible for young women to get an abortion. The real purpose is to make it as impossible for young women to exercise their legal rights as we can possibly make it. That is the real motivation. It is what is driving this bill, and not any supposed concern about parental involvement.

As the New York Times this morning said, the bill is ''a cold-hearted piece of legislation that would jeopardize the health of desperate young women seeking abortions, and potentially imprison adults who help them.'' Realize what this bill would do. A 19-year-old sister who helped her 17-year-old sister to an abortion clinic or to a hospital across the State line could go to jail.

The bill is clearly unconstitutional because it violates the constitutional principles of federalism. The bill violates the rights of States to enact and enforce their own laws governing conduct within their own boundaries, and it violates the rights of residents of each of the United States to travel to and from any State of the Union for lawful purposes, a right strongly reaffirmed by the Supreme Court in its recent landmark decision in Saenz versus Roe only last month.

The fact of the matter is that each State is free, notwithstanding Article IV, to make certain benefits available to its own citizens. A State's criminal laws may not be replaced with stricter ones for the visiting citizen from another State, whether by that State's own choice or by virtue of the law of the visitor State, or by virtue of a congressional enactment.

This bill seeks to export the laws of one State to another. We cannot constitutionally make it a crime to do something that is legal in the State where you do it because it is illegal in a different State.

I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) will cite a 1978 cases in which a Mann Act prosecution for transporting a woman across State lines for the purpose of prostitution was upheld, despite the fact that prostitution is legal in the State to which she was transported.

But all that case says is that of course there can be a Federal law and a Federal crime without a State law. The Federal government can prosecute a spy in New Jersey, even if New Jersey has no laws against espionage.

But this bill is very different. It would only be a crime to transport a young woman to another State for the purpose of obtaining an abortion if she had not met the legal requirements to get an abortion in her own State, in the State she left. In other words, the bill would, in effect, for purposes of abortion, imprison her within the laws of the State that she left, and this we cannot constitutionally do.

So the bill is clearly unconstitutional, and the bill is cruel. It would force a young woman to drive by herself for long distances both before and after an abortion, greatly increasing her own health risks, rather than allow a responsible adult to accompany her to and from the clinic. This is dangerous, it is unnecessary, it will cause deaths.

The American Medical Association has noted that women who feel they cannot involve a parent often take drastic steps to maintain the confidentiality of their pregnancies, including running away from home, obtaining unsafe back alley abortions, or resorting to dangerous and sometimes fatal self-induced abortions.

The AMA has reported that ''the desire to maintain secrecy has been one of the leading reasons for illegal abortion deaths since 1973.'' This bill is a death sentence for many young women. Actually, it is not, because the Supreme Court will throw it out. But if it were ever enacted into law, until the Supreme Court throws it out, it is a death sentence for young women. Like all parental consent laws and required waiting period laws, the bill further risks women's health because of delayed abortions. We should be taking actions to ensure that abortions are as safe as possible, rather than delaying it to make it as difficult as possible.

The bill also invites family members to sue one another for damages. Who gets to sue? Parents, even parents who have been abusive or have abandoned their children; fathers who have raped their daughters are allow to sued for damages from the prison cell. Whom can they sue? The bill entitles parents to sue doctors, clinics, relatives.

The litigation could bankrupt clinics just by the discovery process, which I am sure delights the supporters of this bill. If the intent is only to sue the transporter, the bill should be amended to say so.

What about the criminal penalties? The bill would force a grandmother to go to jail for coming to the aid of a grandchild, or a 19-year-old sister for coming to the aid of her 17-year-old sister.

I offered an amendment which would exempt grandparents and adult brothers and sisters of the minors, but the Committee on Rules would not even allow the amendment to be considered on the floor. It would criminalize almost any adult relative of a child who tries to help a young women.

Proponents of the bill ignore these concerns and wave around a judicial bypass as a panacea, but we know the judicial bypass option of many parental consent laws have been ineffective. Again, my amendment to improve this bill by allowing individuals subject to prosecution to appeal to a Federal court

for a judicial bypass was blocked from consideration by the Committee on Rules.

We know that many local judges refused to hold hearings or are widely known to be anti-choice, and refuse to grant bypasses, despite rulings of the Supreme Court that they cannot withhold the bypass.

This bill further limits the options of young women who, for whatever reason, cannot obtain parental consent. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this unconstitutional and cruel bill.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for this excellent human rights pro-woman pro-family legislation, and thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY), the chairman of the subcommittee, for his expert guiding of this legislation through committee and for his commitment.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of Americans now more fully understand that abortion is violence against children, that it is a horrible dismemberment or perhaps poisoning, one of the other methods frequently employed. It is an execution of children before birth. Americans want it stopped. The polls clearly show that.

A recent survey by the Center for Reproductive Gender Equality, which is run by Faye Wattleton, the former president of Planned Parenthood, found that 70 percent of women want more restrictions on abortion; just women, that was their only universe, their only population polled, 70 percent want more restrictions.

A recent CNN-Gallup poll found that a majority of Americans want most abortions made illegal. That is not what we are dealing with today, but a majority of Americans want to protect the lives of unborn children from this violence, dismemberment, poisoning, and partial birth abortion.

In 1998 in the New York Times a survey was issued on point on what we are talking about today, parental consent. This would apply, of course, and provide integrity for the laws of States on both parental notification and parental consent, but on parental consent, the stronger of the two, it found that a whopping 78 percent of Americans want parental consent laws in their States.

I think Americans adopt a reasonable standard when they say and when they report back with this. They understand that this legislation is very, very reasonable. Secretly transporting teenagers across State lines to procure abortions in a State with no parental notification or consent compounds the violence of abortion by exploiting the vulnerable minor.

Mr. Speaker, when the partial birth abortion ban was debated in the last few years, many pro-abortion organizations said there were ''fewer than 500 partial birth abortions per year in the entire country.'' We now know that was an outright lie. It was repeated on this floor by one speaker after another. We know it is a lie now.

That statement, like other statements, was proven to be false, and interestingly, it was a New Jersey newspaper, the Bergen Record, which has a very strong editorial slant in favor of abortion, that broke the story that one clinic, Metropolitan Medical Associates in Engelwood, did about 1,500 partial birth abortions every year. That is three times the number in the entire country in this one clinic.

Now we also know that Metropolitan Medical Associates and other abortion mills in New Jersey advertise and market their business in Pennsylvania and elsewhere, and use the fact that until just a couple of days ago, and that has changed, thankfully, we just got a parental notification law in New Jersey, but for many years they used the fact that we did not have such a thing to say, look, young teenagers, come across the State line and get your secret abortion.

If Members look at this ad, abortions up to 24 weeks on demand, these are not rape abortions, these are on demand, because the baby is construed to be unwanted. These ads are telling young teens, we can end your baby's life and your parents need never know. It is a secret abortion.

What happens when the complications set in, Mr. Speaker? There is a group called Mothers Against Minors' Abortions. It is not unlike MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, a group of women who have come together to say, enough is enough. We need to protect our daughters from those who would exploit, this so-called trusted adult who can exploit their young daughter.

A woman by the name of Eileen Roberts who testified, and perhaps members of the committee might remember her testimony, pointed out that, and this is her quote, ''Wondering why my daughter had become depressed, over the next 2 weeks my husband and I thought perhaps her boyfriend had introduced her to drugs, so we searched for answers.'' She goes on to say, ''Words cannot adequately communicate the Orwellian nightmare of discovering that your child has undergone an abortion.''

She said her daughter was depressed, and there were all kinds of consequences. Interestingly enough, as she points out in her testimony, when she went to get reparative surgery because of what happened in this legal abortion, but there were complications, she had to sign on the bottom line and give her permission. But when the baby was destroyed and when this intrusive surgery was done, she did not have to give either her consent and she was not notified.

She asked no more secret abortions in her testimony. This legislation again does not impose, although perhaps it should, but it does not, a nationwide or Federal parental notification or consent. It just preserves the integrity of those State laws that say we want to protect our children from the exploitation of those who would do them harm. Please vote in favor of this legislation. Again I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her courageous leadership in offering this bill today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

A 15-year-old pregnant girl, perhaps with no parents to care for her, perhaps even worse, parents that harm her, what crime has she committed? Why do we seek to punish her more by making a criminal out of someone that would try to help that girl? She is already a victim, and this bill would victimize her a second time.

I understand the passion of my colleagues, and the previous speaker in particular, in their opposition to abortion. But what purpose do we serve by forcing an exquisitely lonely young girl to go it alone? What is the political gain that my colleagues see in forcing her into an unsafe abortion? What crime has she committed that is so egregious that she would then be forced to turn away or not turn to someone that might help her?

As we posture about our love and respect for America's parents, I would hope in our zeal we are tempered a little bit by love and understanding for the young victims that we also represent.

□ 1245

I do not ask my colleagues, any of my colleagues, who oppose a woman's right to choose to abandon their principles. But I do wish that supporters of this measure would not use the plight of the most helpless to make their points.

I dare say that no one who speaks today and perhaps no one in this Chamber wants there to be even a single abortion. But this bill, all it does is make sure that someone who is in that unfortunate position is forced to be in that position all alone.

Some who have spoken here today have said, oh, this is an issue of federalism; this is an issue of due process; this is an issue of respect for local courts. But someone in a position faced with these excruciating choices, is it not also an issue of compassion? Should we not also remember that?

Why do my colleagues insist on mocking the idea that perhaps a grandmother is a person who can show great love for that victim? Why do we scoff at the notion that all families are not like those we are blessed to come from? Why do we celebrate our churches, our

synagogues, and our mosques, yet we would make criminals out of a pastor who would help a young victim?

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

(Mr. HALL of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1218. I have listened to this type of testimony for a long, long time. I rise without any ill will toward those who differ with me.

I have heard testimony on abortion for the last 50 years. I started my public service in 1951. I have listened to fathers, and I have listened to mothers. I have listened to girls in trouble, to pastors. I have listened to medical testimony.

I am not among those who want to push anybody off on a sidewalk or fire on anyone who is trying to enter into an abortion clinic. I hope I am not a part of the far right or the far left. I believe I am a part of what they might call the far middle, because the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) testified from the record that 78 percent of the people want parental rights. I have listened to all that testimony.

I voted many, many times. While I have compassion for those who differ with me, I come down on the side of life. I can come down on no other side. By voting in favor of this bill, I think I am not just voting to protect young women. I think I am voting in support of States' rights, and I am voting in support of parental rights.

All of us want the best for our children. We want to help them make very difficult decisions. We want to be there to support them through this process. This bill allows parents to be a part of that very trying time physically and emotionally by enforcing State laws which require parental involvement in a decision bearing serious consequences for our daughters.

In a time when our children cannot even, as has been testified to here time and time again, so much as even receive an asprin at school without parental permission, it certainly seems illogical to allow our minor daughters to travel across State lines to have an illegal abortion.

This bill gives us the chance to tell our daughters that we care about their health and well-being and we want to prevent other adults from taking our place.

I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership, and I am pleased to vote in support of States, of our parents, and of our children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a long-time advocate for protecting children.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding me this time and for her leadership on the Children's Caucus and so many other important issues.

This bill sounds like a good idea. In an ideal world, parents would always be the first person that teenagers would go to with their problems. But, unfortunately, we do not live in an ideal world. Some parents abuse their kids. Some parents kick them out of the house. Some parents are not capable of taking care of their own children.

This bill is not about protecting young women. It is about antichoice politics. I would like to put this vote in perspective. This is the 121st vote against a woman's right to choose since the beginning of the Republican-led 104th Congress. I have documented each and every one of those antichoice votes in a Choice Report which is available on my web site.

The Republican-led Congress has acted again and again to eliminate the right to choose, procedure by procedure, restriction by restriction. Today we are debating a bill to criminalize the act of taking a minor across State lines for an abortion without parental consent if the State in which the person resides requires it.

As the mother of two daughters, I know that this is not a simple issue. Of course, I would hope that my daughters would include me in making such an important decision. Unfortunately, many young women do not live in normal families. They are in severely dysfunctional families.

I would hope that any young woman who refuses or cannot involve her parents would have another trusted adult from whom to seek guidance and support. However, this bill would make criminals out of such adults. It would make criminals out of loving grandparents, siblings, counselors, friends, aunts and uncles who have nothing but the safety and well-being of the young woman in mind.

If a young woman refuses to involve her family and the law prohibits her from looking to another responsible adult for support, then essential parental support and adult support is stripped away from this young person.

This bill does not protect young women from undue influence. On the contrary, it strips them of essential support. This bill is not about protecting our young women. It is driven solely by the divisive nature of abortion politics.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and put the safety and well-being of America's young women before the political agenda of antichoice legislators. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

It sure sounds like a good idea. In an ideal world, parents would always be the first person their teenagers would go to with their problems.

Unfortunately, we don't live in an ideal world.

Unfortunately, some parents abuse their kids.

Unfortunately, some parents kick their kids out of the home.

Unfortunately, some parents are not capable of taking care of their kids.

I'd like to put this vote in perspective. This is the 121st vote on choice since the beginning of the 104th Republican Congress.

I have documented each of these votes in a Choice Report, which is available on my website: www.house.gov/maloney/choicereport.htm

Congress has acted again and again to eliminate procedure by procedure, restriction by restriction.

I find it particularly ironic that at the same time when some are trying to restrict access to contraception for young people through Title X—which will prevent unwanted pregnancies—they are also restricting access to abortion.

Today we are debating a bill to criminalize the act taking a minor across state lines for an abortion without parental consent, if the state in which the person resides requires it.

As a mother of two daughters, I know that this is not a simple issue. Of course, I would hope that my children would include me when making such an important decision.

Unfortunately, many teens live in severely dysfunctional families.

I would hope that any young women who refuses to involve her parents would have another trusted adult from which to seek guidance and support.

However, this bill will make criminals of those loving grandparents, siblings, counselors and friends who have nothing but the safety and well-being of the young woman in mind.

It sends the message to young women that an abortion is something they must go through alone.

This is a dangerous bill, and should perhaps be called the Teen Endangerment Act.

It will succeed only in making it more difficult for a young woman to get a safe, legal abortion. If she refuses to involve her family and the law prohibits her from looking to another responsible adult for help, then essential support is not there.

This is also an unnecessary bill. For those who worry about young women being forced or coerced by an adult into having an abortion against their will, let me remind them that we already have laws, such as informed consent laws or prohibitions against kidnaping and statutory rape, which protect against this.

This bill doesn't protect young women from undue influence. On the contrary, it strips them of essential support.

This bill is not about protecting our young women. It is driven solely by the divisive nature of abortion politics. I urge you to oppose this bill and put the safety and well-being of America's young women before the political agenda of anti-choice legislators.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. I would like to add my voice of thanks to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her excellent leadership on the issue and to the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. CANADY) for his strong work on the subcommittee and for yielding me this time.

Involving parents in a child's life is crucial in the healthy development of a child. Sometimes, however, a decision comes up in a child's life that seems too large for that child to handle. Sometimes it seems like no one, not even parents, would be a good person to help with their decision. Whether it is a problem at school, with friends or even the complicated decisions surrounding an abortion, children, I acknowledge, sometimes feel that relatives, even parents, cannot be relied upon.

But the fact is the parents are often, if not always, the best place to turn for a child in times of crisis. Parents loving and nurturing is complemented by their wisdom and their experience. This bill simply ensures that State laws requiring parental involvement will continue and that no one will be able to short-circuit or circumvent the productive and healthy system of communication that these laws lay out between the parent and their child.

Because of what this bill represents and protects at its core, a strong family bond, I am proud to stand up here today and show my support for the Child Custody Protection Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill on its merits, and I again thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for introducing this bill and showing America how important the family bond really must be.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Most teenagers do involve their parents when making major life decisions like the one we debate today. However, in situations where the young woman cannot share her decision with a parent, she should not be isolated from other sources of counsel and support. Whether it is a grandparent, clergy member, or some other trusted adult, young women are better served by talking through the decision and having someone to lean on rather than being all alone.

While most young women do involve a parent in their decision, not every young woman has that choice. Whether a parent is absent or abusive or worse, we know that not every family is a model family.

This law would endanger some young women who have the misfortune of difficult family circumstance. This law would make criminals out of people whose only crime is to help a young person in distress. H.R. 1218 isolates young women, puts them at risk, and restricts access to reproductive choice.

Let us stop building walls and barriers around our children and let us start having a real discussion about how we can best nurture them, educate them, and raise them to be responsible and productive citizens.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I inquire once again of the Chair concerning the amount of time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA).

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her tireless efforts to bring this important legislative effort to the floor for consideration.

In light of all that has happened over the past few months, our Nation has had a growing concern about the moral fabric of our society. We have felt an increasing need to do everything that we can to protect our children, as they are our most precious resource. We must provide them with a safe environment so that they may thrive as they move into adulthood.

One of life's harsh realities is that some young women become pregnant at too early an age. H.R. 1218 does not terminate a person's right to an abortion but does provide important protections for young children who become pregnant.

This legislation will make it illegal for any person to transport a minor across State lines to obtain an abortion without first consulting a parent or a judge. It will make it a Federal crime if an individual knowingly circumvents the laws of their State to seek an abortion for any mother under the age of 17.

It is most often an older male who preys on a young girl, impregnates her, and then takes her illegally across State lines to have an abortion without the knowledge and consent of the parents. We should all find this manipulative behavior disgusting and disheartening.

Not only is this a crime for an older male to be sexually active with a young girl, but it can be dangerous for that child to receive an abortion. Only a parent knows that child's health history, including allergies to medication. A parent should be informed, and the older male should be prosecuted.

Laws in an increasing number of States, now numbering more than 20, including my home State of Michigan, require parental notification or consent by at least one parent or authorization by a judge before an abortion can be performed.

This legislation will not mandate parental consent in the States which do not currently have parental consent laws but will protect those in States which do require parental consent.

Many of my colleagues are concerned that this bill will prohibit young girls from confiding in a close family member or a friend if they feel they cannot talk to their parents. This is absolutely wrong. There is a provision in the legislature which will allow a judge to relieve the parental notification requirement in certain circumstances. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1218.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

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

□ 1300

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 121, the Child Custody Protection Act. Let me tell my colleagues a story about a functional family, in many ways a picture-perfect family.

A few years ago, I had lunch with Karen and Bill Bell, who had a 17-year-old daughter named Becky, and a son that lived in a suburb. They had a wonderful life, they were a close family, and they supported, Bill and Karen did, parental notification requirements. That is until Becky lay dying in the hospital.

As Karen sat next to her, holding her hand, she said, ''Becky, tell mommy what happened.'' Well, what happened to Becky is that she had an illegal abortion in a State that required parental notification, and she did not want to disappoint her loving parents.

Bill and Karen took a year out of their lives and went State to State to try to oppose parental notification laws. Not because they do not want close families but because they do not want young women like Becky, beautiful young women with their full lives ahead of them, to die.

And so I submit to my colleagues, who in all good faith support this legislation, that the consequences of this law will be that young women will die. It will be women from dysfunctional families and women from middle class and functional families alike, young women who have their entire lives ahead of them, and I would suggest that this should be soundly defeated.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time and I wish to add my voice of congratulations to the others for the good work of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of reasons to support this legislation. Let me focus on just two. Number one, it reinforces existing State laws; number two, it helps parents play a more active role in their children's lives.

More than 20 States have laws requiring the consent of one parent before a minor can have an abortion. Nonetheless, too many organizations and too

many businesses seek to avoid those laws. Now, each speaker today has been talking about his or her own experience back in their home State. Every one of those speakers should support this bill because this bill reinforces the laws back in their home State.

Let us also be very clear about something. This bill does not punish a grandparent or an aunt if a pregnant child turns to them for counseling or support. It does, it does, when that adult seeks to evade the existing law of their home State.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all understand how great the need is for the other goal of this bill, helping parents to be more actively involved in their children's lives. This bill does so by reinforcing State requirements of parental consent. And I know my colleagues have heard it before, but it is worth repeating. Under current law it is easier for a child to get an abortion than it is for that child to get an aspirin.

Today, children need a parental consent waiver to attend a field trip, to join the basketball team or to get an aspirin. For goodness sakes, why should a child not be required to receive parental consent before they undergo major surgery for abortion?

Once again I want to congratulate and thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her work. We need to allow parents to have this opportunity to parent their children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of debate about the merits or lack of merits of abortions. I want to turn the attention of the Members to another issue, and that is the legal issue that resulted in this matter coming to the Committee on the Judiciary, not the policy issue of abortion versus nonabortion. We deal with legal issues in the Committee on the Judiciary, and I would submit to this body that this is an unprecedented legal maneuver that is taking place here.

There are a number of States that allow lotteries, but we do not prosecute somebody who goes from a State that does not allow a lottery to a State that does allow a lottery for doing that. There are a number of States that allow gambling. We do not prosecute a person that goes from one State that does not allow gambling to a State that allows gambling to engage in that legal activity in that particular State. This proposal would prosecute somebody for going to a State to engage in conduct that is legal in that State.

So I do not think we need to be misled about this protection of States' rights. The States' rights that the proponents of this legislation are protecting are the rights of the States who have parental consent laws, not the rights of the States who do not have parental consent laws. We ought to be free to exercise the legal rights in the State in which those rights are available.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of this bill, I have heard often during the debate on this particular piece of legislation, refer to the procedure that we call abortion as being both safe and legal. I have heard this now two or three times. It is indeed legal, but it is anything but safe, for inevitably in this procedure one person ends up dead and another oftentimes wounded emotionally and/or physically harmed. It is anything but a safe procedure.

It is for that reason that I rise in support of the Child Custody and Protection Act and in support of the rights of parents across this country. Because these decisions that a girl will make in this regard will live with her for the rest of her life and they are the ones with which parents should be involved.

Just 2 weeks ago, we stood in this chamber talking about the importance of family and the need for parents to play a greater role in the lives of their children. A vote for this bill today is a step in that direction.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues what we are talking about are young girls, young girls in trouble, young girls who are unmarried, young girls who invariably, according to the statistics, have been impregnated by older men exploiting them. We are talking about situations that are not common. It is common for parents to be responsible, to be nurturing, not to be punitive, but that is not always the case.

I do not think we should be legislating morals when we do not know the individual circumstances that may apply. I think we should leave this to the States. We should not have legislation that is as punitive as this. I think it is regressive, and I would hope we would vote against it.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this minute to talk about two things that are very near and dear to my heart, child protection and parental rights. As a mother of two sons, I think I know a lot about both of those things.

This bill and those issues come together on the floor of the United States House today in the form of the Child Custody Protection Act.

I think it is a frightening reality that thousands of adults of every year take minor girls across State lines for the purpose of getting an abortion, in secret, behind the backs of their parents, in direct violation of parental involvement laws of a minor girl's home State.

Eighty-five percent of Americans agree it is wrong to take a minor across State lines for an abortion without their parents' knowledge. No one, not friends, not relatives, not a counselor at a clinic should be allowed to take our children across State lines for an abortion.

Let us support laws that bring families together, not tear them apart. We must do what the American people want and what is best for our children, and that is pass the Child Custody and Protection Act.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up any misconceptions. This bill is not about partial birth abortions, this bill is not about advertising of unscrupulous abortion clinics or anyone else. This bill is about endangering the lives of teenagers, teenagers who may be suffering from a different kind of family life than most of us would like.

My colleagues on the other side kept using the example that we seek parental consent forms to take aspirin in schools. I beg to differ with them. We seek consent forms. Grandmothers and aunts and those who may have custody of the child can do so. And when I say custody, I am stretching the word. It may not be a legal term.

This act, perceived to be protecting a child, endangers a young woman's life, because it denies her the opportunity for a nurturing person to help her make a terribly important decision.

This country's laws give us the right to choose. This endangers the lives of young women just because they are teenagers. It eliminates the privacy right. It throws them into a courtroom that is cold and impersonal. And if they cannot tell their parents and they cannot tell others, how can they go into a courtroom and ask for a waiver.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that we not politicize this issue; that we think about the lives of our children; and that we stand for educating young women; we stand for stopping the numbers of abortions in young women by educating them and preparing them for adult life; and we stand away from this kind of legislation that endangers the lives of innocent young women who seek only, seek only, to be able to live their lives and to not continue the mistake that they may have thought that they have made and they do that seeking the nurturing and loving and caring attitudes of those who may want to help them.

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, my 13-year-old daughter had a slight head wound that required

stitches. My husband and I were in D.C., so my parents took Amanda to the hospital. But because the injury was not life-threatening, the hospital refused to give her stitches until Dexter and I gave permission. Yet, incredibly enough, Amanda could be taken to another State and undergo an abortion without my husband and me knowing about it. Would the abortionist know what medicines Amanda is allergic to? Of course not. Parents know, parents can help.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a moment to ponder on the infamous Joyce Farley case. Let us remember the way in which her underage daughter was taken advantage of and raped. Let us not forget about the pain and the suffering she endured, the severe complications, the bleeding, the multiple hospital visits and the astronomical medical bills that her parents were forced to pay, all because one stranger, the mother of the rapist, who is now a litigant in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, thought that she could take the life of Joyce Farley's daughter into her own hands.

Joyce's 12-year-old was raped then later driven to another State by the rapist's mother. She underwent a botched abortion and was dropped off 30 miles from her home. And, of course, she had to have another hospital visit to correct the damage done by the abortionist.

Cases such as Joyce Farley's must not be repeated. Now more than ever it is evident that children need their parents. Society needs to do everything within our power to help parents assume responsibility for our children. We need to try to secure the right of parents to become involved in the lives of our children and to help them, not to pull families apart.

The opponents of this legislation have sought ways in which to defy this child-parent relationship. They have tried to place grandparents, brothers, sisters on par with the parents. But let me ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, what well-meaning sweet old grandmother would not feel the need to let a child's parent know? What well-meaning minister would drive a child to an abortion clinic and advise the child to keep the pregnancy and the abortion a secret from her parent?

Mr. Speaker, the American people have expressed support for more parental involvement. They support a parent's right to know, and they support the Child Custody Protection Act.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of The Child Custody Protection Act. This bill will help to enforce parental involvement laws that are implemented to protect the physical and emotional health of children.

Parents know their child's medical history, as well as other health factors that a minor child might not even know about themselves. When parents aren't involved in major medical decisions, such as abortion, risks to the minor's health increase dramatically. In fact, in it's H.L. versus Matheson decision (1981), the Supreme Court expressed it's concern that abortion can be harmful to minors, ''The medical, emotional, and psychological consequences of an abortion are serious and can be lasting; this is particularly so when the patient is immature.''

Why in the world would we not want parents to be involved in these decisions? Parents have to sign permission slips for their kids to go on field trips at school, and they have to sign a medical slop that allows them to take over the counter medication at school. But abortion advocates would have you believe that parents shouldn't have to sign off on major decisions like abortion. That just doesn't make sense.

This bill does not in any way require states to create new parental consent or notification laws, nor does it interfere with existing state laws regarding abortions for minors.

This bill would make it a federal misdemeanor to transport a minor across a state line for an abortion, if that action circumvents state law requiring parental or judicial involvement in that minor child's abortion decision. This legislation ensures the rights of parents, protects the health of minors, and enforces state law.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my strong support for H.R. 1218, The Child Custody Protection Act. As a father of seven and a grandfather to 34, the thought of a stranger taking one of my grandchildren to another state to receive an abortion absolutely sickens me.

The Child Custody Protection Act would make it a federal offense for someone who is not the parent or guardian, to knowingly transport a minor across state lines so that she can receive an abortion.

H.R. 1218 is plainly an issue of parental knowledge and state laws. It is alarming to think that our children are required to receive parental consent to take aspirin at school, yet a stranger can make critical decisions about their health and well-being.

Mr. Speaker, more than twenty states currently require parental consent or notification as a precondition to receive an abortion. In supporting this legislation we are respecting state rights, and upholding the family relationship as the center for moral values and guidance. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Transportation Committee, I am concerned about the broad impact H.R. 1218 could have on our citizens' right to travel safely. We are considering taking away the right of young women to move freely between states with family or friends to seek legal medical care.

Now, suppose citizens were locked into the laws of their home state as they travel across country. This would mean that the speed limits, marriage regulations, restrictions on adoption, and all other controls over behavior would in fact follow the citizens.

This would be absurd. In fact, the premise of ''federalism,'' is our entitlement to travel and be subject to the laws of the state we are in.

The principles of this bill obliterate that right. The strict provisions—with no exceptions for travel with family or clergy—discourage free interstate travel and subject young women to perilous travel alone. This violates our federal system, is unconstititional, and frankly, unacceptable.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1218. There is nothing more important in parent-child relationships than for parents to be involved in the healthcare decisions of their children.

The basic parental right and responsibility is perhaps most critical in the case of pregnancies of young woman.

In most American homes, no one cares more about the welfare, health, and safety of a child than her parents.

Although a young woman may be frightened or feel or ashamed to share with her parents, parents are usually best able to provide support for these most personal decisions.

Unfortunately, not all young women are able to confide in their parents should they become pregnant. A victim of family violence or incest is often not in a position to share her pregnancy with her parents for fear of further abuse.

This bill, although laudable for its intention to encourage communication between parents and children, does not provide alternatives for a young woman who is unable, for fear of physical or emotional abuse, to involve her parents in her decision.

In addition, the bill would criminalize the actions of close family members who might seek to assist a young woman who is struggling with this monumental decision. For troubled American households, grandparents, estranged parents, aunts, uncles, or siblings often serve in the parental role.

The bill unfortunately does not make provisions for such circumstances. In fact, it may put these young women in a more dangerous situation should they feel compelled to turn to illicit providers of abortion services or travel alone.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the need for more parental involvement in their children's lives, but for these reasons, I must vote ''no'' on H.R. 1218.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to give my support to the Child Custody Protection Act and I commend Representative ROS-LEHTINEN for working so diligently to protect children and the rights of their parents.

Today we live in a nation bitterly divided over the debate of abortion. As horrifying as abortion is, this bill really deals with another issue, that of States rights. Two weeks ago, you joined me to pass the Ten Commandants Defense Act, another piece of legislation securing the rights of States to establish their own laws. Both of these pieces of legislation protect the Tenth Amendment of States rights.

Representative ROS-LEHTINEN's act argues that citizens and businesses of one state should respect the laws of another state. If the people of Alabama have voted for the rights of the parents to know if their children want an abortion, this is the law within the borders of Alabama. No one, not even a well-meaning friend, has the right to break this law by taking a child away from their home and into another state for what could be the most terrifying and traumatic experience of their life.

Abortion clinics are enticing people to break the law by advertising in the phone books of neighboring states with parental notification laws. We are constantly hearing of the tobacco industry being sued for illegally targeting minors in advertising. Using the same logic, these abortion clinics may be setting themselves up for a few lawsuits.

We convict and sentence adults for engaging in sexual relations with a minor, yet we don't even slap the hand of an adult who aids a minor in destroying their unborn child. Unfortunately, right now, without this law in place, a statutory rapist can conceal the evidence of his crime by taking his young victim across state lines to abort the child he fathered.

As a parent and a defender of the Constitution, I am calling on you, my fellow lawmakers, to respect the autonomous powers of States to allow parents to parent.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Child Custody Protection Act. This legislation will make it a federal misdemeanor for a person to transport a minor across state lines in order to circumvent state law so that the minor may obtain an abortion.

In North Carolina—Parental consent is required. A Physician cannot perform an abortion on a minor unless they have the consent of a parent or legal guardian. The Child Custody Protection Act is designed to give parents input in one of the most serious and lasting decision a child could make. While North Carolina parents are guaranteed a voice in our state, there is still an enormous federal loophole in this effort. The fact that someone else could transport that same young woman to another state with more lenient parental laws completely undermines this common sense measure.

I hope that we will work for policies that keep young women from having to make this type of decision in the first place. Abortion should not be a decision that a school aged girl has to make. The pressures in our society are so great on young women to have sexual relations before marriage. We need to go one step further in our schools and communities by teaching abstinence until marriage as the correct and healthy method of sex education. This would be a life saver for our children—keeping them from ever having to make the decision of whether or not to have an abortion.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, for the record I strenuously object to H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. This bill would make it illegal for a trusted adult who is not a parent to bring a minor to another state for an abortion.

Although I think young women should be encouraged to seek their parents' guidance when facing difficult choices regarding abortion and other reproductive health issues, it is not appropriate or possible for the government to legislate family involvement in this important and highly personal decision.

Many minors do not seek advice from their parents because they have experienced violence in their family or fear violence if they tell a parent of their abortion. H.R. 1218 presumes incorrectly that most young women are part of a loving, supportive and healthy home, but in reality it will force many young women to face this situation in isolation rather than trusting a close adult, such as a grandparent, clergy member or sibling.

It is my fear that this measure will force young women to seek illegal dangerous medical treatment rather than tell their parents of their pregnancy. As a result, this would completely undermine a woman's right to choose guaranteed by Roe v. Wade.

In fact, I can argue that this legislation is irresponsible because it does nothing to address the need for education. It is critical that we emphasize the importance of educating our youth about family planning in order to reduce the number of abortions in this country.

Finally we must remember that most young women go to their parents for guidance, but we have an obligation to protect young women who cannot turn to a supportive parent by voting against H.R. 1218.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Child Custody Protection Act. I believe this legislation takes the wrong approach to the problem of teen pregnancy and could turn a young woman's fear into desperation.

Minors should consult their parents before seeking an abortion, and more than 75 percent of young women already involve one or both parents in their decision, but some teens fear family violence if they talk to their parents; other teens are deeply afraid of disappointing their parents. This bill does not address the reality of dysfunctional families in which so many children exist.

Instead of increasing parental involvement, this bill could harm young women by further isolating them at a time when they are already facing the crisis of an unwanted pregnancy, leading them to turn to illegal or unsafe abortions or to travel alone to other states. As drafted, even a step-parent, aunt, or grandmother could not accompany a minor unless the parent had been notified or had consented, depending on the state law. The Supreme Court has decided that the Constitutional right to privacy includes a minor's right to terminate a pregnancy. Although states are given the option of enacting their own laws on this issue, H.R. 1218 would federalize a process that many states have chosen not to enact.

The Child Custody Protection Act intends to make it a federal crime to assist a minor by crossing state lines to obtain a legal abortion. The desire to maintain secrecy has been one of the leading reasons for illegal abortion deaths. Building roadblocks for a pregnant teenager can cause her to feel more alone and alienated in a fearful situation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1218, the ''Child Custody Protection Act'' which would make it a federal offense to transport a minor across a state line for an abortion if this action circumvents a state law requiring parental involvement in that minor's abortion or circumvents a requirement of a judicial waiver. This legislaiton does not manate parental involvement but requires obedience to state law. This bill deals with the narrow but important question of the interstate transportation of minors to circumvent existing state laws which places pregnant girls at risk and ignores parental rights.

In a widely publicized 1995 case, a 12-year-old Pennsylvania girl became pregnant after involvement with an 18-year-old man. Pennsylvania law requires parental consent or judicial bypass for an abortion to be performed on a minor. However, the man's mother took the pregnant girl for an abortion in New York, which has no parental involvement law. The girl's mother did not even know that she was pregnant. When Pennsylvania authorities prosecuted the woman for interfering with the custody of a child, she was defended by a pro abortion group which argued that the woman's action were like those of ''thousands of adults who each year aid young women in exercising their constitutional right to an abortion''. The fact is that many abortion advocates advertise and refer young girls to neighboring states to avoid these laws. This reality is not in the best interests of these children.

Exceptions already exist when the pregnant girl's health is genuinely at risk and judicial bypass procedures exist for situations where abusive parents or guardians are involved. The fact is that for the vast majority of cases it is the parents or legal guardians—not the boyfriends, strangers, or meddling in-laws—who are generally best able to weigh the risks of various courses of action in the light of their often unique knowledge of the girl's medical history, psychological makeup, and other crucial factors.

Schools require parental involvement for field trips, medications, early school release, and academic decisions such as sexual education classes, yet with reckless disregard for state laws, a stranger can legally transport a minor across state lines and have her undergo a potentially life-threatening procedure.

Parental notification laws were signed into law this month in both Florida and Texas. Twenty other states already have these laws on the books. The Child Custody Protection Act is supported by a vast majority of Americans since it works to strengthen the rights of parents to raise their children as they see fit by enforcing state laws which require parental involvement in a decision bearing serious medical and emotional consequences to their daughters. The legislation passed the House with a vote of 276–150 last year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this critical legislation and request that the President sign it into law.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is a member in this House who is against supporting and reinforcing family values. We all know that the family is under assault in this country. Efforts to counter this assault and foster good public policy, have occurred in 34 states that currently have laws requiring consent or notification of at least one parent or court authorization before a child can obtain an abortion. These states have expressed their public policy that when a child is going to have an abortion, the parents of the child, the mother who bore her, the father who supports the family unit, know about it, know that their daughter is going to be treated by an abortionist who is going to perform a very serious surgical procedure with potentially serious consequences.

These states have decided by passing these laws that parents are entitled to be part of that decision. This bill reinforces those state laws. It is good legislation, designed to support the family and prevent the evasion of state laws that require parental consent before a child can have an abortion.

I can think of nothing more destructive to the family unit than back door efforts to evade the inclusion of a parent in a child's decision to have an abortion. Some have said grandparents, siblings or others should have the right to take a minor child for an abortion without parent's knowledge. This would create a situation where the grandparents are pulling in one direction and the parents, who have the primary responsibility for the child's well-being and her unborn child, are pulling in another. I say, leave it to the parents. Yes, you can have parents who are intolerant, absent, abusive, or involved with drugs, but the law recognizes these situations and provides for a judicial by-

pass of a parental consent requirement. This bill recognizes the humanity of the unborn and reinforces the structure of the family. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1218, the ''Child Custody Protection Act of 1999.''

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1218 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 4, after line 11 insert the following:

''(3) The prohibitions of this section do not apply with respect to conduct by an adult sibling or grandparent, or by a minister, rabbi, pastor, priest, or other religious leader of the minor.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion to recommit.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I come to this floor with a very heavy heart, because I had hoped that in deliberations on dealing with something as, if you will, sacred and challenging as the very private and terrible decision of having to decide whether to terminate a pregnancy could be done in a bipartisan manner.

I indicated earlier in my remarks, we are not debating partial-birth abortion; we are not talking about advertising that may be too solicitous and too open; we are really talking about a life that, unfortunately in America, may be somewhat different than we would like.

I loved to watch the T.V. Show Ozzie and Harriet, and I really enjoyed the fact that children lived in two-parent families in a loving and nurturing environment. I enjoyed those television programs. But, Mr. Speaker, that is just not today's reality.

We live in a different time. We come from mixed and different cultures. So many Americans have had to grow up without parents or without the traditional family structure. This is a day, Mr. Speaker, when many young people have to live with their grandparents. I represent communities who have extended families and who have to reach out to take care of someone who may have been abandoned.

Poverty strikes in this Nation, and sometimes parents go off because they are frustrated and cannot take care of their family. This overemphasis on parents, Mr. Speaker, is unfair. The motion to recommit responds to the dire circumstances of young people who do not have parents who are there to nurture and care for them.

We offered this amendment in committee. We offered it in the Committee on Rules, and we were denied. So that means that a young woman who has been raped, who has been involved in incest or child abuse through the family situation cannot seek to have their grandparent, their grandmother, their adult siblings, their aunts, their religious advisors like ministers and rabbis to provide them the guidance that would help them to make the right decision. These loving people under this bill will now be put in jail if they attempt to help and counsel this young female teen-ager who has nowhere else to go.

I am confused as to why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep talking about States' rights and then we want to alter States' rights by federalizing this particular activity. States already have these provisions and yet now we want to take away the rights of those who are in States who do not have them. This bill endangers the lives of teens who may have to make the worse decision in their life.

Let me share with my colleagues the story of Keishawn, 11 years old, and her Aunt Vicky. Keishawn, 11 years old, was raped by her father. Mr. Speaker, is that the parent that Keishawn should have gone and gotten consent from? Therefore she sought help from her aunt, her aunt under this bill would be jailed under this legislation.

And what about Becky Bell, who was dating her older brother's boyfriend, who had loving parents, who was in a State with parental consent, who was frightened to go to the courts and ask for a judicial bypass or waiver and went to a back-room abortionist, where her young life was snuffed out because of the inadequate medical care. And, yes, she died due to a terrible infection of which the medical examiner confirmed that she died due to a botched abortion.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that we should be able to resolve. We should leave it to the States. But, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to put this bill on the floor, how can we deny grandparents the right to counsel these young teens, where no viable parent is involved.

We are not asking for grandparents to intrude into the relationship of loving families who can talk and generate the decisions that need to be made within the privacy of their home. But, Mr. Speaker, are we here so blinded by the fact that we do not realize what kind of world we live in, that we are living in a world with broken homes? Are we to indict those families who are doing the best they can to raise their children by grandparents or aunts—are they now to go to jail? Are our minister and rabbis to go to jail too?

I just heard on this floor yesterday how important it is to turn our eyes toward our heavenly Father. But yet we want to deny religious leaders the right to give counsel to these suffering teens.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues support a motion to recommit that recognizes the world in which we live has changed and we all don't come from two-parent families. We live in a Nation that has a diverse population that finds many different family structures to guide a teen-ager. Although we should encourage families to stay together we must also accept the fact that young girls can be raped, there is incest, there is child abuse. Sometimes families are not the kind of families that we would like.

I understand the reality of Keishawn and Becky Bell. Becky Bell is now dead. She is dead because we forced upon her the laws of parental consent, and we denied her the right to counsel with other family members to help her in her terrible time of need.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote down the bill and to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a motion to recommit to exclude grandparents, older siblings, trusted relatives, and the clergy from H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act of 1999.

Although many young women would involve their parents when seeking an abortion, not every young person can do so. Parents may be abusive, or even absent. In those cases where a young woman cannot involve her parents in the decision, there are others who would help by offering physical and emotional support during a time of crisis, confusion and emotional pain. A minor should be able to turn to a relative, close friend, and even clergy members for assistance.

In those cases, this law would endanger minors who cannot talk with their parents and would make criminals of those people the minor turns to for people help.

Supporters of this bill claim that judicial bypass, a procedure which permits teenagers to appear before a judge to request a waiver of the parental involvement requirement, is a preferred alternative. However, many teens do not make use of it because they do not know how to navigate the legal system.

Many teens are embarrassed and are afraid that an unsympathetic or hostile judge might refuse to grant the waiver. Also, the confidentiality of the teen is compromised if the bypass hearing requires use of the parents' names. In small towns, confidentiality may be further compromised if the judge knows the teen or her family.

The need to travel across state lines may be necessary in states where abortion services are not readily available. This may be because of various state restrictions or distance. Some young women must seek services outside of their home state because the closest abortion provider may be across state lines.

When a young woman must travel these distances, we do not want her taking this difficult and tumultuous step alone. Therefore, I offer this motion to recommit to exclude grandparents, older siblings, trusted relatives, and the clergy, so an adult can assist a young woman who is facing an arduous choice.

Grandparents play an important role in the lives of young people. Grandparents act as counselors for children who cannot speak with their parents. In many cases, grandparents act as parents to children who are abandoned or neglected by their own parents. The relationship between a child and a grandparent should be viewed just as sacred as the relationship between a parent and a child.

Older brothers and sisters also form a unique bond with children who cannot communicate with their parents. There are so many instances where an older brother or sister acts as the parents. We should reward these outstanding members of the family who have taken on such responsibility; we should not punish them with threats of criminal sanctions.

This motion to recommit also would exclude aunts, uncles, first cousins and godparents from the prohibitions of this bill. We should not punish caring relatives for providing support to a scared young woman.

In a time of crisis, a member of the clergy is an important counselor. The advice and assistance of the clergy should not be compromised for fear of criminal sanctions. In its present form, this bill would criminalize any efforts by a religious leader to assist a young woman in her efforts to obtain an abortion.

I hope that my colleagues will accept this motion to recommit. It is vital that we allow our young people to turn to responsible adults when facing abortion. We want trusted members of society bonding with the young woman seeking their help; we do not want these members taken away in bonds.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all the Members of the House to oppose this motion to recommit for the simple reason that in its four lines it sweeps aside the whole concept of parental involvement. It sweeps aside the notion that it is the parent who should have the primary responsibility for the nurture of children.

Now, this is a concept that has been recognized time and time again by the Supreme Court of the United States. It is a concept that has been recognized by the Supreme Court in the very cases where the Supreme Court has dealt with the various State laws calling for parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision.

Now, what does the amendment provide for? The amendment says that a grandparent can substitute for the parent, an adult sibling, a minister, a rabbi, a pastor, a priest, or other religious leader of the minor.

Now, I love my in-laws and my parents, but they have no business taking my daughter across State lines for the purpose of having an abortion. And I have a great deal of respect for my pastor, but I will guarantee my colleagues that he has no business taking my daughter across State lines for the purpose of having an abortion. It is the parents who have the primary responsibility, and we should recognize that along with the States who have passed laws which recognize that and along with the Supreme Court, which has recognized that in opinion after opinion.

Now, the truth of the matter is, if there are difficult circumstances such as we have heard about in the debate where it is not possible for a young girl to go to her parents concerning such a decision, the courts have required that there be made available a judicial bypass procedure. That is there. In all the laws that are in effect across the land, there is a judicial bypass procedure.

We have heard an example of a child that was raped by the father and an effort was made to take the child for an abortion without the knowledge of the authorities. Well, that is exactly the kind of case where the judicial bypass should most certainly be utilized so there will be a certainty that the authorities are aware of this parental abuse that is taking place.

Why that sort of thing should be handled in some other manner secretly makes no sense to me. I do not think the child's interest is being protected unless the authorities are involved. That is how the child is going to be protected against future abuse by a father who would commit such a heinous crime.

The opponents of the bill and the supporters of this motion to recommit contend that judicial bypass procedure is not meaningful, that it does not work. Well, I would suggest to the Members of the House that that is a fallacious argument. In case after case, the Supreme Court of the United States has imposed requirements on the judicial bypass procedures to make certain that they do work in a way that protects the interest that the court has found must be protected.

The Supreme Court said that the judicial bypass must allow for consideration with sufficient expedition to provide an effective opportunity for abortion to be obtained. That is what the Supreme Court said back in 1979.

In subsequent cases, they have struck down laws where it has been shown that there was a systematic failure to provide a judicial bypass option in the most expeditious practical manner. The cases are there. The judicial bypass mechanism works as the Supreme Court intended it to work.

The problem that the opponents of this bill have is that they do not like any parental involvement law. They do not believe that there should ever be a requirement for parental involvement. They believe that the decision to have an abortion is a decision that the minor should be able to make on her own, without any input from anybody other than from the abortionist. That is the bottom-line position of the people who oppose this bill.

I would suggest to my colleagues that that is the wrong position. That is the position that is overwhelmingly rejected by the American people. It is a position that has been rejected by the Supreme Court. And it is a position that this House should, once again, reject as we reject the motion to recommit and move forward to the passage of this important legislation.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her outstanding leadership on this. I urge the Members of the House to vote against the motion to recommit and in favor of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 164, nays 268, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

YEAS—164

Abercrombie	Cummings	Hinchey
Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Allen	DeFazio	Hoeffel
Andrews	DeGette	Holt
Baird	Delahunt	Hooley
Baldacci	DeLauro	Horn
Baldwin	Deutsch	Hoyer
Barrett (WI)	Dicks	Inslee
Becerra	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Bentsen	Dixon	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Berkley	Doggett	Jefferson
Berman	Dooley	Johnson (CT)
Biggert	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop	Engel	Jones (OH)
Blagojevich	Eshoo	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Etheridge	Kilpatrick
Boehlert	Evans	Kind (WI)
Boucher	Farr	Lampson
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Lantos
Brown (FL)	Filner	Larson
Brown (OH)	Ford	Lee
Campbell	Frank (MA)	Levin
Capps	Frost	Lewis (GA)
Capuano	Gejdenson	Lofgren
Cardin	Gephardt	Lowey
Carson	Gilchrest	Luther
Castle	Gilman	Maloney (CT)
Clay	Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)
Clayton	Green (TX)	Markey
Clyburn	Greenwood	Matsui
Conyers	Gutierrez	McCarthy (MO)
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Crowley	Hilliard	

McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Porter
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—268

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—2

Brown (CA)
Martinez

□ 1347

Mr. BISHOP changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 270, noes 159, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—270

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vento
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—159

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Porter
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stabenow
Stark
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

Brown (CA) Lewis (CA) Martinez
Ford Lucas (OK)

□ 1355

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall vote No. 261, and, if I had been present on final passage H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act, I would have voted ''yes.''

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 66, ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 230

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. 66) to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance. 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1400

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 230 would grant H.R. 66, the Route 66 Corridor Act, an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule makes in order the Committee on Resources amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be open to amendment by section. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule also allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 230 provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

H.R. 66, the Route 66 Corridor Act, would permit the Secretary of the Interior to support and collaborate with the State and local and private institutions to preserve one of the most famous highways in the United States. The bill, introduced by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), would further the preservation and restoration of portions of the highway, businesses and sites of interest during this period of outstanding historic significance.

In its heyday, Mr. Speaker, Route 66 extended from Chicago to Los Angeles, helping businesses to move their products and millions of Americans to move their families westward, primarily between 1933 and 1970.

It also opened up the southwestern landscape to tourism, has been mentioned in books, television, movies and songs. H.R. 66 was reported by the Committee on Resources on a voice vote and there is no controversy surrounding this legislation.

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

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding the customary amount of time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule and, as my colleague has described, this rule will equally divide and control the debate of the chairman and the ranking minority member on the Committee on Resources.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process that we use here in the House. All Members will have the chance to offer germane amendments.

The bill authorizes $10 million to help preserve historic buildings and sites and highway portions along old Route 66 from Chicago to Los Angeles. The Federal share of any project is limited to 50 percent.

A Federal study completed in 1995 found that Route 66 is nationally significant and that the cultural resources along the road are disappearing.

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

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 791, STAR-SPANGLED BANNER NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL STUDY ACT OF 1999

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 232 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 232

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. 791) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route of the War of 1812 British invasion of Maryland and Washington, District of Columbia, and the route of the American defense, for study for potential addition to the national trails system. 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the

Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from 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 gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H.Res. 232 would grant H.R. 791, the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trails Study Act of 1999, an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule makes in order the Committee on Resources amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be open to amendment at any point.

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

Finally, H.Res. 232 provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 791 would amend the National Trails System Act to designate for study as a potential addition to the National Trails System the route of the British invasion of Maryland and the District of Columbia during the War of 1812. Such designation would give recognition to the patriots whose determination to stand firm against enemy invasion and bombardment preserved this Nation for future generations of Americans.

H.R. 791, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), would authorize studies which the Congressional Budget Office estimates would cost the Federal Government approximately $250,000 over the next 2 years. The bill contains no unfunded mandates and thus would not affect pay-go procedures.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 791 was reported favorably by the Committee on Resources on a voice vote and there is no controversy surrounding this legislation. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for yielding me this time, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule which will allow full and fair debate on H.R. 791. This rule provides 1 hour of debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

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

H.R. 791 authorizes a study of the route British invaders and American defenders followed between Baltimore and Washington during the War of 1812.

The study is the first step to declare the route part of the National Trails System. This is an open rule and it was adopted by a voice vote in the Committee on Rules. I urge adoption of the rule.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 592, WORLD WAR VETERANS PARK AT MILLER FIELD GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 231

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. 592) to redesignate Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as ''World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills''. 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from 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 gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 231 would grant H.R. 592, the World War II Veterans Park at Miller Field Gateway National Recreation Area, an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

□ 1415

The rule makes in order the Committee on Resources amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be open to amendment at any point. In addition, the rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI prohibiting nongermane amendments against the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

Finally, House Resolution 231 provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 592 was introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), and would redesignate the Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as the World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 592 would have no significant impact on the Federal budget. The bill contains no unfunded mandates, and thus would not affect pay-go procedures.

H.R. 592 was reported favorably by the Committee on Resources on a voice vote, and there is no controversy surrounding the bill.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. It will allow for full and fair debate on H.R. 592. As my colleague has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

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

Miller Field is a 64-acre section of the Gateway National Recreation Area on Staten Island, New York. The bill designates that section as the World War Veterans Park at Miller Field to honor the veterans who fought in the world wars to protect democracy and freedom.

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

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to House Resolution 230 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. 66.

□ 1418

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. 66) to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance, with Mr. BONILLA 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 Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 66, introduced by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), will preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor.

Route 66 was a nationally significant part of American history, and was foremost among the early highways that helped change and shape America throughout the early and mid 20th century.

Extending from Chicago to Los Angeles, Route 66 was nonetheless important to the entire country. It enabled American businesses to move goods, individuals to seek better lives, and the government to move troops and war supplies. It also opened up the West to tourism, and allowed the post-war migration of families to the booming job market of California.

Route 66 has become an enduring part of America's culture through books, television, songs, and movies. As Americans became increasingly mobile, the two-lane roadway known as Route 66 could not handle the increased traffic volume. The Interstate Highway system came into existence, new roads were built, and traffic was diverted away from the former route.

Route 66 eventually became so fragmented and confusing that in 1979 it lost its official U.S. Highway Route 66 designation. The remaining portions of the former Route 66 have been incorporated into State and local highway systems.

H.R. 66 would preserve the cultural resources along the historic Route 66 by allowing the Secretary of the Interior to support and collaborate with State, local, and private institutions to preserve these resources.

The preservation of Route 66 would include the preservation or restoration of portions of the highway, businesses and sites of interest and other contributing resources along the highway. The Secretary could provide cost-share grants, information services, and technical assistance to local entities.

H.R. 66 would also authorize the appropriation of $10 million for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 to carry out the purposes of the bill. Mr. Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 66.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and thank him for all the hard work he has done on the Committee on this bill, and I really appreciate very much the time and attention the gentleman has given to this.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for her leadership and hard work on this bill. I can tell the Members, I am very proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Route 66 began in the early 1920s as a vision, a paved highway that would link the great American heartland with the Pacific Ocean. Starting in Chicago, Route 66 winds its way through eight States, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, before ending at Santa Monica, California.

At a time when most roads were unpaved, not to mention unpassable in inclement weather conditions, Route 66 stretched 2,400 miles and was one of the country's first paved interstate highways. In New Mexico, Route 66 wound its way through the towns of Tucumcari, which is located in my district, Santa Rosa, Albuquerque, Grants, and Gallup, which is also in my district.

Also during the early 1920s, the automobile was gaining in popularity. Prompted by lower prices as a result of Henry Ford's innovative assembly line manufacturing, the automobile was in reach of many Americans. Farmers and ranchers no longer lived in isolation for long periods of time, as they could now drive to town and still tend to their fields and animals all in the same day. Workers in urban areas could now live outside the cities and commute to work. American life was changing, and Route 66 chronicled these changes.

Michael Wallace wrote a book called ''Route 66, the Mother Road,'' and I would recommend to any of the Members or any of the public this book. It is an excellent history of Route 66.

He wrote in the book, ''Route 66 was the road of dreamers and ramblers, drifters and writers, the road of John Steinbeck, Woody Guthrie, and Jack Kerouac. A ribbon of American highway that transported the Oklahomans driven from their land as storms of dust swept across their farms to the promise of California. It was also the highway of commerce—of automated

ice cream stands and old 'no-tell' motels, salty truck stops, and the neon alure.''

H.R. 66 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to preserve or restore historic sites along the route; to cooperate with public and private entities in developing local preservation plans; to develop a technical assistance program in the preservation of Route 66; to coordinate a program of historic research, curation, and preservation; to make available cost-share grants; and to provide information about existing cost-share opportunities.

Route 66 started out as a vision. Today it is a fond memory, an important piece of Americana that should be preserved for current and future generations. This legislation will enable the preservation of this historic landmark, and will also provide a lift to the economies of every community along its route.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico, for his kind words, and I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), the author of this piece of legislation, who has done a substantially great job in getting to this point.

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

I would like to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG), the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) for their support of H.R. 66.

I would also like to commend the staff who have worked so hard on this, Allen Freemyer and Gary Griffith, David Watkins and Rick Healy.

I would also like to recognize the hard work of Mrs. Susie McComb, the President of the New Mexico Route 66 Association, and Mr. David Knudson, who is the executive director of the National Historic Route 66 Federation, for their support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 66, a bill to preserve and protect the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor, is important to my State and to many others. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS), the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), and Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN of New Mexico and others who live along this historic route have been working on it for more than 5 years now.

I would also like it thank my colleague, the gentleman from northern New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for his joining on as an original cosponsor of H.R. 66 this year.

This version of H.R. 66 addresses the concerns raised by both the majority and the minority on the Committee on Resources. It passed by voice vote in both the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands and on the full Committee on Resources.

At a March 11, 1999, subcommittee hearing, the administration testified in support of the bill. H.R. 66 is substantially similar to a bill that the House considered on the floor last year in the waning days of the 105th Congress. The Senate companion to my bill, which was H.R. 4513, garnered a majority of support, but there were some objections because it did not go through the normal hearing process.

The bill is supported by the National Parks and Conservation Association and the National Park Service, and enjoys bipartisan support in both the House and Senate.

H.R. 66 authorizes the National Park Service to support efforts of State and local, public and private persons, nonprofit Route 66 associations, Indian tribes, State historic preservation offices, and others for the preservation or restoration of structures or other cultural resources, of businesses and sites of interest along Route 66.

The Park Service would act as a clearinghouse for communication among Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as nonprofit entities, and would participate in cost-sharing programs and make grants not to exceed $10 million over 10 years. That is what the bill is about. I think it is more important what Route 66 is about.

Route 66 is 2,448 miles long. It crosses eight States and three time zones stretching from Chicago all the way to L.A. It is firmly rooted in Americana.

□ 1430

Almost every child in America who studies English in high school reads ''The Grapes of Wrath'', where John Steinbeck writes, ''Highway 66 is the migrant road. 66—the long concrete path across the country, waving gently up and down on the map, from the Mississippi to Bakersfield—over the red lands and the gray lands, twisting up into the mountains, crossing the Divide and down into the bright and terrible desert, and across the desert to the mountains again, and into the rich California valleys.

''66 is the path of a people in flight, refugees from dust and shrinking land, from the thunder of tractors and shrinking ownership, from the desert's slow northward invasion, from the twisting winds that howl up out of Texas, from the floods that bring no richness to the land and steal what little richness is there. From all of these the people are in flight, and they come into 66 from the tributary side roads, from the wagon tracks and the rutted country roads, 66 is the mother road, the road of flight.

''Two hundred and fifty thousand people over the road. Fifty thousand old cars—fifty thousand wounded, steaming. Wrecks along the road, abandoned. Well, what happened to them? What happened to the folks in that car? Did they walk? Where does the courage come from? Where does the terrible faith come from?

''The people in flight from the terror behind—strange things happen to them, some bitterly cruel and some so beautiful that the faith is refired forever.''

Route 66 is a part of our history and a part of our literature and a part of our culture. Even though it was decommissioned in 1985, it continues to be a part of our lives from Chicago to L.A.

There are Route 66 associations in almost every State. In New Mexico, the Route 66 Association is alive and well and a strong supporter of this bill.

There is a little elementary school in Moriarty, New Mexico, in the East Mountains of my district. It is called Route 66 Elementary School. Last year, I showed the House a hubcap that the students of Route 66 Elementary School had given to me. After that speech, I received several letters from the students who were at Route 66 Elementary School about their school and how it is designed around the Route 66 theme.

I would like to read one of those letters from Kelsey Byrne in Ms. Trujillo's fourth grade class. It says, ''Honorable Congresswoman Wilson, our principal told us about the hubcap. It is an honor to have had you show it on television. I am very glad to get part of my education here at Route 66. It is historical, you know. I believe that this school will go on for generations. People use their school education all the time, even us kids. That is why I think everyone deserves a good education. Route 66 is very important to me. It is old, but it is in very good shape. I would like to thank you for supporting us and good luck.''

Unlike today's interstate highways, Route 66 is a collection of roads tied together by highway signs. It is a collection of stories, stories about migration and war and the automobile and the Depression and the Dust Bowl. But it is also a story about dreams and about courage and about strength and sadness and faith.

It is a means to an end and an end in itself. It is now decommissioned, but it remains a preferred means of travel for those who want to get off the beaten path.

When America entered World War II, traffic on Route 66 slowed to a trickle because of gas rationing. Military convoys began to travel across the highways with men and machines, renewing the need for a fast, complete corridor from the heart of the country to the coast.

It starts in the home of the 1933 World's Fair in Chicago, Illinois; passes the Chain of Rocks Bridge in Missouri; the Jesse James Wax Museum in Missouri; in Galena, Kansas, the site of the 1935 United Mine Workers strike that erupted into violence; the Will Rogers Museum in Oklahoma and on into Texas; and then of course into New Mexico through Tucumcari and Santa Rosa to Moriarty, the home of Route 66 Elementary School, and into Albuquerque, my hometown, where Route 66 is no Central Avenue.

One can drive it from one end to the other looking at old motor courts and

the curio shops, most of which still operate, and have lunch at the Route 66 Diner.

Finally, it goes on into California, the home of Ray Crock's first McDonald's in San Bernardino, and then on down the long route to Pasadena along the route of the Tournament of Roses Parade.

The year 2000 will mark the 75th anniversary of Route 66.

H.R. 66 will help all the States through which Route 66 passes to celebrate this anniversary, to preserve its unique culture, and to preserve this corridor that is so much a part of America and American history.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of additional points. First of all, on the point of bipartisanship, the reason that we have reached this point in terms of legislation and having it here on the floor is the Democrats and Republicans have signed onto this bill, Democrats and Republicans have worked in the subcommittee, in the full Committee on Resources, to make sure that this bill was fully heard. I think this bill is a good example of how the Congress should work in a bipartisan way to bring forward legislation that we all agree on and that we can move forward with. So I would like to thank all sides for doing that.

Secondly, this legislation is very important to business owners. I just wanted to pick one example, because there is a wonderful man in New Mexico by the name of Armand Ortega. He grew up with my father over in a small little town called Saint John's, Arizona, which is near the Arizona-New Mexico border.

Mr. Ortega owns a wonderful place along Route 66 called the El Rancho Hotel, and that hotel used to be a hotel where movie stars would come and stay. As a result of that, he has captured on that idea, and he has on each of the doors on his hotel the name of the movie stars. Ronald Reagan, many others are listed on the doors of that motel.

Now, as a result of this bill, this business owner, Mr. Ortega, will be able to apply for a grant, will be able to restore and make sure that the El Rancho Hotel is a place that is there for future Americans to see and it will be there for a future part of our history for all to observe.

In concluding here, I would just like to thank all of the Members of the Committee on Resources that have worked so hard on this, especially on the Democratic side.

The gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), our ranking member, has done a great deal to see that this legislation has come to the point it has today.

We have had other hard-working staff members on the Committee on Resources' side, Rick Healy, Dave Watkins, and also my staff member Bob Scruggs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, as a representative of Route 66, and as a Member privileged to represent a district which exists only because of the growth that Route 66 made possible, I rise in support of this legislation, which recognizes the central role that Route 66 played at a critical point in American history.

Mr. Chairman, the foothill communities of the San Gabriel Valley which I represent grew up in the post-World War II era, and are populated by the families of tens of thousands of people who came to Southern California on Route 66. My district is home to Monrovia's famed Aztec Hotel, a well-known symbol of the architectural distinctness of many landmarks along Route 66. I have had the pleasure of participating in the City of Duarte's annual parade in salute to Route 66, which travels down a stretch of this famous road. This unique heritage is a major reason that Route 66 has been immortalized in writing and in song.

Although we all recognize the importance of interstate highways today, the significance of a highway link to California was initially shown by the First Transcontinental Motor Convoy of 1919, which included then-Lieutenant Colonel Dwight David Eisenhower. As President, of course, Eisenhower oversaw the creation of the modern interstate highway system. The Convoy which took two months to travel from Washington to San Francisco and encountered numerous problems along the way, demonstrated the inadequacy of existing surface roads to California. It made clear that it would be essentially impossible to supply the West Coast overland from the East in wartime. Even more important at that time and in the decades to follow, it highlighted the difficulty in moving soldiers and materiel from the West to the East in times of war. Considering the central role that California's defense industry would come to play in our national defense in World War II, it was critical to address this weakness.

Besides enhanced national security, the creation of Route 66 is a watershed in American history for a number of reasons. For Salinas, California's John Steinbeck for example, Route 66 was the ''Mother Road''—it enabled more than 200,000 Americans to escape the despair of the Dust Bowl and seek better fortunes in California. The migration to California that began during the Great Depression along Route 66 was to continue for decades.

Route 66 was key to the expansion of international commerce as well. By linking the port cities of Los Angeles and Chicago with points throughout Illinois, Missouri, and Kansas, Route 66 linked the heartland to America's major ports, helping to make the breadbasket of America the breadbasket of the world as well.

Route 66 permitted the greatest wartime manpower mobilization in United States history. Between 1941 and 1945 the government invested about $70 billion in capital projects in California, a large portion of this in the defense sector in and around Los Angeles and San Diego. This enormous capital outlay created new industries and thousands of new jobs. With the end of the Cold War, as employment in defense has declined in California, the advanced technologies and skilled workforce that were developed in California along with the defense sector have been an essential contributor to the development of California as the world's leader in high-technology products.

Perhaps most importantly, by making the onset of the automobile era, the designation of Route 66 in 1926 symbolizes the mobility revolution that enables Americans to go where they want, when they want. Route 66, and other highways such as the Lincoln and the Dixie created at the same time, mark the beginning of a national effort to enable people to move quickly and efficiently around this vast country. This unparalleled ease with which we move people and goods across this country is central to our flexible and vibrant economy. I believe it has been absolutely essential to empowering Americans to pursue their dreams.

Mr. Chairman, I ask all my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the special connection that the Seventh District of Missouri, and especially Springfield has to a highway known both as the Main Street of America and as The Mother Road—Route 66. We will be voting later today on an act to preserve portions of this unique part of our history.

Traversing almost 2,500 miles, 8 states and three time zones from the windswept shores of Chicago on the north and east to the sun drenched shores of Santa Monica on the south and west, route 66 cut across America's heartland beginning an era of transcontinental automobile and truck travel that has continued for 75 years.

Although conceived by Congress with legislative action in 1925 as a national highway and commissioned in 1926, Route 66 began with only 800 miles of paved road. Almost 1,700 miles of the trip was over gravel and dirt roads. It was not until 11 years later that paving was completed.

Route 66's connection to Southwest Missouri is far more than it's strategic geographic placement across the breadth of the district. It is far more than linking this strong agricultural market in the 1920's and 30's with expanded outlets throughout the nation.

The dream of an inter-regional link between Chicago and Los Angeles is ascribed to Cyrus Avery of Tulsa Oklahoma and John Woodruff of Springfield Missouri. These two men understood the importance of transportation of this country and were willing to invest of themselves in this effort. Historians say that as result of Woodruff's work the decision to name this new route—Route 66 was actually made in a meeting in Springfield. Woodruff later served two terms as President of the Route 66 association.

Woodruff was also a promoter of Springfield and the Ozarks who understood the importance of public and private partnerships. He raised funds to buy the land so that the state of Missouri would create what is now Southwest Missouri State University. He traveled to New York City and secured a grant from Andrew Carnegie to help fund Drury College. Years later he also raised funds to purchase the land for the U.S. Federal Medical Center. And the former railroad attorney was instrumental in getting the city's first airport.

Route 66 is not just a story of creating a unified ribbon of concrete and asphalt from one great metropolitan center to another. It is the story of linking urban, suburban and rural together. It is the story of making travel accessible to millions. It is the story of what we sometimes refer to as an American dream—a country where two men with a vision and who

worked hard enough, can literally change the course of a country.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 66, the Route 66 Preservation Act. Mr. Chairman, Route 66 is the premier historic trail of the automobile age. The automobile has changed America forever and Route 66 played a large role in this revolution of mobility. Route 66 ran over 2,000 miles from Chicago to Los Angeles, linking the east and the west in our great Nation more closely than ever before.

Barstow, California, in my own 40th District, is an original stop on the crossroads of opportunity known as Route 66. In fact, Route 66 traces a path through my District all the way from Needles on the Colorado River to San Bernardino, California. Route 66 served as the crossroads of opportunity for the great flow of traffic across the broad middle of our Nation and into America's land of promise, California.

This legislation before us today will ensure that the contributions of Route 66 to American history will not be forgotten. Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 66 and vote to preserve the cultural resources of historic Route 66.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise again in strong support of this legislation and appreciate the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and her inspired remarks.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by section as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered read.

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

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

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR.—The term ''Route 66 corridor'' means structures and other cultural resources described in paragraph (3), including—

(A) lands owned by the Federal Government and lands owned by a State or local government within the immediate vicinity of those portions of the highway formerly designated as United States Route 66; and

(B) private land within that immediate vicinity that is owned by persons or entities that are willing to participate in the programs authorized by this Act.

(2) CULTURAL RESOURCE PROGRAMS.—The term ''Cultural Resource Programs'' means the programs established and administered by the National Park Service for the benefit of and in support of preservation of the Route 66 corridor, either directly or indirectly.

(3) PRESERVATION OF THE ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR.—The term ''preservation of the Route 66 corridor'' means the preservation or restoration of structures or other cultural resources of businesses, sites of interest, and other contributing resources that—

(A) are located within the land described in paragraph (1);

(B) existed during the route's period of outstanding historic significance (principally between 1926 and 1970), as defined by the study prepared by the National Park Service and entitled ''Special Resource Study of Route 66'', dated July 1995; and

(C) remain in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Cultural Resource Programs at the National Park Service.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means a State in which a portion of the Route 66 corridor is located.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the entities described in subsection (c), shall facilitate the development of guidelines and a program of technical assistance and grants that will set priorities for the preservation of the Route 66 corridor.

(b) DESIGNATION OF OFFICIALS.—The Secretary shall designate officials of the National Park Service stationed at locations convenient to the States to perform the functions of the Cultural Resource Programs under this Act.

(c) GENERAL FUNCTIONS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) support efforts of State and local public and private persons, nonprofit Route 66 preservation entities, Indian tribes, State Historic Preservation Offices, and entities in the States for the preservation of the Route 66 corridor by providing technical assistance, participating in cost-sharing programs, and making grants;

(2) act as a clearinghouse for communication among Federal, State, and local agencies, nonprofit Route 66 preservation entities, Indian tribes, State historic preservation offices, and private persons and entities interested in the preservation of the Route 66 corridor; and

(3) assist the States in determining the appropriate form of and establishing and supporting a non-Federal entity or entities to perform the functions of the Cultural Resource Programs after those programs are terminated.

(d) AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary may—

(1) enter into cooperative agreements, including (but not limited to) cooperative agreements for study, planning, preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration related to the Route 66 corridor;

(2) accept donations of funds, equipment, supplies, and services as appropriate;

(3) provide cost-share grants for projects for the preservation of the Route 66 corridor (but not to exceed 50 percent of total project costs) and information about existing cost-share opportunities;

(4) provide technical assistance in historic preservation and interpretation of the Route 66 corridor; and

(5) coordinate, promote, and stimulate research by other persons and entities regarding the Route 66 corridor.

(e) PRESERVATION ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide assistance in the preservation of the Route 66 corridor in a manner that is compatible with the idiosyncratic nature of the Route 66 corridor.

(2) PLANNING.—The Secretary shall not prepare or require preparation of an overall management plan for the Route 66 corridor, but shall cooperate with the States and local public and private persons and entities, State historic preservation offices, nonprofit Route 66 preservation entities, and Indian tribes in developing local preservation plans to guide efforts to protect the most important or representative resources of the Route 66 corridor.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

The Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. RESOURCE TREATMENT.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall develop a program of technical assistance in the preservation of the Route 66 corridor and interpretation of the Route 66 corridor.

(2) PROGRAM GUIDELINES.—As part of the technical assistance program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall establish guidelines for setting priorities for preservation needs for the Route 66 corridor. The Secretary shall base the guidelines on the Secretary's standards for historic preservation.

(b) PROGRAM FOR COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall coordinate a program of historic research, curation, preservation strategies, and the collection of oral and video histories of events that occurred along the Route 66 corridor.

(2) DESIGN.—The program under paragraph (1) shall be designed for continuing use and implementation by other organizations after the Cultural Resource Programs are terminated.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

The Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 66) to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance, pursuant to House Resolution 230, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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.

STAR-SPANGLED BANNER NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL STUDY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231 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. 791.

□ 1442

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. 791) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route of the War of 1812 British invasion of Maryland and Washington, District of Columbia, and the route of the American defense, for study for potential addition to the national trails system, with Mr. BONILLA 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 Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 791, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST). H.R. 791 authorizes a study be completed for a potential addition to the National Trails System. Specifically, this bill would study the designation of the route the British took in their invasion of Maryland and Washington, the District of Columbia, and the route of the American defense during the War of 1812.

The proposed trail would stretch through six Maryland counties, Washington, D.C., and the City of Baltimore, where the trail would ultimately lead to Fort McHenry. Fort McHenry, of course, is where, on September 14, 1814, American forces bravely turned back the British invasion of Baltimore and was the event which sparked Francis Scott Key to pen our national anthem.

The designation of this route as a National Historic Trail would serve as a reminder of the importance of the concept of liberty and give long overdue recognition to the patriots who preserved this liberty for future generations of America.

Mr. Chairman, we have all worked hard on this bill and addressed the concerns of both the minority and the administration. This is a good bill, and we have bipartisan support on this bill. It is supported by the National Park Service. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 791.

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

□ 1445

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, under the National Trails System Act, any route proposed for designation as a national historic trail must be studied to determine the suitability and feasibility of such a designation. H.R. 791 would authorize such a study of the route taken by British troops during the invasion of the United States during the War of 1812. The route crosses nine counties in Maryland and passes through the cities of both Washington and Baltimore.

There is no doubt many of the sites along this proposed site are significant in American history. Not only did British forces lay siege to the U.S. Capitol and eventually burn it down, but it was during the ultimate American victory of Fort McHenry that a local attorney named Francis Scott Key penned what is now our national anthem. A study of these sites for a national historic trail can only serve to deepen our knowledge of the importance of these events in our history.

During our committee's consideration of this measure, an amendment was adopted ensuring that this new study will be carefully coordinated with several ongoing studies with which there could be some overlap. Such coordination will improve the final result of each of these products.

This is a bipartisan bill where both sides have worked closely to have this bill passed, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 791, as amended.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the author of this legislation.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands of the Committee on Resources, for yielding me this time; and I thank all the members of the Committee on Resources for their help on this piece of legislation. But in particular I want to thank the residents of the State of Maryland in my district for bringing this idea, this concept, to our attention.

The War of 1812 is not one of those wars that elicits a great deal of dramatic thought. We do not see it on the silver screen very often. I like to compare it to the Korean War. We hear a great deal about World War II, and there has been many films about the Vietnam conflict, but we did not hear a lot about the Korean War veterans until in recent years, and there is a stunning monument on the mall to the Korean War veterans for their efforts and struggles to preserve liberty in that part of Asia.

During the American revolution, patriots fought so valiantly to bring liberty and justice to light in the Americas, to bring a new idea that people can institutionalize freedom, that people can institutionalize the idea that an individual is independent, and we talk a great deal about the American revolution.

The War of 1812 was a conflict that was our second war of independence. Now, there was a great deal of misunderstanding between the British and the French and the Americans, and certainly back in 1812 there were no telephones, no fax machines, no E-mail, for example. There was no way to communicate with another person until one was talking face-to-face with that person. I bring that up because some of the issues that caused the conflict between the United States and Great Britain were resolved 2 days before the war started, but there was no way to get that message across. So we had this conflict.

And the conflict basically was continental. The conflict was in the Great Lakes, Lake Champlain, Canada, the mid-Atlantic States, the great Chesapeake Bay, and certainly all the way down to the Gulf of Mexico at the battle of New Orleans. This could all have been averted, but we needed this struggle, I guess, to show Europe the United States was firm in its belief that it was independent; that it preserved the right of freedom and justice and liberty for all Americans, and eventually for all the rest of the world.

Now, if we could go forward quickly to the end of the conflict, the agreement to end the war was signed 2 weeks before the last battle was fought. And anybody on the House floor right now who is, I guess, middle-aged, they will remember that song; ''In 1814, I took a little trip, along with Colonel Jackson down the mighty Mississipp. We took a little bacon and we took a little beans, and we took a little ride to New Orleans.'' I remember I used to love that song. But that battle that we smile when we hear the song was a tragedy. Hundreds and hundreds, if not well over a thousand men on both sides were killed because of that conflict. And that conflict was fought to show that the United States was determined to be independent and free.

This trail, which we will come up with after about 3 years of study, will show people all across this country and all across this world America's second battle of independence. There will be a brochure that people can follow from the lower Chesapeake Bay through the Potomac River, up several counties in Maryland, to show how the British tried to take the troops that protected Washington, south of Washington into Georgetown, and draw them away as far as Baltimore so that they could go into the District of Columbia, our Nation's capital, and burn every single

Federal building except for the post office and the patent office, including this building that we now speak from. Fortunately, however one wants to look at it, coincidentally a huge tornado with driving rains came in and flushed out the fire.

Now, we know the rest of the story which is fundamental to this legislation. The Star-Spangled Banner. Francis Scott Key went on board a British ship to try to release Dr. Beanes from his captivity. Francis Scott Key was accompanied by John Skinner. They were going to release Dr. Beanes, but they also wanted to attack Fort McHenry, as the chairman mentioned a little earlier.

As the ship traveled up the Chesapeake Bay, the beautiful Chesapeake Bay, which probably had a few more fish in it at the time, maybe some more clams and oysters, but we are trying to restore the Chesapeake Bay, and maybe a piece of this legislation will bring some attention to that as well, as they came up to Fort McHenry they wanted to bomb Fort McHenry and continue their onslaught to recapture America. And what Francis Scott Key saw we still remember today. As the night glistened in stars, it also glistened with the bombardment from the British ships, but the Americans held. And the next morning the flag still flew over Fort McHenry. And that flag, Mr. Chairman, is now in the Smithsonian institute.

But Francis Scott Key penned the poem which later became our national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner. The flag still waves over Fort McHenry, regardless of the bombs bursting in air. And that spirit, that feeling, that sense of community that we are one among many still holds today in the United States. So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Star-Spangled Banner Trail Bill.

The last comment I want to make is a gracious ''thank you'' to those constituents that brought this idea to our attention, and also to my staff, Erika Feller, for doing a great deal of work on this particular issue.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) for yielding me this time, and I thank my friend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) for listening to those constituents and responding to those constituents and allowing the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), who represents the City of Baltimore in which Fort McHenry is located, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) from Montgomery County, in which, of course, there are many historic sites of the War of 1812, and, of course, I have represented the City of Bladensburg for many, many years, another historic site in the British effort to turn aside the revolution and the Peace Treaty of 1783, signed, as my friend knows, in the old Statehouse in Maryland, which is pictured, the Senate Chamber in which that Treaty of Paris which ended the war was signed on the 14th of January 1784 in Annapolis, and the picture of the Senate Chamber is on the wall in the rotunda.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are reciting some degree of history. It is important that we learn from history. It is important we not forget history so that we are not condemned to live the worst parts of history. The historic trails are important assets for our country and for our generations yet to come.

The eloquence of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) in reciting that song that, yes, brought a smile to my face as well, because I remember it well. I loved that song. It is a catchy tune. But as he points out, it relates a tragic event.

The history of Maryland is replete with events that surround the founding of this Nation and the establishment of the greatest democracy the world has ever known, and certainly its most long-standing democracy in the world. So I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to do so. In order to designate a historic trail, we need to research that issue. This bill will provide for that effort to be undertaken. I think it is very appropriate.

The proposed trail would provide an opportunity for citizens to learn about the British Washington-Baltimore campaign during the War of 1812 and to experience the story of how our national anthem came to be written by Francis Scott Key.

The Star Spangled Banner Trail would be the first national historic trail in the mid-Atlantic region. As currently envisioned, it could take visitors through six counties in Maryland as well as Washington, D.C. and Baltimore.

The route, which would follow the path taken by the British in the War of 1812, would begin in my district where the British landed in Calvert County Maryland and launched their campaign to destroy the Barney Flotilla and, after the Battle of Bladensburg, burn Washington, D.C.

The trail would then follow the path of the retreating American army up through Georgetown, through Montgomery County, and onto Baltimore where they ultimately defeated the British forces at Ft. McHenry.

Mr. Speaker, the War of 1812 and this campaign is a fascinating, but untold, chapter in our Nation's history. Creating this trail will provide a critical link in this turning point in our Nation's history.

I want to thank my good friend Mr. GILCHREST for sponsoring this legislation and urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Puerto Rico, who I might say does such an outstanding job and who, I hope at some point in time, will represent the 51st State. That is an aside, that is not the issue today, I understand that, but this bill is about freedom, this bill is about stars in the Star-Spangled Banner, and perhaps we will add one for the representative from Puerto Rico in the near future.

I thank also my friend, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for his leadership in getting this bill to the floor. The gentleman is a very fine Member of this House and his attention to details large and small has been appreciated by this body, and I appreciate his leadership in bringing this to the floor.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), and I wish to tell the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that I appreciate his comments very much.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for yielding me this time and for all the leadership he has shown not only in this legislation but in other legislation that has enhanced the American people.

I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), for his work in bringing this bill to the floor, and others also.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to lend my support to H.R. 791, the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail Study Act of 1999, and I certainly want to commend my very good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), who introduced this and who just gave a very moving explanation of the bill and all of its implications.

I am honored, along with my colleagues, to be a cosponsor of this legislation. It will ultimately lead to the creation of a trail to help preserve and honor significant historic sites associated with the War of 1812, America's second war of independence.

Trails provide our Nation with many benefits. They offer opportunities to experience solitude or to socialize with families and friends. Natural trail corridors preserve vegetation and wildlife. Bicycles and pedestrians commute on trails, and that decreases road congestion and air pollution.

Americans are seeking trail opportunities as never before to participate in a wide range of recreational activities, from hiking and bicycling, to horseback riding and backpacking, trails across our country are used by all types of people in settings ranging from urban, suburban, rural and wilderness.

In the early days of our Nation before railroads and highways and rail were constructed, people traveled on foot, on horseback, or by wagon. Some of these trails remain in existence today as reminders of our rich history. For example, the Oregon Trail, the Santa Fe Trail, the Trail of Tears. They all exist as chapters in our Nation's heritage.

In the early 20th Century, trails became a way to gain access to spectacular natural beauty. The first interstate recreational trail was conceived in 1921 as a national preserve parallel to the East Coast, and we now know that trail as the Appalachian Trail.

H.R. 791 simply authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a

study of the British invasion route and the line of American defenses occurring in Maryland and Washington during the War of 1812 for potential addition to the national trail system.

□ 1500

While the War of 1812 and the British invasion during the conflict is a defining period in the history of our Nation, it is an often neglected period of our national heritage. It is my hope that this legislation will help to reorganize and honor the important battles during the summer of 1814 which helped to shape our Nation.

The War of 1812 remains the only time in which the United States of America has been invaded by a foreign power. In August of 1814, a British expedition in the Chesapeake Bay won a victory at Bladensburg, Maryland, and subsequently took Washington, burning the Capitol and the White House. The British, however, were halted at Ft. McHenry in Baltimore on September 14th under the ''Rockets' Red Glare.''

Currently, just down the National Mall from the Capitol at the National Museum of American History, technicians, historians and textile experts are working to preserve the actual Star-Spangled Banner which flew over Ft. McHenry. There are about 30 sites along the proposed Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail, both famous and forgotten, which marks some of the most historically significant events of the War of 1812.

I am proud to represent a place called Brookeville, Maryland, a tiny town which played a huge role during the War of 1812. Under H.R. 791, this town is to be included on the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail study.

Brookeville, only 18 miles from Washington, served as our Nation's capital for a brief period in August of 1814, when President James Madison fled the White House to escape the British invasion.

The home of Postmaster Caleb Bentley and his wife, Henrietta, served as a refuge for President Madison and several members of his Cabinet. Mrs. Bentley, a Quaker, said, ''It is against our principles to have anything to do with war, but we receive all and we relieve all who come to us.''

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 791, to honor our Nation's history and recognize the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail and the critical events of the War of 1812.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank my friend, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), for yielding me this time and for his help in marshalling this bill through the committee.

I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), for his work on this issue. This is an important bill. I want to compliment the speed in which this matter was handled in the committee.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and I filed this legislation on February 23, and we were later joined by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) in moving this bill to, we hope, the establishment of this trail.

I also want to acknowledge the hard work of the Senate sponsor, Senator SARBANES, who is marshalling this bill in the other body. We are working together. I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) bringing this up to our constituents.

I represent a district that is rich in history in Baltimore, and I want to thank the historians in my community who have been working with us on this trail. I have the honor of representing the district that includes Ft. McHenry and, of course, the great history that was accomplished in that particular spot. I want to thank the people from Ft. McHenry for their help in bringing us to this motion that we can now act on, H.R. 791, the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail Study Act of 1999.

I think it is highly appropriate that on the eve of the last July 4 celebration before we start the new century this body is considering a bill that would recognize the sacrifices and contributions of American patriots from the previous one. This legislation would authorize a study to designate the route of the War of 1812 British invasion of Maryland and Washington, D.C., as well as the route of the American defense, a National Historic Trail.

Mr. Chairman, we have done this on many occasions, established historic trails in our country. We have done it for the Appalacian Trail, the Continental Divide, the National Scenic Trail, the Florida National Scenic Trail, and many, many others. I think it is altogether fitting and appropriate, in the interest of our Nation, that we do likewise for the War of 1812.

This War of 1812 was important for many reasons in the history of this Nation, and my colleagues have already commented on many of the important aspects of this particular battle. One that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), mentioned is it the only time in the history of our Nation that we were invaded by a foreign power.

Of course, we successfully were able to defend ourselves. But for a good part of this particular war, it was uncertain as to whether we were going to be able to defend our Nation. It was clearly our second war of independence, and it bode well for the future of this Nation in developing a defense that has been able to protect our citizens against all foreign tyrants.

The story of the War of 1812 goes beyond just stopping the British from invading our young Nation. But the heroics of many of our citizens at many different battles along the way will go down as part of the heritage of our Nation.

We hope that this trail will be able to allow people in our country to better appreciate what our patriots have done during the history of our Nation. Whether it was at Bladensburg, where we were not successful, or North Point, where we were successful, or Ft. McHenry, where we were successful, heroism was the order of the day.

Of course, we are all very proud of Francis Scott Key, a young attorney who took upon a mission of mercy to have released a young doctor that was being held by the British. The doctor had helped young British soldiers, and Francis Scott Key was able to implore the British to release this particular soldier from captivity. But, as was Francis Scott Key's luck, he was on a British boat at the time that they were ready to invade Baltimore and Ft. McHenry, so he was required to stay on the ship during the battle of Ft. McHenry. He was so inspired by what he saw that he wrote the poem that has become our national anthem.

So there is a great deal to be learned from the War of 1812. There is a lot that we all can learn from it. I applaud the committee for setting in motion the way that we will be able to establish an historic trail that will allow our citizens a better understanding of the history of this Nation and what makes this Nation so great, the people who are willing to give of their lives to protect the freedom that we all enjoy today. This is a fitting monument to their work, and I applaud this House for taking it up today.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time. I will not take the entire minute, but I do want to say just two quick things.

My compliments and gratitude to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for their effort in moving this legislation through and for taking the time to come down to the House floor this afternoon and saying the words that they have spoken. It is greatly appreciated.

I also want to make a comment about our counterparts on the Senate side, and I know we are not supposed to mention the senators, but the effort they are making on that side to move this legislation through there, as well.

The last comment I would like to make is that I would invite my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), that when the trail is finally done that the four of us stand at Ft. McHenry

and sing for our constituents the Star-Spangled Banner.

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

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I would welcome my colleague into the Third Congressional District of Maryland to participate. We do have, of course, Flag Day. We invite all Americans to join us in a pause for the pledge to the flag and our national anthem.

Let me assure my colleague that I checked with the Parliamentarian and we can mention the names of senators if they are sponsors of a comparable bill in the other body. So it was within the rules of the House to mention our senators.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his kind invitation. I think, rather than singing it, he would probably prefer to have me say it if he heard me sing before. He might play the piano, too.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the gentlewoman has a wonderful voice. I know the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has a wonderful voice, and I know the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has a wonderful voice. So we will work it out.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me thank all those who have participated in the very inspiration and interesting speeches we heard.

I look forward to the four of my colleagues singing the Star-Spangled Banner. And in the previous bill we just passed, I would assume the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) will then join and sing the theme song from Route 66, as long as we are going that way.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as having been read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 791

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 ''Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail Study Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the British invasion of Maryland and Washington, District of Columbia, during the War of 1812 marks a defining period in the history of our Nation, the only occasion on which the United States of America has been invaded by a foreign power;

(2) the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail traces the arrival of the British fleet in the Patuxent River in Calvert County and St. Mary's County, Maryland, the landing of British forces at Benedict, the sinking of the Chesapeake Flotilla at Pig Point in Prince George's County and Anne Arundel County, Maryland, the American defeat at the Battle of Bladensburg, the siege of the Nation's Capital, Washington, District of Columbia (including the burning of the United States Capitol and the White House), the British naval diversions in the upper Chesapeake Bay leading to the Battle of Caulk's Field in Kent County, Maryland, the route of the American troops from Washington through Georgetown, the Maryland Counties of Montgomery, Howard, and Baltimore, and the city of Baltimore, Maryland, to the Battle of North Point, and the ultimate victory of the Americans at Fort McHenry on September 14, 1814, where a distinguished Maryland lawyer and poet, Francis Scott Key, wrote the words that captured the essence of our national struggle for independence, words that now serve as our national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner; and

(3) the designation of this route as a national historic trail—

(A) would serve as a reminder of the importance of the concept of liberty to all who experience the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail; and

(B) would give long overdue recognition to the patriots whose determination to stand firm against enemy invasion and bombardment preserved this liberty for future generations of Americans.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF TRAIL FOR STUDY.

Section 5(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (36) (as added by section 3 of the El Camino Real Para Los Texas Study Act of 1993 (107 Stat. 1497)) as paragraph (37) and in subparagraph (C) by striking ''detemine'' and inserting ''determine'';

(2) by designating the paragraphs relating to the Old Spanish Trail and the Great Western Scenic Trail as paragraphs (38) and (39), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(40) STAR-SPANGLED BANNER NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail, tracing the War of 1812 route from the arrival of the British fleet in the Patuxent River in Calvert County and St. Mary's County, Maryland, the landing of the British forces at Benedict, the sinking of the Chesapeake Flotilla at Pig Point, the American defeat at the Battle of Bladensburg, the siege of the Nation's Capital, Washington, District of Columbia (including the burning of the United States Capitol and the White House), the British naval diversions in the upper Chesapeake Bay leading to the Battle of Caulk's Field in Kent County, Maryland, the route of the American troops from Washington through Georgetown, the Maryland Counties of Montgomery, Howard, and Baltimore, and the city of Baltimore, Maryland, to the Battle of North Point, and the ultimate victory of the Americans at Fort McHenry on September 14, 1814.

''(B) AFFECTED AREAS.—The trail crosses 8 counties within the boundaries of the State of Maryland, the city of Baltimore, Maryland, and Washington, District of Columbia.

''(C) COORDINATION WITH OTHER CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED ACTIVITIES.—The study under this paragraph shall be undertaken in coordination with the study authorized under section 603 of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5 note; 110 Stat. 4172) and the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network authorized under the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 112 Stat. 2961). Such coordination shall extend to any research needed to complete the studies and any findings and implementation actions that result from the studies and shall use available resources to the greatest extent possible to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

''(D) DEADLINE FOR STUDY.—Not later that 2 years after funds are made available for the study under this paragraph, the study shall be completed and transmitted with final recommendations to the Committee on Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate.''.

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

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

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) having resumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 791) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route of the War of 1812 British invasion of Maryland and Washington, District of Columbia, and the route of the American defense, for study for potential addition to the National Trails System, pursuant to House Resolution 232, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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. HANSEN. 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. 66 and H.R. 791, the two bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE TO HAVE UNTIL FRIDAY, JULY 9, 1999 TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1995, TEACHER EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce may have until 3 p.m. on Friday, July 9, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 1995, the Teacher Empowerment Act, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

WORLD WAR VETERANS PARK AT MILLER FIELD GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to House Resolution 231 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. 592.

□ 1514

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. 592) to designate Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as ''World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills'', with Mr. BONILLA 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 Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

□ 1515

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

I rise in support of H.R. 592 introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA). H.R. 592 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate a portion of Gateway National Recreation Area in New York as World War Veterans Park at Miller Field. H.R. 592 would change the name of this park to recognize and honor the veterans of our world wars who fought to protect and defend democracy and freedom.

During markup of this bill, we accommodated concerns by the administration. This bill is now supported by the National Park Service and the minority. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 592.

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of H.R. 592.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 592 as introduced would have amended the act designating the Gateway National Recreation Area in New York City to change the name of Great Kills Park to World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills.

The National Park Service testified at the hearing of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands on May 11 that it opposed this name change because there is no known connection between Great Kills Park and World War II activities or historical figures, nor do veteran groups have any known connection with the area. It was also noted that NPS already administers several entire national park units that are historically tied to World War II veterans.

However, we learned at the hearing that there is general agreement to provide some sort of recognition to veterans at a more suitable location, known as Miller Field, within the Gateway National Recreation Area.

While the NPS appears to have administrative authority to make such a change, the Committee on Resources adopted an amendment, drafted by the NPS, to designate the location as World War Veterans Park at Miller Field. Based on the representations made to us by the NPS, this change appears to be in keeping with NPS policies and as such we support the bill as amended.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), the sponsor of this legislation.

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 592 is a simple bill. If passed, it would rename a portion of the Staten Island Unit of the Gateway National Recreation Area as World War Veterans Park at Miller Field. The purpose of this bill is simply to honor the brave men who served in World War I and World War II. Staten Island has a long and proud tradition of honoring our veterans, and this bill merely adds to that tradition.

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) of the Committee on Resources and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands for their assistance in moving this bill through the committee process, and, on my staff, Travers Garvin, for really carrying the load.

Originally, as the ranking member indicated, H.R. 592 was intended to rename the Great Kills portion of the Gateway National Recreation Area. H.R. 592 would have renamed that park World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills. The National Park Service was concerned that the park being renamed should have a historical connection to the new name. Nevertheless in response to those concerns, we agreed to a compromise. H.R. 592 will now rename another portion of the Gateway National Recreation Area, known as Miller Field.

Miller Field was originally named after a World War I aviator and was used as a military airstrip during World War II. In order to recognize veterans from both World War I and World War II, the bill seeks to rename the park World War Veterans Park at Miller Field. This change satisfies the National Park Service concerns and, more importantly, still recognizes veterans from Staten Island, Brooklyn and our Nation. I have spoken with veterans who had supported the original bill and they have agreed to the change.

I believe strongly that without our veterans' dedication and sacrifice, we would not have the freedoms that we enjoy to this day. My concern is that as time goes by, perhaps the memories, particularly those in the World War I and World War II generation, may fade. The renaming of this park will stand as a timeless reminder of the heroism of the brave men and women who served our Nation. It is my wish that for generations to come, the thousands of people who use this park will stop for a moment and remember the heroism of these men and women.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that enactment of H.R. 592 will have no significant impact on the Federal budget. It is simple, again noncontroversial and bipartisan. The bill has 13 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle and all parts of the country. H.R. 592 is legislation that takes pride in America. Because of this, I expect it will be an easy vote for. I think it would be especially appropriate to pass this bill for our veterans as we head into the Fourth of July weekend.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman from New York's legislation to honor veterans of World War I and World War II by renaming Miller's Field in honor of our veterans. As the only New York member on the Committee on Resources, I was happy to support this legislation in committee. I believe that this park will not only honor veterans in the New York-New Jersey area but veterans throughout our country.

Recently, I had the honor to join the French Consul General in New York to present the French Medal of Honor to a World War I veteran who lives in Flushing, New York. Tragically this

gentleman is one of only a few veterans of the World War I era who are still with us today. Men and women who served in World War II are rapidly passing away as well. This park will help honor their deeds and their fight for freedom which brought an end to tyranny and injustice, not once but twice in this century.

I am proud to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) in support of this proposal to honor our veterans. As the largest metropolitan area in the United States with one of the largest concentrations of veterans, I can think of no better place to honor the memories of these men and women who fought for freedom and to remind future generations of the valor and heroism of our American soldiers.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY). I know he was a great help at the committee in steering it through. We have 56,000 veterans in the 13th Congressional District. Again I can only hope and pray that we can do all we can to recognize their efforts. This bill would go a long way. I encourage its strong support.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY).

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to commend both the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and all of those who are supporting this legislation. It is appropriate that we take this up at this particular time as we approach another celebration of our Independence Day and remember to keep our priorities straight. Had it not been for the men and women who have worn the uniform of the United States military through the years, we would not have the privilege of going around bragging about how we live in the freest and most open democracy on the face of the earth. Freedom is not free. We paid a tremendous price for it. Not a day goes by that I do not remember all of those who, like my brother Bill, made the supreme sacrifice and all of the many veterans who served our country and then came back home and rendered such outstanding service in our communities and raised wonderful families to carry on their great traditions.

I enthusiastically support this legislation. I thank the sponsors. I urge my colleagues to approve it unanimously.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 592

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF PORTION OF GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AS WORLD WAR VETERANS PARK AT MILLER FIELD.

Section 3(b) of Public Law 92–592 (16 U.S.C. 460cc–2(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)''; and

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

''(2) The portion of the Staten Island Unit of the recreation area known as Miller Field is hereby designated as 'World War Veterans Park at Miller Field'. Any reference to such Miller Field in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to 'World War Veterans Park at Miller Field'.''.

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

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

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 592) to redesignate Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as ''World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills'', pursuant to House Resolution 231, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate a portion of Gateway National Recreation Area as 'World War Veterans Park at Miller Field'.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 592, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

RURAL NEVADA AGAIN UNDER SIEGE BY U.S. FOREST SERVICE

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, once again, the absolute greed of the Federal bureaucracy is pushing aside the common sense of local people on an issue in my district.

I would like to share with my colleagues what can only be termed as an insensitive approach to a very personal and private situation of the Federal Agency Forest Service in my home State of Nevada.

In its seemingly endless battle over public lands in rural Nevada, once again we are under siege by the Forest Service. But it is not commercial real estate or high market value land interests that we are after, it is about a mere two-acre cemetery.

The Forest Service wants to sell the small town of Jarbidge, Nevada, two acres to buy its own cemetery where the parents and grandparents of this small rural town have been laid to rest since the beginning of this century.

The Federal Government already owns nearly 90,000 square miles of Nevada's lands. Nevadans are not asking for much, a mere two acres to be exact, a two-acre cemetery already occupied for nearly a century by parents and grandparents of many Nevadans.

On behalf of the families of Jarbidge, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1231 to convey these two acres out of the millions they own.

WHERE I STAND—MIKE O'CALLAGHAN: USFS PICKS NEW FIGHT

(Mike O'Callaghan is the Las Vegas Sun executive editor)

About the time it appears there is some justice and common sense ruling northeastern Nevada, along comes another goofy act.

A couple of weeks ago this column praised the Nevada Supreme Court for settling a dispute started three years ago by a few Elko County residents who saw a conspiracy under every rock in that huge area. After using and abusing the power of a local grand jury the district judge was slapped and four state employees were given back their lives by the Supreme Court.

That whole mess was started by a businessman who believed the state and federal conservation agencies were conspiring to destroy the county when acting to protect the environment. He wrote a letter to the county commissioners calling for a grand jury because the conservation agencies, especially the Nevada Division of Wildlife and the U.S. Forest Service, and environmental groups were ruining almost everything held dear by the people of that area. Those suffering economically, according to the writer, were the ranching, mining, and business communities and all of the taxpayers.

The grand jury was called and it acted as wild as the charges made in the letter. While all of this was going on, the U.S. Forest Service sat on its hands and took no action to replace a road damaged by a flood in 1995. This resulted in the county going to fix the road running alongside the West Fork of the Jarbidge River. Immediately another federal agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, came unglued because it said the roadwork was hurting the bull trout habitat. Eventually this mess was calmed down and on the surface appears straightened out because the state also had a role to play.

So now everything is hunky-dory between the federal conservation agencies and Elko County? Not really. There's the small issue over cemetery land at Jarbidge. Yes, a very small two acres that Rep. Jim Gibbons wants turned over to the county. Here are Gibbon's words before a subcommittee in Washington last week:

''As you may know Jarbidge is a small, rural community in Elko County, Nevada. Known historically for its contribution to Nevada's mining industry, this community is surrounded by national forest lands and the Jarbidge Wilderness Area.

''Within this area is a small cemetery, under administration of the Forest Service, where generations of residents of this historic community have been laid to rest.

''The earliest tombstones are dated in the very early 1900s, and some members of the Jarbidge community claim that this land has been used as a cemetery long before its designation as Forest Service land.

''Since 1915 the Jarbidge Cemetery has been operated under a permit to Elko County by a Special Use authorization which runs periodically for 10 and occasionally 20 years.

''In an effort to remove the uncertainty about the continued existence of this cemetery and to resolve the operational responsibility, the residents of Jarbidge have long expressed an interest in having two acres, containing the cemetery, conveyed to the county so they might have a permanent, private cemetery.

''Madame Chairman, that is why I have introduced HR 1231, a bill that would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey approximately two acres of National Forest lands to Elko County, Nevada, or continued use as a cemetery.''

No problem for this small request coming from a state with thousands of square miles controlled by the federal government. Guess again. USFS Deputy Chief Ron Stewart testified against HR 1231 because his agency expects to be paid fair market price of those two acres. His testimony doesn't describe how you put a price on a cemetery that's just a bit less than 100 years old. What it does reveal is a petty attitude by a large federal agency that continues to result in even its rational decisions being questioned by the people in and around little Jarbidge.

Gibbons could hardly believe Forest Service officials were making the demand but it they were, he added, they ''should hang their heads. These people are asking for a cemetery, not for land to build commercial or residential enterprises. . . . ''

Because of the actions of Elko's runaway grand jury I began to wonder what was in the water the jurors were drinking. This most recent action by the Forest Service in Washington has convinced me that its decision makers are drinking straight from the polluted Potomac River.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

(Mr. LIPINSKI 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 gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO MODERNIZE AND STRENGTHEN MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to start this afternoon by talking about the President's plan to modernize and strengthen Medicare for the next century which he announced at a press conference that was held at the White House yesterday; and let me say, Mr. Speaker, if I can, that I strongly welcome this proposal. I think it is a very good proposal and specifically with regard to the new prescription drug benefit, the effort to eliminate copayments and deductibles for preventive care, the fact that it also includes the Medicare buy-in for the near elderly, those who just are below the age of 65, and the fact that by using 15 percent of the projected surplus that Medicare is fully funded for a much longer period of time than would be the case under current conditions. All these things I think are a strong indication that this is a very good proposal which certainly the Democrats support and which I am hopeful that the Republicans and the Republican leadership will support as well so that we can get a bill out of committee to the floor and passed in this Congress.

Let me just talk a little bit about some of the most important aspects of this Medicare proposal in my opinion. I think probably the most important aspect is the new voluntary Medicare Part B prescription drug benefit that is affordable and is available to all beneficiaries.

We all know that when you talk about Medicare the biggest gap, if you will, that exists in the Medicare program now is the lack of a prescription drug benefit. When Medicare was started under President Johnson as a Democratic initiative back in the 1960s, over 30 years ago now, prescription drugs were not that much a part of the average senior citizen's budget. Medicine then was not so much emphasizing preventive care, particularly prescription drugs; and, frankly, a lot of the prescriptions that we have now had not even been invented. So it was not an important issue. It was not included in the Medicare package at the time.

But as time went on over the last 30 years the lack of a prescription drug benefit has been a major gap causing senior citizens to expend a lot of money out of pocket, in some cases several thousand dollars a year. And so the President's response in trying to include a modest prescription drug benefit is commendable, it is fully paid for, and I think it will go far towards helping senior citizens and the disabled under Medicare to deal with this problem.

I just wanted, if I could, to outline some of the high points of this. There is no deductible. And, well, basically the way it applies is that you contribute initially $24 a month as the premium that you pay for this new Part B; and Medicare, once you participate, pays half of your drug costs from the first prescription filled each year up to

$2,000 a year when the program begins. And eventually that will be phased in to be up to $5,000 a year in drug costs. And, of course, the premium will go up as well and could, when fully phased in by 2008, be as much as $44 per month.

But what it would mean is that, when the program starts, is that if you pay $24 a month and you have as much as $2,000 in prescription drug costs for the year, half that will be paid by Medicare. And there is no deductible, there is no copay, so to speak, so that starts with the first prescription, that half of it is paid for by Medicare.

The other thing that is important is that this program, if you participate in this new Part B benefit, will insure the beneficiaries a discount similar to that offered by many employer-sponsored plans, which is estimated to be, on average, over 10 percent. So even if you go above the $2,000 per year, you are still benefiting in the discount, and of course the discount is your floor. So you are going to get a discounted price before you are even starting to pay for the prescription drugs.

The cost I mentioned initially is $24 per month beginning in 2002 when the program is set to begin. I would also point out that for those beneficiaries, for those Medicare recipients who are below a certain income level, there would be no premium. Beneficiaries with incomes below 135 percent of poverty, and that is $11,000 for a single individual or $17,000 for a couple, would not pay premiums or cost sharing. Those with incomes between 135 and 150 percent of poverty would receive premium assistance as well. So in many ways this is modeled after the so-called QMB program with Part B of Medicare where, if you are below a certain income, you do not pay the premium at all, and then there is assistance for those a little bit above that level to pay part of the premium.

Finally, I wanted to mention with regard to the prescription drug benefit that it would provide financial incentives for employers to retain their retiree health coverage if they provide a prescription drug benefit to retirees that was at least equivalent to the new Medicare outpatient drug benefit. This would save money for the program. So we would encourage those who already provide or have a prescription drug benefit as part of their pension or retirement health benefits, that would be incentives for employers to keep that benefit.

Now some may say, ''Well, how many Medicare recipients would actually benefit from this prescription drug program and would see fit to opt for it because it is voluntary?'' And we estimate, the President estimates, that most Medicare beneficiaries will choose the drug option because of its attractiveness and affordability. Older and disabled Americans rely so heavily on medications that about 31 million beneficiaries would benefit from this coverage every year. So there are about 31 million, which is the majority of Medicare recipients, who would find that if they pay this premium per month, or if they were eligible to not have to pay the premium, that they would end up saving money and opt for the Part B prescription drug benefit.

Now let me talk a little more about some of the other major aspects of this, the President's Medicare proposal, that I think are worthy of note. One of the things that is changing, and I think for the good with regard to health care, and that is not only for seniors and the disabled, for everyone, is the renewed emphasis on prevention. A few years ago, preventive medicine was not really in vogue. Some people did it, some people did not, but it was not thought about a great deal. But increasingly we know that if people take preventive measures, and prescription drugs are really part of that, I mean then they avoid hospitalization, they avoid nursing home care, they avoid expensive treatment.

Well, the President, when he unveiled his Medicare expansion and modernization proposal yesterday at the White House, said that it would include the elimination of all cost sharing for preventive benefits in Medicare, and that means basically that there would be no copayments and deductibles for preventive services covered by Medicare. And just to give you examples, that would include cancer screening, bone mass measurements, pelvic exams, prostate cancer screening, diabetes self-management benefits, mammograms. Anything that is preventive we would eliminate the deductible and the copayment.

I think that is significant, not maybe as significant as the drug benefit, but kind of that goes along with it, because what it means is we do not want to discourage people because they have to shell out a certain amount of money into not taking preventive measures, and the reason makes sense, not only for them individually, but also because it saves the government money because, if they do these types of screenings, maybe they avoid hospitalization and expensive operations that Medicare would have to pay down the road.

So I think it makes a lot of sense, and let me just mention two other things. One is the Medicare buying proposal. This is something that is not new. The President proposed it in his State of the Union address, but he is reiterating it once again, and it will be part of this legislation that is sent up to Congress. And that says that Americans between the ages of 62 to 65 would be able to buy into the Medicare program for approximately $300 per month if they agree to pay a small risk adjustment payment once they become eligible for the traditional Medicare at 65. So people in those years would be able to buy into Medicare. Displaced workers between 55 and 62 who had involuntarily lost their jobs and insurance would buy in at a slightly higher premium, about $400 a month, and retirees over age 55 who had been promised health care in the retirement years would be provided access to COBRA continuation coverage if their old firm reneged on their commitment. So, again, we are reiterating this buying proposal for the near elderly, very important because so many of those people do not have health insurance.

And last thing, and then I would like to yield to one of my colleagues, is that the President reiterated once again that he will dedicate 15 percent of this growing surplus over 15 years to Medicare, and that will ensure the life of the Medicare trust fund until at least 2027. So we are extending the life of the Medicare trust fund. It means that Medicare remains solvent for almost another 30 years, terribly significant.

So many senior citizens come up to me and say that they are worried about, as my colleagues know, whether Medicare is going to be there, and of course younger people as well. It is probably more of a problem for younger people than it is for senior citizens right now. But this proposal which the President put forward would keep Medicare intact and fully paid for until the year 2027.

So I think it is a great idea. I am sure going to see a lot more Democrats coming up and saying that they support it, and hopefully we will get support from the Republican leadership as well.

Madam Speaker, I wanted to go into some more details about the President's Medicare plan because I think that it is so important. Many people, many Members of Congress, I am sure, hear from their constituents about the problems that their constituents have because of gaps in Medicare, particularly with regard to the prescription drug benefit. But the bottom line is that the President's plan is seeking to modernize and strengthen Medicare in a lot of different ways, as my colleagues know. And if I could just highlight some of the other things that were mentioned yesterday by the President when he had the press conference at the White House?

□ 1545

A lot of the Medicare modernization program that he has put forward seeks to modernize and strengthen Medicare by making it more competitive and efficient.

I know that those are words that are often thrown out around here and people mention that all the time, but I think that it is important to kind of stress some of the efforts that the President is putting forth that would also make the Medicare program more competitive and efficient, if I could at this time.

One of the things that he stressed was giving traditional Medicare new private sector purchasing and quality improvement tools. The proposal would make the traditional fee-for-service program more competitive through the

use of market-oriented purchasing and quality improvement tools to improve care and constrain costs. It would provide new or broader authority for competitive pricing, incentives for beneficiaries to use physicians who provide high quality care at reasonable costs and coordinating care for beneficiaries with chronic illnesses and other best practice private sector purchasing mechanisms.

Essentially, what he is trying to do is to make Medicare more competitive, more efficient, by bringing in some private sector tools. That is estimated to save about $25 billion over 10 years.

The second area where this competitiveness comes into play is by extending competition to Medicare managed care plans by establishing a competitive defined benefit while maintaining a viable traditional program. The competitive defined benefit proposal would, for the first time, inject true price competition amongst managed care plans in Medicare. Plans would be paid for covering Medicare's defined benefits, including a new subsidized drug benefit which we mentioned, and would compete by offering lower cost and higher quality.

Price competition would make it easier for beneficiaries to make informed choices about their plan options and would, over time, save money for both the beneficiaries and the program.

The competitive defined benefit would do so by providing beneficiaries with 75 cents of every dollar of savings that result from choosing lower cost plans. Beneficiaries opting to stay in the traditional fee-for-service program would be able to do so without an increase in premiums. There is a savings from that of $8 billion over 10 years starting in the year 2003.

Then there are two more points, if I could, and then I would yield to some of my colleagues who I see are joining me on the floor to discuss this.

The third point is that the President's proposal constrains outyear program growth but more moderately than the balanced budget amendment which we adopted in 1997. To ensure that program growth does not significantly increase over most of the Medicare provisions of the Balanced Budget Act, which expire in 2003, the proposal includes outyear policies that protect against a return to unsustainable growth rates but are more modest than those included in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

I do not want to keep going into all of the details of this, but I think that the President again should be commended for trying to bring a more competitive and efficient approach into the Medicare program. And that is one of the reasons that we are able to save some money.

So, in essence, what he is doing here is bringing a significant amount of the surplus, 15 percent, into the Medicare program to make sure that the program is solvent, to expand the benefits to include the drug benefit, but at the same time trying to make the program more competitive and efficient and saving money.

That would be also brought back into the program for these extra benefits like prescription drugs, as well as to keep the program solvent until the year 2027.

Obviously this is the type of thing that is very important, and I think only helps in the overall effort to strengthen and modernize the Medicare program.

It is interesting because many of us on the Democratic side have been talking about the need to include a prescription drug benefit, and our effort, and I see my colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is here, actually goes back to, I think it was sometime in May, around Mother's Day, when there was a report put out by the Older Women's League, OWL, and I had come to the floor at that time to specifically point out how the gaps in the Medicare program have a particularly negative impact on older women, which the OWL report highlighted.

Most of what was discussed was the problem in terms of out-of-pocket costs for prescription drugs.

The other thing that the OWL report pointed out is that many of the lowest income senior citizens again are women and those are the very women who would benefit most from this prescription drug benefit and would not have to pay at all because they fall below the poverty level and would not even have to pay the $24 monthly premium.

So all in all, this is a great program.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine, who came down here to join me and discuss this.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good day. The President's proposal to reform Medicare is a giant step forward to preserve, protect and strengthen a program that is one of the best things that we do, that the Federal Government does, for senior citizens.

Together, Medicare and Social Security keep 40 to 50 percent of our seniors out of poverty and yet these programs both face some challenges. In the case of Social Security, the challenge is largely demographic, simply more people are growing older. And as the baby boom generation retires, there will be extra pressure on the program.

Medicare has a demographic problem but also a cost problem and a quality problem.

I thought what I would do today is talk a little bit about the prescription drug benefit that is contained in the President's proposal and then talk a little bit about some other aspects of the proposal that I think are very important.

Last year, I asked for a study in my district on the cost of prescription drugs to the elderly, and that study was done by the Democratic staff of the Committee on Government Reform, and they found that, on average, seniors are paying twice as much for their prescription medications as the drug companies' best customers, and the best customers are hospitals, HMOs, and the Federal Government through the purchases it makes for veterans or through medicaid.

As a consequence, I introduced last year and again this year what is now H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act. Now, this legislation would allow pharmacies to buy drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the best price given to the Federal Government. We think it would reduce prescription drug prices for seniors by 40 percent, 40 percent, at virtually no cost to the Federal Government.

Now, when I introduced this legislation, I thought we would have some support on the Republican side of the aisle, because I thought, naively, that a bill which provided a substantial discount on prescription drugs to seniors, at virtually no cost to the Federal Government, with no new bureaucracy, would have broad bipartisan support, but that has not happened.

I am very pleased that in the President's proposal this concept, though not the bill, is included. The concept is included in the President's proposal by the suggestion that Medicare would contract with pharmacy benefit managers and that those pharmacy benefit managers would get at least a 10 percent discount from the manufacturers for prescription drugs.

I think we could do better. I think we could be more aggressive, but it is really a step in the right direction.

The President's prescription drug benefit is a modest step, but again the right sort of step. What he is proposing is this: For an initial premium of $24, rising to $44 by 2009, Medicare beneficiaries could sign up for a prescription drug benefit that would pay them initially $1,000 maximum toward their prescription drug costs, one half of their total costs, covered costs, and that benefit would rise to $2,500 by the year 2009.

So for those seniors who have $2,000 in prescription drug costs right now or $5,000 in prescription drug costs by the year 2009, the government would basically pay one half of all their costs in return for a modest premium. That is a good plan and a real step forward.

What is interesting is the reaction of the Republicans to these various proposals. On the one hand, the Republican reaction to the President's plan has been, well, two-thirds of seniors have coverage for their prescription drugs; we do not need this plan. But the two-thirds is not quite right.

Thirty-seven percent of all seniors have no coverage at all for their prescription medications. That percentage in rural areas is 50 percent. Fifty percent of seniors in rural areas have no coverage whatsoever.

Another significant percentage have inadequate coverage. So at the very least, we are talking about half the seniors on Medicare and we cannot just dismiss them out of hand and say because it is only half the seniors on Medicare we should therefore forget about them. These seniors have very serious problems paying for their food and for their medication.

A couple of stories. I have seniors in my district who have written me, women who have written me and said, I do not want my husband to know, but I am not taking my prescription medication because my husband is sicker than I am, and we cannot both afford our medications.

It should not be that way in this country, not when all of those people are already on a Federal health care plan called Medicare.

The Republican reaction to our bill, which has virtually no cost to the Federal Government, is, oh, dear, it may involve price controls, which it does not; pharmaceutical companies may not be as willing to do research and development. I do not believe that for a moment.

They have not signed on to a bill with virtually no cost to the Federal Government, and when it comes to the President's plan they say it costs too much.

What is uniform here is a refusal to recognize the seriousness of the problem that seniors are having paying for their prescription medications and their food and their rent or whatever, an unwillingness to come to grips with it. The President's plan comes to grips with this problem. He is basically saying, if we were inventing Medicare today, no one, no one, would leave out a prescription drug benefit.

So the question in this time of unprecedented economic growth, with budget projections that are better than any this country has seen in the last 30 or 40 or 50 years, the question is, cannot we take care of our seniors? I really believe that we can.

There is another piece of the proposal that I wanted to mention. I think this is an important piece of the proposal. What the President is saying is we need a competitive defined benefit plan. It builds on the security and the stability that we have in Medicare today.

Now, what do I mean by that? Well, today the benefits that people have under Medicare remain the same, from year to year to year, unless Congress acts to change them. There is stability. There is predictability. There is continuity in that benefit structure. But if private insurance companies come into Medicare, take over Medicare, what we will find is the benefits will start changing; prescription drugs that are covered today will not be covered next year; the benefits will change; the premiums will change, and we will wind up with confusion, with lack of clarity, with instability and with lack of predictability. That is not what seniors in this country need.

Now, what the President is saying to the extent that there are managed care companies, HMOs, operating under Medicare, and that is about 14 percent of the Medicare market right now, they ought to be providing a basic, defined benefit plan which cannot be changed. Stability, continuity, predictability, that is the kind of competition we need, over price, over quality, but not over variation in benefits.

□ 1600

Private health insurance companies will also act to exclude the sickest and the poorest and to cover the healthy and the wealthy. That, again, is not what our seniors need. We want the equity of this existing Medicare system to continue under any reform proposal.

What is exciting about the President's proposal is that he has made the commitment to preserve the equity in the system, he has made the commitment to expand and improve on the benefit structure by adding a Medicare benefit, and he has also insured the solvency of Medicare out to the year 2027.

This is a remarkable achievement. We should not let this opportunity pass by. We have a chance in this country now to take the two programs that mean the most to our seniors, social security and Medicare, and use the surplus that we have, set it aside, save it, and take care of these two major commitments of the Federal government.

The message is clear, first things first. We have a commitment to our seniors, social security, and Medicare. We have the resources to make sure that the government follows through on that commitment, and we ought not to let this opportunity pass by. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. PALLONE. I just wanted to thank the gentleman from Maine. He has been the leader on this whole issue of the high cost of prescription drugs. He introduced a bill, I think he gave us the number, but I call it the Allen bill, because he is the prime sponsor. I am a cosponsor of that bill. I think it is a very important piece of legislation in terms of the effort to try to control prices of drugs, which are out of hand, particularly for senior citizens.

I am really glad that the gentleman talked about how the President's bill, even though it is different, or the President's proposal, even though it is different, tries to get at the costs. One of the things we mentioned was this whole discount that would be available, as well as the competitiveness.

The gentleman's proposal as well as this one I think kind of follow on each other in an effort to try to achieve the same goal. I just wanted to say, I wanted to yield to the gentleman from Texas, but I know a lot of people, and I have already heard that from some of the Republicans, and I am not saying all of them, because I think we are going to actually get some Republican support on this, and hopefully a lot of it. But I have heard the same thing, this does not help everyone, this only helps 50 percent of the people.

The President said yesterday, this was a modest proposal. This was not a proposal to try to cover everyone, but it is modest and it is paid for. That is the main thing.

He went out of his way in the document that was presented to us yesterday and in the discussions we have had since then to show in detail how every penny of this thing is paid for. I think that is important, because we know that everything is not endless around here and we have to pay for things.

The fact of the matter is something like 31 million seniors would benefit from this program, a majority. To me that is a strong beginning, and something that we should support. I appreciate what the gentleman said.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if I might address some queries to both gentlemen, first, if I understand the legislation of the gentleman from Maine, it does not involve any cost to the taxpayer at all. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLEN. I would agree with that, except there might be some small administrative cost, but virtually no cost.

Mr. DOGGETT. There are various ways to deal with this problem, but what the gentleman is spotlighting, those least able to pay get charged the most. I know one very commonly prescribed medication for those over 65 having to do with cholesterol, that it is 300 percent more if one is a senior paying individually than if one is in some kind of group health insurance plan, like many of my folks are there in central Texas.

So, for example, I have here in Washington today a number of teachers from our public schools. They have a better arrangement probably now through their group and health insurance to get prescriptive drugs than they would have as an individual retiree once they are on Medicare, because there is no Medicare coverage, and they are going to be charged all the market will bear when they are having to bargain for themselves individually, is that not correct?

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman has it, that is right.

Mr. DOGGETT. But that is not true for veterans, is it? We also have some veterans here today from central Texas. A veteran going through the Veterans Administration can avoid that problem to some extent, can he not?

Mr. ALLEN. To some extent. Certainly some veterans get their prescription drugs free through the Veterans Administration. It does not apply to all veterans, but it does apply to some. There are some benefits for veterans, that is true.

Mr. DOGGETT. How is it that the Veterans Administration is able to get these prescription drugs at a more reasonable price than an individual veteran not covered, or someone who is on

Medicare and not covered can get them?

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman will yield again, basically this is a question of market power. The best prices are given by the manufacturers, the pharmaceutical manufacturers, to hospitals, HMOs, or the Federal government, all of which have some negotiating power.

What my legislation does and what the President's proposal does, to an extent, is basically say, for those people who are already under a Federal health care plan, namely, Medicare, they ought to get a similar discount. That is all that we are saying with the legislation that I have introduced.

Mr. DOGGETT. So to all those major interest groups that are opposing the gentleman's legislation and saying we are going to have cost controls and we are going to threaten research and all these various straw men that they raise to oppose doing something for seniors who have to pay the most when they have the ability to pay the least, the gentleman is saying, really, he is going to let the market work, but he is going to bring a little equity in the bargaining power to the marketplace.

Then I would ask the gentleman, and I appreciate very much the gentleman's leadership on this measure, I would ask the gentleman from New Jersey about why it is, at a time when Congress has recessed early, before people have left work in Austin, Texas, and in much of the country, I think Congress recessed today again just after doing very, very little and nothing very meaningful for the American people. We were not here on Monday. There is some debate whether we will be here on Friday.

Why is it that there can be an issue as important as providing prescription drugs for those who are over 65 and addressing the concerns through a Patients' Bill of Rights of those of all ages who rely on managed care, why is it that the Congress is not out here having a full debate, where Republicans and Democrats are debating about what the best way is to solve this problem?

Mr. PALLONE. I think the answer is very simple. That is that the Republican leadership in the case of the Patients' Bill of Rights, the HMO reform, simply does not want to bring up the bill because they do not want it to pass. They know if the Patients' Bill of Rights, the HMO reform, comes up and it is considered, it will pass, so they exercise their leadership by not bringing it up.

I think the reason they do it is very simple: They are beholden to the insurance companies. They are beholden to the HMOs. They spend, the HMOs spend millions of dollars on advertising and influencing congressional races. They do not want this legislation brought to the floor because they know it will pass.

Mr. DOGGETT. At least in terms of the time available here, there is no reason why we could not have already considered the Patients' Bill of Rights. And as far as prescription drugs, whether it is the approach the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has taken, the approach that the President has recently indicated he supported, or any number of other avenues, there are other pieces of legislation introduced, the reason that those are not getting considered here on the floor has nothing to do with the Congress not having time to consider them, does it?

Mr. PALLONE. I do not think anybody can make the argument that we do not have the time. As the gentleman very well pointed out, we did not meet Monday, we met yesterday very briefly, today we adjourned at 2:30.

Mr. DOGGETT. We will have a recess next week. I doubt most people will know we are in recess. The Congress has done so little so far this year, they probably won't miss anything other than the rhetoric next week, certainly no meaningful action.

Mr. PALLONE. The gentleman did not mention, but I could add, it took almost 2 weeks in the other body, the Senate, for the Democrats to insist that the Patients' Bill of Rights be brought up. They almost had to filibuster in order to make sure that the bill was brought up.

I understand that when we come back after the recess that there is an agreement to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights in the Senate, but there were two weeks wasted because the Republican leadership would not bring it up. It remains to be seen whether they actually do when we come back.

Mr. DOGGETT. I know next week during the recess here in Washington I am going to be meeting with seniors in Austin at a pharmacy to do very much the kind of presentation I know the gentleman has already done in New Jersey, to point out for a neighborhood pharmacy in Austin, Texas, the difference in the charges that seniors without prescription drug coverage get charged and that everybody else gets charged. It is a cruel disparity.

I have one letter after another here that I expect I will have an opportunity to explore with the gentleman at another time as we try to draw attention to the failure of the Republican leadership to deal with this issue; of people saying that they have to make some really critical lifetime choices, and sometimes it is a matter of choosing food, of choosing groceries, or choosing prescriptive drugs.

I think the American people should be appalled at the failure of this Congress to come to grips with these issues. It is not a lack of time, it is a lack of leadership and a lack of interest in these kinds of pressing problems that the American people face. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman bringing this up.

When the President unveiled his plan yesterday, and we were there, that was the reason he cited why he was dealing with this prescription drug benefit, because he said that when he was first elected he was hearing a chorus from different senior groups about how they had to decide between whether they were going to eat and have proper nourishment as opposed to paying for their prescription drugs.

He vowed that he was going to make sure that something was done about it so people did not have to make that choice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Coming from Florida, where we have over 3 million senior citizens, this is a real crucial issue for us. I can tell the gentleman that no matter where I go in Florida, the major issue is Medicare and what is going to happen to the program. Really, it is not social security, it is not education, this is what on their minds, because of the cuts that exist in the program from the balanced budget amendment.

Can the gentleman tell me a little bit about the President's proposal in restoring some of those cuts in home health care?

Mr. PALLONE. I know that concerns have come up with home health care, with some of the outpatient services, and also with teaching hospitals that have been concerned about the limitations on the amount of money that they have available with research.

What the President said, and I do not have the details in front of me, was that because of the infusion of funds from the 15 percent of the surplus, which is a growing amount now that would be dedicated to the Medicare program, and because of the cost savings that he was putting in place with the new efficiency and competitive proposals that I mentioned previously, and others, that more money would be available to address some of these problems.

Yesterday he did not specifically mention which ones would receive a certain amount of money, but a lot of things the gentlewoman mentioned, including the home health care.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Nursing homes.

Mr. PALLONE. They were mentioned. My understanding is that because of the savings, as well as the money that is going to be made available in the surplus, because of the surplus, some of those concerns can be addressed.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. A couple of those things that he did mention, which is very exciting for people in Florida, and one that the gentleman has been talking about, the prescription drugs, which is so crucial for the people of Florida, I cannot tell the the gentleman how many times that I go home and this subject comes up about the cost of medicine.

People join the HMOs for various reasons. Basically, their prescriptions eat

it up in a couple of months, and then they are left having to pay this astronomical cost of medicine. So I am very excited about this portion of the President's proposal.

Another proposal that is very exciting is that when this program started in 1965, a lot of the things that we have done in medicine were not available, so the prescreening portion, that people can go in and be screened for cancer, diabetes, and other things without any cost, that preventative part, and not be penalized, that preventative part I think is so crucial.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree. I have to be honest, for the 12 years that I have been in Congress, I guess it is 11 years, the thing that always bothered me the most was how we did not provide any incentives for preventative care.

Forgetting the health aspects, which of course we do not want to forget, that is the most important thing, but just looking at it from a financial perspective, every one of the things that the gentlewoman mentioned, if that manages to catch something before it gets worse it is going to save us so much money, because down the road we would have to pay for the operation, the hospital care, the nursing home care, astronomical costs that can be saved because somebody does some kind of preventative screening or testing.

So what the President proposed makes sense. Why penalize people or discourage them from having those kinds of preventative measures? I totally agree. I think that was one of the best aspects.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. One of the things that I have decided to do, Mr. Speaker, to highlight the program, is in my town meetings I am going to bring in seniors in Jacksonville, I am going to have a coffee with them, to discuss the proposal; in Orlando I am going to bring them in during a luncheon. Because I think it is important that they not only talk with me and get the details of the proposal, but they call the other representatives in the area.

I think it is very important, particularly for Florida, with the number of elderly population that we have, and growing, that we get some relief. I think this is a way that we can go in Florida. I am hoping that all Members of the Florida delegation will support this proposal. Of course, the people can decide whether or not they think this is important.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree. One of the things, one of the reasons I think it is so important that we have these kinds of outreach programs, is my own experience in my district.

My district runs from very wealthy to very poor. A lot of the seniors who are below a certain income and eligible for what we call the QMBY program, where their Part B benefit was paid and they did not even have to put out a premium, were not even aware that that was true. They did not know that they were eligible to not have to pay the premium for the Part B doctor's bills. The same is going to be true with this program.

□ 1615

Once we put this into place, this new part D, if they are below a certain level, I think I mentioned $11,000 for a single or $17,000 for a couple, they would not even have to pay the premium. So for the group of people that are in that category, this is a Godsend in my opinion. So it is important to get out there and, as the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) says, and talk to people about it. Because a lot of people are not even aware of the benefits that are there for them now, let alone once we pass this new benefit.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I think, in the richest country in the world, it is ludicrous that seniors have to decide whether or not they are going to pay their rent, buy their medicine or buy food. I think we need to commend the President for coming forward with this recommendation.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. So I will do all I can to inform the public so that they will call Members of Congress. A lot of people think that we are working because we are meeting 5 days a week. But it is not the quantity, it is the quality of what we are doing. If we are not dealing with the issues that is important to them, then we might as well be home doing constituent case work.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly. Madam Speaker, if the gentlewoman would bear with me, I mentioned earlier OWL, which I think stands for Older Women's League. They put out this report around Mother's Day this year that we were talking about on the floor at the time to try to get some of the changes that the President has now proposed. There were just three examples. They gave some real life examples that were mentioned at that time. If I could just briefly mention them, because I think they really illustrate why this is so important.

This is a woman from Montgomery, Alabama, Clusta, I do not know if I am pronouncing it right, C-L-U-S-T-A, I guess is her first name. She is 77, widow of 15 years, lives alone. Social Security is her sole source of income. Her Medicare Part A hospital coverage is supplemented by Blue Cross/Blue Shield. She pays her Medicare Part B premium as part of the specified low income Medicare beneficiaries. So that means that she does not get it all free, but she gets some assistance. So she does not pay the whole thing.

But she goes on to talk about how valuable Medicare is, but she says it is not enough. She spends as much as $3,000 a year on her health, most of which goes for medicine. She takes 15 different medications, some twice a day. Of course, she lives in subsidized housing.

In order to be in that slim B category, she is probably making maybe, I do not know, $12,000, $13,000 a year. She is spending $3,000 of that on prescription drugs. I mean, it is ridiculous. My colleagues can see how this would benefit her.

There is this other woman, Joan, from southern Connecticut. She is 67, retired social worker, and I am going to skip a lot of this stuff. But she has an illness which she explains as too many infection fighting T cells that attack her internal organs and her nerve cells. She goes on to describe her illness, but she has a supplemental insurance policy which covers 80 percent of her medication. Otherwise, prescription drugs would cost her $3,500 annually. But this policy, which is a Medigap policy, is said to expire, and she is now looking to replace it.

Now, again, I think the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) was pointing out that there has been some suggestion, well, a lot of seniors get prescription drugs because they have Medigap, supplemental insurance that they pay, so what is the big deal? Well, the big deal is that, in many cases, they cannot afford to buy Medigap because it is getting more and more expensive. A lot of people cannot get the coverage.

In this woman's case, she knows it is going to expire. She obviously cannot continue it. I mean, she would benefit in a major way, $3,500 a year in prescription drug benefits. It is unbelievable.

Then I just want to mention one more, and this is a woman, Rhoda, from suburban Minnesota. She is 70. Her late husband and her both suffered from chronic disease. She is a breast cancer survivor. She talks about the value of Medicare.

She said that her and her husband spend closes to $300 a month on prescription drugs. They take three prescription medications apiece everyday, and her husband took two insulin shots each day as well. The couple pay out of pocket for various things.

I mean, again, I do not want to get into all the details, but there are just so many people out there that are in this category. That is why we need this program.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I just want to add one thing. With all of the advances in medicine, some of the most beneficiary advancements include our ability to detect diseases before they become life threatening. Under the President's plan, these types of screening would also be covered.

We all know that one ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. This is a perfect example of how we can use medicine advanced to make smart and cost effective changes in the way we deliver health care.

I really want to commend the President for coming forth with this recommendation, and I am hoping that we in the Congress will look very seriously

at his proposal, and that the community will get involved, and that different groups that support elderly get involved so that we can pass a bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have to say I know that we have been very disappointed with the Republican leadership on a number of health care initiatives, most importantly the Patients' Bill of Rights that they refuse to bring up, so that now we have got to actually sign this discharge petition and try to get it to the floor.

So far, there has not been a lot of criticism of the President's proposal on Medicare. I am hopeful, I am sort of crossing my fingers here and hoping that, at some point, we will see an expression of support for this.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am certainly hoping that everybody from Florida will take a real close look at this proposal because I do not think it should be a Democratic or a Republican proposal. I think this proposal should be one that benefits the people, particularly the people of Florida. I am just hoping that my colleagues will come to the table and let us work together for the good of the people of Florida and also the good of the people throughout the country. I think we can do this in a very bipartisan way.

Mr. PALLONE. I hope so. Madam Speaker, again, I just keep pointing out that the only reason that we start to agitate as Democrats is because we cannot get some of these good proposals brought forward. That is certainly true with the Patients' Bill of Rights. But, hopefully, it does not have to be the case with this Medicare proposal.

I know that, initially, there was Republican resistance to the idea of taking 15 percent of the surplus and using it for Medicare. I hope that they will go along with that. I hope that they will go along with the prescription drug proposal and some of these other very significant changes in Medicare that the President has proposed.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I once again want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for his leadership on this matter. The people in Florida owe him a great deal of gratitude for bringing this issue before the public.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) again for leading us always on these very important issues.

I was listening to the comments in my office. It dawned on me that I represent one of the youngest, if not the youngest, district in the Nation. Traditionally, a lot of the discussions in my district are about young people, and, therefore, day care and education and schools; and a lot of times, unfortunately, not enough is discussed about the issue of senior citizens.

Yet, it dawned on me also, as I was listening, like the rest of America, my district is aging. We are not becoming the younger district that we were. All of a sudden, this becomes a very serious issue.

I just wanted to come down and take just a few minutes to say that I think the President has put before us an excellent plan, and there is no reason why we should not respond to it.

But my biggest concern continues to be the same concern I had when I came down last week and joined the gentleman for the discussion on HMOs, managed care. The whole issue of how can we as the greatest Nation on earth continue to dodge, to duck the issue of providing the best, which we are capable of, medical care, the most affordable, which we are not doing but we are capable of, and the most universal medical care.

If we had bad medical services in general, if we had bad medicine and we had bad doctors, then maybe the plan would be to keep a lot of people away from it and not make it available to everybody. But that is not our case.

So what the gentleman from New Jersey is doing here today, and what I want to join him, is to plea with the American people to join us in alerting Members of Congress to the fact that this time here we are dealing with yet another issue in the whole area of providing medical services.

At times, we deal with the millions of young people and Americans who are not covered by medical insurance. At other times, we deal with the whole issue of the people who are not getting the proper services. Here we are talking about people that are covered but who run the risk of having this kind of coverage either end someday or not be handled properly or not be of the quality that it should be.

We have before us a proposal that I think makes a major step to address that issue. We have an opportunity to deal with it in a bipartisan fashion.

Madam Speaker, I just wanted to take these few minutes to join the gentleman from New Jersey, to thank him again for bringing us together and to tell him to count on me and his colleagues to continue to put this message forward, that this is about saying what a society stands for.

If a society cannot take care of its children, and we have spoken about that, cannot take care of its elderly, then it really did not accomplish what it set out to do. This is an opportunity, and we can do it.

Mr. PALLONE. We will continue and bring this up on a regular basis.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

PROVISIONS FOR LANDSLIDE AND MUD SLIDE VICTIMS

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues about a rather unique, but important natural disaster that has occurred in my district. Since actually well before I was sworn in, a very slow moving but powerful landslide has destroyed more than 130 homes in the city of Kelso, Washington.

The nature of landslides is such that they are not well covered by coverage normally available through FEMA and HUD and other disaster relief mechanisms available through the government. The result is that these people have lost virtually everything they own. Fortunately, we have lost no lives. But 130 people have seen their dreams destroyed by this landslide.

I have exhausted and worked very hard with my staff and the agencies to provide whatever help we can provide. Yet, still uncompensated and uninsured damages remain, and we have looked for ways that we might be able to help them.

Therefore, we have devised some targeted tax measures that would assist folks in this particular type of situation. It would provide targeted tax relief to homeowners located in State or federally declared disaster areas who have lost their homes due to disasters for which insurance is not readily available.

Let me underscore that. One can buy insurance for a great many natural disasters, but landslide and mud slides, it is very difficult to find insurance, and it is very expensive if one can find it.

Let me underscore also that normal FEMA coverage does not help in situations like this. The homeowners in this particular district have done everything they can. They have done it right. They have played by the rules. They are two income families. Yet, they have lost everything.

So this is what our bill would do. It would clarify the law to ensure that any mortgage forgiveness provided to homeowners would not be taxable as income. What would happen there is, should a lender decide to forgive interest or forgive a mortgage, under current law, that forgiveness could be considered a gift, and the poor taxpayers who now have their home buried under mud would have to pay taxes on a home which has been completely obliterated. It will not be a common thing, but if people are kind enough to step forward and forgive mortgage in those cases, it would be important.

Additionally, this legislation would establish a tax credit to help those taxpayers who required to continue paying mortgage payments on the destroyed home as they also pay rent or additional mortgage payments for a new residence.

Put ourselves in the position of these homeowners. Again, they have played by the rules. Through no fault of their own, their primary home has been destroyed. They are still having to pay mortgage on that home while they rent another residence for their family. This proposal would provide some tax relief in that circumstance.

There is a third thing this would do. If one should try to claim a casualty loss for one's destroyed home, under current law, the calculation on that

loss is on the basis of the home. As we know, the basis is its initial value when one purchased it, not the current value. So what we would do is adjust the way that calculation is developed so that one could deduct, take a casualty loss based on the current value of the home, the most recently assessed value.

These are common sense measures. They are fair measures. They would help good hard working constituents who played by the rules and, through no fault of their own, have lost virtually everything they own. It would have minimal impact on the Treasury because it deals with the very small and specific instance in which our existing laws have not been able and our existing agencies have not been able to help these folks.

Finally, Madam Speaker, and there are some cases where homeowners are fortunate enough to sell their home in these disasters, and this legislation would allow the homeowners to deduct the full value of the loss.

□ 1630

There are some complexities to it which we could share in accompanying written testimony, but my main point is to share the following points:

We have homeowners who have, again, lost everything they owned, who were not able to buy insurance and for whom FEMA and the other disaster mechanisms have not been able to help. This is a targeted, specific and quite inexpensive proposal to just help those folks in federally- or State-declared disaster areas who have lost virtually everything try to get a little bit back through the structure of the tax codes.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding, and I hope the Congress will consider this favorably.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues about a natural disaster situation in my district that warrants significant relief, and to introduce legislation that will provide some badly needed assistance to the victims of these disasters.

Since even before I was sworn in as a member of this body, I have been working with a group of constituents from the City of Kelso, in my Southwest Washington district, to provide assistance to their disaster-torn community. This city has literally been torn apart by slow-moving landslides that resulted from heavy rainfalls. In fact, during the last 14 months, more than one hundred homes have been destroyed by those landslides, and the remainder of the homes may suffer the same fate in the next 5 to 10 years.

These constituents and their families have struggled to rebuild their lives after their homes or their businesses tumbled down the hill under tons of mud and debris, and I have done everything in my power to ensure that the federal government does everything that we possibly can to help them to that.

Our Nation has experienced several very powerful natural disasters in the past few years. What differentiates these disasters in my district from many others is the fact that insurance was not readily available for this type of disaster—in fact, most homeowners policies specifically exclude mudslides as a covered peril—and now many of these folks have lost nearly everything they own.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I have devised some targeted tax measures that would assist folks in this type of situation.

My legislation would provide targeted tax relief to homeowners located in state or federally-declared disaster areas, which have lost their homes due to disasters for which insurance is not readily available. I can't emphasize enough—many of these folks have lost everything. In most cases, any assistance received from FEMA or state agencies might compensate for 15 to 20 cents on the dollar for their losses, but will only be a small step in helping these homeowners get back on their feet.

These homeowners need a fair chance to get back on their feet, without continuing to shoulder the burden of heavy debt for a destroyed residence. So this bill combines a number of changes to the tax code to help give them such an opportunity.

First, the bill clarifies the law to ensure that any mortgage forgiveness provided to these homeowners would not be taxable as income. Madam Speaker, I have heard from some financial planners in my district that in some cases, they have advised their clients not to seek forgiveness of their mortgage debt from their lenders for this very purpose; and I know for a fact that there are some local lenders who would generously provide such relief for some borrowers if, in fact, such forgiveness was sought by the homeowner. The Federal Government simply should not be taxing the generosity of these lenders who may provide relief of a disaster-victim's heartache. To me, this is common sense and should be expressly defined by the tax code.

Additionally, the legislation would establish a tax credit to help those taxpayers who are required to continue paying mortgage payments on that destroyed home as they pay rent or additional mortgage payments on a new residence. These are some of the most devasted homeowners that I have encountered. Not only have they lost nearly everything they own, but now they face years of carrying this heavy burden of debt in addition to the regular expenses of purchasing a new home and rebuilding their lives.

So I have developed a tax credit that would permit these taxpayers to reduce their taxes by the amount of the mortgage payments on that destroyed home in the years following a disaster. As I stated before, this provision would apply to those disasters for which insurance is not readily available, and only to those mortgage payments made after the qualifying disaster. I simply believe that this is the most direct method of helping our constituents who carry this enormous burden.

Third, the bill would adjust the computation of the casualty loss deduction by allowing taxpayers to deduct the fair market value of a home, instead of only the basis in the home as permitted under current law. Again, this applies only to taxpayers facing this extreme set of circumstances and would not apply to taxpayers who elect to take the credit which I discussed previously. But more importantly, this is a fair measure. Taxpayers who may have lived in a particular home for 20 or 30 years, who may have nearly all of their savings tied up in that home, deserve to get an adjusted deduction that accounts for the modern-day value of that home.

Finally, Madam Speaker, in those cases where the homeowner is fortunate enough to sell a home located in such a devasted area, which may or may not have been irreparably damaged but may be severely devalued, this legislation allows taxpayers to deduct the full value of that loss. Current law limits taxpayers to a capital loss deduction of $3,000, with the ability to carry over any balance to future years. Section 5 of this measure would eliminate the $3,000 limit under these narrow circumstances, so that taxpayers would be able to immediately deduct the full value of a loss taken on the sale of their property which, in many areas heavily impacted by natural disasters, may have depreciated extensively. As under current law, any balance of the capital loss beyond taxable income would be carried over to future years. In my opinion, there's no reason for applying this limitation to capital losses to natural disaster situations and, for that reason, I am proposing that we lift the cap in only these cases.

Madam Speaker, I realize that the situation in Kelso may be unusual, but as such, the impact of this measure on the federal government should be limited. It's impact, however, in helping to rebuild the lives of our disaster victims would be enormous.

This is clearly the right thing to do to help our neighbors get back on their feet. As we wrestle with the option for spending projected budget surpluses in the foreseeable future, I ask my colleagues to consider the plight of our nation's disaster victims and to support these efforts to expeditiously enact the measures that I am proposing today.

FIBROMYALGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GRANGER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the approximately 3.7 million Americans who are plagued by a little-known chronic disorder called fibromyalgia.

Fibromyalgia is a severe form of arthritis characterized by widespread pain and tenderness in the areas of the neck, spine, shoulders, and hips, as well as by fatigue, weakness and sleep.

Unfortunately for these individuals affected by fibromyalgia, the exact cause of the disorder is unknown, and worse yet, there is no known cure; however, this much is known about fibromyalgia, it may be triggered by stress, trauma or possibly an infectious agent in susceptible people.

Thanks to the efforts of organizations such as the National Arthritis Foundation, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, and the National Institute of Arthritis and Muscular Skeletal and Skin Diseases, NIAMS, breakthroughs in treatments for relieving the pain of those affected by fibromyalgia are now more commonplace, thank goodness. Medical experts, for example, have determined that a combination of exercise, medication, physical therapy, and relaxation

can help relieve the symptoms of fibromyalgia. This is very good news, but there is a lot of work still left to be done.

I respectfully call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize the severity of the issue of fibromyalgia, to support individuals affected by fibromyalgia through public awareness and education, to recognize the leadership of the Arthritis Foundation, CDC, and the States in developing the National Arthritis Action Plan, which includes strategies to address all forms of arthritis, including fibromyalgia, and to recognize the importance of committing resources to the Arthritis Foundation, the CDC, NIAMS, and the relevant Federal research institutions helping to pinpoint the cause of fibromyalgia, and eventually find a cure for fibromyalgia.

Before I finish, I would like to share with my colleagues a story of a constituent of mine, Lin Kisslinger, from Oklahoma City, who was diagnosed with fibromyalgia 9 years ago. Lin is an extremely courageous woman who has gone to great lengths to promote an awareness of fibromyalgia in my home State of Oklahoma and throughout the country. Lin successfully helped establish a statewide fibromyalgia awareness day in Oklahoma, and she played an integral role in finding the Fibromyalgia Support Group of South Oklahoma City.

With Lin Kisslinger's continued dedication to promote the awareness of fibromyalgia, combined with the efforts of the Oklahoma City and Tulsa chapters of the National Arthritis Foundation, the National Arthritis Foundation itself, the CDC, and NIAMS, I am confident that a cure for fibromyalgia will be discovered sooner, rather than later.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to support my House Resolution on fibromyalgia.

SUSPEND CLINTON-CASTRO MAY 1995 MIGRATION ACCORD

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I rise to call for the immediate suspension by the Clinton administration of the May 1995 Migration Accord with the Cuban dictatorship and to urge the adoption of a serious U.S. policy of assistance to the Cuban internal opposition, and other steps to accelerate the liberation of Cuba and an end to the refugee tragedy, as well as to the threats to U.S. national security posed by the Castro dictatorship, all of which are being covered up and ignored by the Clinton administration.

This administration's policy towards Cuba can no longer hold. The administration cannot continue to sweep the Cuban crisis under the carpet. The Cuban crisis and the tragedy of the oppression of the Cuban people must no longer be treated as an immigration issue. We must address the issue comprehensively as one of vital U.S. national security, including the need to stop Cuban narcotrafficking, a congressional hearing on which will take place very soon.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and their staffs for their critical work on this very serious matter.

We also have to realize that this problem, the problem of the Cuban dictatorship, is one of biological weapons development, of promotion of international terrorism, of destabilization of the Western Hemisphere, of alliances with rogue states in furtherance of anti-American interests, and of the promotion of international criminal activity.

The way to solve the immigration problem is to solve the national security problem and the tragedy of the oppression of the Cuban people. Before Castro's takeover of Cuba in 1959, never, even during the worst poverty of the economic depression of the 1930s, not only were there no rafters, there was not even 1 year when the U.S. quota allotment of immigrant visas for Cuba was filled. The Cuban people are not an emigrant people. They are desperately seeking freedom today due to the totalitarian oppression and economic destruction caused by the Castro dictatorship.

Yesterday, off the coast of Miami Beach, we saw an unfortunate demonstration of the profoundly unacceptable nature of the Clinton policy of focusing on the Cuban tragedy as an immigration issue. The policy is deeply flawed.

The United States should immediately, one, first suspend the immoral and illegal Clinton-Castro Migration Accord of May 1995, which violates the generous tradition of the American people with regard to refugees from Soviet Bloc countries and also violates the Cuban Adjustment Act of 1966.

Secondly, inform Castro with all clarity that any attempt to fabricate a new crisis for the United States, such as by attempting to send massive amounts of refugees, shall be responded to with immediate U.S. action which would include a naval blockade of Cuba, not only of refugees which would be returned to the Cuban shore, but also of all oil shipments to the island.

And, thirdly, initiate a serious and vigorous program of assistance to the Cuban internal opposition and other steps to hasten the demise of the Cuban dictatorship and the reestablishment of democracy and the rule of law in Cuba.

The time has come, Madam Speaker, to end the suffering and oppression of Cuba, not to fire water cannons and pepper spray on defenseless Cuban refugees trying to swim to freedom.

HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, we ought to begin this presentation with proposing a toast, and perhaps we can raise our glasses to propose a toast to the health of the American people, because that is what this special order is all about, the health of the American people.

For a long time now, many of us in the House have been about the business of trying to double, over a period of 5 years, the funding for the National Institutes of Health. In doing so, we are focusing directly on the reason for the toast that we made to start the proceedings, namely preventive medicine for the health of the American people, remedies for some of the maladies that afflict the American people, and long-term strategies to bring about a world safer for our people, and to rid the world eventually of all of our diseases that so ravage the lives of so many people.

So doubling the funding for the NIH, for the National Institutes of Health, is a worthy goal and it accomplishes so many facets of goals for the American people, and for the citizens of the world, for that matter, that sometimes we wonder why there is not more support than there sometimes is shown. But last year, last session, we were successful, those of us who participate in this endeavor, in making the first downpayment on the doubling effort over a period of 5 years by succeeding in having our appropriators list $2 billion into the then budget, the downpayment on the doubling.

We are now in the posture where we must do the same thing in order to maintain the momentum by bringing about increased funding for the NIH for the current session. In doing so we have introduced H. Res. 89, I believe it is, which asks our Congress, our House of Representatives, to consider doubling the funding for NIH.

Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the copy of H. Res. 89, which takes care of what we are after in the funding for the National Institutes of Health.

H. RES. 89

Whereas past investments in biomedical research have resulted in better health, an improved quality of life for all Americans, and a reduction in national health care expenditures;

Whereas the Nation's commitment to biomedical research has expanded the base of scientific knowledge about health and disease and revolutionized the practice of medicine;

Whereas the Federal Government represents the single largest contributor to biomedical research conducted in the United States;

Whereas biomedical research continues to play a vital role in the growth of this Nation's biotechnology, medical device, and pharmaceutical industries;

Whereas the origin of many of the new drugs and medical devices currently in use is based on biomedical research supported by the National Institutes of Health;

Whereas women have traditionally been underrepresented in medical research protocols, yet are severely affected by diseases including breast cancer, which will kill over 43,900 women this year; ovarian cancer which will claim another 14,500 lives; and osteoporosis and cardiovascular disorders;

Whereas research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health is responsible for the identification of genetic mutations relating to nearly 100 diseases, including Alzheimer's disease, cystic fibrosis, Huntington's disease, osteoporosis, many forms of cancer, and immune deficiency disorders;

Whereas many Americans still face serious and life-threatening health problems, both acute and chronic;

Whereas neurodegenerative diseases of the elderly, such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease, threaten to destroy the lives of millions of Americans, overwhelm the Nation's health care system, and bankrupt the medicare and medicaid programs;

Whereas 4,000,000 Americans are currently infected with the hepatitis C virus, an insidious liver condition that can lead to inflammation, cirrhosis, and cancer, as well as liver failure;

Whereas 250,000 Americans are now suffering from AIDS and hundreds of thousands more with HIV infection;

Whereas cancer remains a comprehensive threat to any tissue or organ of the body at any age, and remains a top cause of morbidity and mortality;

Whereas the extent of psychiatric and neurological diseases poses considerable challenges in understanding the workings of the brain and nervous system;

Whereas recent advances in the treatment of HIV illustrate the promise research holds for even more effective, accessible, and affordable treatments for persons with HIV;

Whereas infants and children are the hope of our future, yet they continue to be the most vulnerable and underserved members of our society;

Whereas approximately one out of every six American men will develop prostate cancer and over 49,200 men will die from prostate cancer each year;

Whereas diabetes, both insulin and non-insulin forms, afflicts 15,700,000 Americans and places them at risk for acute and chronic complications, including blindness, kidney failure, atherosclerosis, and nerve degeneration;

Whereas the emerging understanding of the principles of biometrics has been applied to the development of hard tissue such as bone and teeth as well as soft tissue, and this field of study holds great promise for the design of new classes of biomaterials, pharmaceuticals, and diagnostic and analytical reagents;

Whereas research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health will map and sequence the entire human genome by 2005, leading to a new era of molecular medicine that will provide unprecedented opportunities for the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and cure of diseases that currently plague society;

Whereas the fundamental way science is conducted is changing at a revolutionary pace, demanding a far greater investment in emerging new technologies and research training programs, and in developing new skills among scientific investigators; and

Whereas most Americans show overwhelming support for an increased Federal investment in biomedical research: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the ''Biomedical Revitalization Resolution of 1999''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that funding for the National Institutes of Health should be increased by $2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 and that the budget resolution appropriately reflect sufficient funds to achieve this objective.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I also want to enter into the RECORD the list of our cosponsors for the resolution, which reads like a who's who of our current membership in the House of Representatives.

H. RES. 89

Sponsor: Rep Gekas, George W. (introduced 03/02/99).

Cosponsors (58):

Rep. Bentsen, Ken—03/02/99.
Rep. Callahan, Sonny—03/02/99.
Rep. Nethercutt, George R., Jr.—03/02/99.
Rep. Stearns, Cliff—03/04/99.
Rep. Green, Gene—03/04/99.
Rep. Frost, Martin—03/04/99.
Rep. Moakley, John Joseph—03/10/99.
Rep. Horn, Stephen—03/10/99.
Rep. Gonzalez, Charles A.—03/10/99.
Rep. Cooksey, John—03/10/99.
Rep. Ose, Doug—03/10/99.
Rep. Lofgren, Zoe—03/11/99.
Rep. Baldacci, John Elias—03/11/99.
Rep. Slaughter, Louise McIntosh—03/17/99.
Rep. Gordon, Bart—03/17/99.
Rep. Carson, Julia—03/23/99.
Rep. Goss, Porter J.—03/25/99.
Rep. Lewis, John—04/13/99.
Rep. Cummings, Elijah E.—04/13/99.
Rep. Bilirakis, Michael—04/13/99.
Rep. Hooley, Darlene—04/13/99.
Rep. Phelps, David D.—04/13/99.
Rep. Brady, Robert—04/15/99.
Rep. Gejdenson, Sam—04/27/99.
Rep. Wynn, Albert Russell—04/27/99.
Rep. Watt, Melvin L.—05/04/99.
Rep. Sanchez, Loretta—05/26/99.
Rep. Lantos, Tom—06/08/99.
Rep. Forbes, Michael P.—06/22/99.
Rep. Pelosi, Nancy—03/02/99.
Rep. Porter, John Edward—03/02/99.
Rep. Morella, Constance A.—03/04/99.
Rep. Shows, Ronnie—03/04/99.
Rep. McCarthy, Carolyn—03/04/99.
Rep. Pryce, Deborah—03/10/99.
Rep. Cunningham, Randy (Duke)—03/10/99.
Rep. Blagojevich, Rod R.—03/10/99.
Rep. Etheridge, Bob—03/10/99.
Rep. Bachus, Spencer—03/10/99.
Rep. Frank, Barney—03/10/99.
Rep. Nadler, Jerrold—03/11/99.
Rep. King, Peter T.—03/11/99.
Rep. Clement, Bob—03/17/99.
Rep. McIntyre, Mike—03/23/99.
Rep. Price, David E.—03/23/99.
Rep. Hoeffel, Joseph M.—03/25/99.
Rep. Mink, Patsy T.—04/13/99.
Rep. Bilbray, Brian P.—04/13/99.
Rep. Capps, Lois—04/13/99.
Rep. Coyne, William J.—04/13/99.
Rep. Wamp, Zach—04/13/99.
Rep. Eshoo, Anna G.—04/15/99.
Rep. LaFalce, John J.—04/27/99.
Rep. English, Phil—04/27/99.
Rep. Miller, Gary—05/04/99.
Rep. Capuano, Michael E.—06/08/99.
Rep. Borski, Robert A., Jr.—06/10/99.
Rep. McGovern, James P.—06/23/99.

Mr. GEKAS. And, Madam Speaker, I also wish to add to the RECORD a statement that I have prepared for this special order in which the title, quite appropriately, is ''Doubling NIH Budget in Five Years—Taking the Second Step Toward Doubling.'' That is exactly what we are talking about.

''DOUBLING NIH BUDGET IN FIVE YEARS—TAKING THE SECOND STEP TOWARD DOUBLING''

1. Doubling funding for the National Institutes of Health over the next five years. Is this a reasonable goal? Can we and should we obtain this goal?

What is the current budget situation for the NIH? The Congress has a history of doubling the NIH budget over ten years, so we are suggesting that we accelerate the pace of discovery by increasing health research from the usual 7% or 8% increase to a 15% increase per year for five years. This is a reasonable and obtainable goal given our past funding experience and the future potential for health discoveries. We are suggesting that the NIH FY'2000 budget contain a $2 billion increase rather than the $1 billion increase the Congress would usually provide.

The result is that NIH will go from a funding level of $15.6 billion in FY'99 to $17.6 billion in FY'2000. This would be the second step toward doubling because we added $2 billion increase to the NIH budget last year. The second step should be easier than the first. We would take the NIH from a $14 billion budget to a $28 billion budget.

When I say we would make these increases I am referring to my colleagues, 56 other Members of the House who are committed to this same doubling goal and taking the second step by cosponsoring H. Res. 89. I am introducing for the RECORD the list of the 56 cosponsors, the ''Dear Colleague'' letter circulated by the Co-Chairs of the Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus: Reps. Callahan, Pelosi and Bentsen, joined by Reps. Porter and Nethercutt, along with a copy of the bill.

Can we make this goal this year? Certainly those in the Congress who know the operations of the NIH the best support us in the effort, including the Chairman of the authorizing Committee, Rep. Bilirakis and the Chairman of the appropriations Committee, Rep. Porter. I am pleased that both have committed to the goal and joined H. Res. 89.

We also have Senate support for the NIH doubling goal in five years from by fellow Pennsylvanian, Senator Specter, who has introduced a similar bill, S. Res. 19, to accomplish the same goal. He was joined in a bipartisan manner by his ranking Member on the Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator Harkin. We certainly have the political will to go forward with the second downpayment, if we call upon it. I am asking all of my colleagues to join us on this mission and cosponsor H. Res. 89, so we can call upon our leaders and show that we support this important funding priority.

2. I may have convinced you that we have the ability to meet this goal, but you may ask why we should? Here we stand in June 22nd, 1999, on the brink of the next millennium, very different, healthier people because of health research, than the cruel and short lived lives of individuals that witnessed the dawn of this past 1000 years. Despite the progress that we have made in health research, we still face major global health challenges. Because the U.S. is the world leader in biomedical research, we have a special duty to transfer the benefits of our discoveries to the people of the world. Although this is an altruistic statement, we also know that our own quality of life and security will be enhanced if infectious diseases are controlled. The spread of infectious disease is the number one global health issue

that we all face, according to a recent report of the World Health Organization, infectious diseases killed 11 million people globally in 1998 and killed 180,000 people in the U.S., the third leading killer in the U.S. The NIH is taking the lead in confronting this global health problem by establishing a new center for vaccine development. Vaccines that immunize people against the HIV virus, new highly infectious strains of TB and against malaria the killer of children in sub-Sahara Africa are all possible, if we have the resources.

I feel very strongly about the global effort to transfer the benefits of NIH research through communication efforts such as the Internet and through commerce such as vaccine type drug therapies and prevention strategies. We will ultimately strengthen the economies of the developing world by attempting to eradicate disease. Last Congress I introduced a bill to establish a National Goals Commission with this purpose as its mission and I invite all of my colleagues to join me as original cosponsors of a new bill that also focuses on encouraging increased Internet conferencing on biomedical research and the control of infectious diseases through increases in vaccine development.

We are truly at a new frontier with the end of World War II, the end of the Cold War, where now former enemies in Europe work together to eliminate despotic state action that had once been tolerated, earlier in this Century. The U.S. has mobilized its resources to accomplish these goals and we can now harness and mobilize our scientists in all disciplines to assist the world effort to eliminate disease. This should be our highest priority for a national goal.

3. The increased funding we were able to provide the NIH last year has had a real impact on new priorities for the NIH with expanded activities in the following areas:

Expanding clinical research funding through better translation of research from the bench to the patient.

Accompanying expanded clinical research is promoting more PH.D/M.D. Researchers, which are on the decline, as the number of PH.Ds grows.

Expanding opportunities for collaboration with other science disciplines such as computer science and physics to work better at the molecular level.

Interpreting the human genome, which will be completed within the next two years.

4. Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus Briefings for the Congress have educated the attendees on the latest, cutting edge research. There have been over 90 briefings for the Congress since 1990. The 1999 Caucus Series was particularly instructive of the advances we are making in health care because of increased funding for research. For example, last week Dr. Solomon Snyder from Johns Hopkins University, told us that the role of Nitic Oxide in many human body functions such as heart pressure and as a neurotransmitter was only discovered in 1990. Since that time, medications such as Viagra, for male impotence have been developed in less than a decade. The pace of discovery has truly accelerated.

5. Emergency Spending-outside the 1997 budget caps: There is a global killer on the prowl killing 11 million people around the world and killing 180,000 people in the U.S. The World Health Organization just sounded an altert that we must controll this killer before it is completely out of control. Emergency spending has been found to assist in the Kosovo Campaign and I submit that this is no less important.

Madam Speaker, the 56 cosponsors are intent on having people like the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) use their influence as chairmen of respective committees vital to this effort, who are also cosponsors, and I offer at this time the written remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), of whom I just spoke, on this subject.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of increasing the federal government's commitment to biomedical research through the National Institutes of Health. As Chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee, I am a strong advocate of this agency's vital mission. I have joined many of my colleagues in supporting efforts to double federal funding for the NIH.

The NIH is the primary federal agency charged with the conduct and support of biomedical and behavioral research. Each of its institutes has a specialized focus on particular diseases, areas of human health and development, or aspects of research support. When we consider its role as one of the worlds's foremost research centers, it is amazing to remember that the NIH actually began its existence as a one-room Laboratory of Hygiene in 1887.

Medical research represents the single most effective weapon against the diseases that affect many Americans. The advances made over the course of the last century could not have been predicated by even the most far-sighted observers. It is equally difficult to anticipate the significant gains we may achieve in years to come through increased funding for further medical research.

Last year, Congress gave a substantial increase in funding to the NIH. The fiscal year 1999 omnibus appropriations law provided $15.6 billion for the NIH—an increase of almost $2 billion or 15 percent over the previous fiscal year. This increase represents a sizable down payment toward the goal of doubling its funding over five years. This year, I am hopeful that we can make similar progress in that regard.

As we work to increase federal funding, I am also sponsoring legislation to encourage private support for NIH research efforts. My bill, H.R. 785, the Biomedical Research Assistance Voluntary Option or ''BRAVO'' Act, would allow taxpayers to designate a portion of their federal income tax refunds to support NIH research efforts. I introduced the bill on a bipartisan basis with the Ranking Member of the Health and Environment Subcommittee, Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Madam Speaker, every dollar invested in research today will yield untold benefits for all Americans in years to come. Indeed, our own lives might some day depend on the efforts of scientists and doctors currently at work in our nation's laboratories. I urge all Members to join me in supporting a strong federal commitment to biomedical research.

Mr. GEKAS. And so, Madam Speaker, we see we have an appropriator and a chairman of relevant committees, as well as many other Members who are interested in seeing this effort succeed.

And the question arises, well, who is interested in this besides the people at NIH? Every American citizen ought to be interested in it. It has to do with the health of the household. Mr. and Mrs. America and the children and the other residents of the household can hope for nothing better than for clean, healthy lives so that they can fulfill their destiny with as little as possible disruption by ravaging disease and ill health.

So this is our effort, all of us. And it is that simple. Do we want reduction in health costs? Of course we do. Do we want less hospitalization for our people? Of course we do. Do we require fewer and fewer spaces in the future for nursing homes and more people to be able to remain at home? Of course we do.

All of this is within the scope of what we are trying to do. Because every effort that the National Institutes of Health makes on research, biomedical research and other kinds of findings that they can make, all of that goes to the prevention of disease and the curing of disease. And not only do we save lives but we save money. That is why we have to consider the doubling of the effort as being one of an investment in eventually reducing costs, because we will reduce costs along the way.

The gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) has been one of the chief supporters of this effort, Madam Speaker, and I would like to yield to him at this time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to stand in support of the gentleman's resolution.

Some of our colleagues stood up here today and praised the President for coming across with the support for helping to finance the cost of pharmaceuticals for our seniors, and the issue of Social Security being taken off budget.

And I would like to say that I think those of us on the Republican side praise the President for coming over and supporting some of the concepts that Congress took action on not too long ago, this month, in saying that Social Security is a trust fund, not a slush fund. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has been trying to reach consensus on what we should be able to work out some time within the near future, and that is the ability of seniors to be able to have their pharmaceutical drugs paid for.

□ 1645

So I, for one, am going to stand up here today not only with the chairman but also to praise the President for coming across and supporting a lot of congressional priorities. But I think the issue of pharmaceutical drugs with Medicare is still treating symptoms of the problem, and that is we have these diseases which continue to be a problem in our society.

The resolution of the chairman really, as we would say, is an investment in the future. Because if we can avoid or reduce diseases such as heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer's disease, if we can reduce stroke, then we can reduce the cost of having to treat problems related to those diseases.

This resolution really says that it is time that America makes a commitment to investing in our public health

just as we invest in our infrastructure, roads, bridges, and canals.

I would strongly support the contention of the chairman that we need to double our investment. In fact, I would say clearly by comparison that Americans one day are going to wake up to the fact that in 1960 President Kennedy stood up and challenged this country to put a man of the Moon within 10 years, and at that time we increased the funding to a level that would be about 10 times what we spend on public health research, in the process of putting somebody on the Moon.

That kind of national commitment was made possible by strong leadership but really the big point was that level of commitment resulted within 10 years in the fulfillment of the promise and fulfillment of the commitment, and the fulfillment of the goal of placing a man on the Moon.

I think we can all agree, when it comes down to affecting our families, our children, our grandchildren, our great grandchildren's lives, that the one thing that really could totally dwarf placing somebody on the Moon is the ability to end cancer as we know it, to end heart disease as we know it, to make Alzheimer's a thing of the past, such as polio has become practically in our society, to take things like stroke and put it in the category of smallpox.

This is really a chance for us to make that commitment, with all the resources we have available, not by buying from this group or that special group or promising this group that we are going to give them more money. This is a promise to all Americans, the globe, all humans, that America at this time and this place is making the type of commitment to public health that was made back in the 1960s for space exploration.

The fact is this is our chance to be able to make a commitment. Let us just say this resolution is just a first step at saying we are going to put forth more effort and, hopefully, achieve more of the successes we are going to see in districts like mine.

Madam Speaker, San Diego County has one of the most aggressive health research facilities in the world. We are doing the human mapping program that not only allows us to understand what causes heart disease or causes Alzheimer's, but is allowing us to know why the body does what it does so that we can someday avoid these diseases rather than just treat them as we are talking today on the Medicare issue.

I want to stand again as not only a San Diegan who has many of these research facilities in his district but also as somebody who has the privilege of serving on the Committee on Health and the Environment and has oversight for many of these operations. I want to thank the chairman, and I want to stand here today and say, all America should be looking at this type of commitment. I want to thank the author of the resolution. Let us move forward and let us rise to the challenge.

Just as America rose to the challenge of John Kennedy, I think the resolution of the chairman deserves our commitment to rise and fulfill the promise that our public health strategies can actually provide for America.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate the commentary of the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) who has been stalwart in most of the efforts surrounding the problems of continued funding for medical research.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) very much not only for his leadership on this issue of increasing medical research funding in the Government but for his leadership on so many issues.

I am grateful to have a chance to talk for a few minutes to acknowledge not only his work but to acknowledge the need for additional medical research through the National Institutes of Health and other agencies of Government which conduct medical research.

It is not a small matter that is defined and distributed to the National Institutes of Health for research only. It is a very big issue for not only the human condition in our country but also for other agencies that coordinate with the National Institutes of Health and in doing some very, very important research to try to cure diseases in this country.

I happen to have a very serious interest in diabetes and recognize fully the cost of diabetes to society. Twenty-five to twenty-six cents out of every Medicare dollar goes for paying for the consequences of diabetes in our society.

So, to the extent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and others in this body, both Democrats and Republicans, engaged in adding preventive care to the Medicare legislation that we set back in 1997 to allow for diabetes education and diabetes test strips, to allow for mammographies and colorectal exams and prostate exams for people in the Medicare population, that is a money saver.

So with the preventive care effort that is undertaken by Congress, combined with the research that is being done at the National Institutes of Health, not only on diabetes but on many other diseases, we can reduce this cost to the Medicare system.

So it is in our national best interest, in my judgment, that we devote more resources to the National Institutes of Health research and medical research through the National Science Foundation, through the VA Hospital system, through the Department of Defense, and other agencies of Government, the Centers for Disease Control, for example, and others, if we are going to help the human condition.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for his work, and I am very serious about the hard work he has done to make increasing medical research funding a reality in our country. It is a wise expenditure of money, of the taxpayers' dollars, because it helps all of us.

Diabetes, for example, is indiscriminate in touching not only minority races but the Caucasian population. It hits all ages and stages. It hits native American populations disproportionately to the rest of the populations in our country, and it is a cruel disease that affects so many people. Sixteen million Americans in our country have diabetes, and some 7 or 8 million of them do not know they have it. So not only diabetes but cancer and Alzheimer's and all those diseases that touch people's lives need to be cured.

I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) I was out at the National Institutes of Health just last week and met with the Director Dr. Varmus and the other directors of the Institutes talking not only about diabetes but increasing funding. I mentioned to them at the time that I felt the President's budget, which I think is around 2.3 percent, is just inadequate. I know we did an extraordinary increase last year in the appropriations process, and I am proud to be on the Committee on Appropriations and supported it. But we want to do better than 2.3 percent so that we take advantage of these great opportunities for research and cure some of these serious diseases that affect all of us.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has touched on an important aspect of what we are trying to do. The more we are able to prevent disease or cure the existing diseases, the more beneficial will be our Treasury as well as the lives of our citizens.

This chart that we have here shows heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer's, mental disorder, arthritis, depression, stroke, osteoporosis, etc. Altogether, these cost us $500 billion a year as a society. That is what it costs us.

Now, insofar as research can settle in and provide a cure for one or all of these, billions of dollars every year can be saved, not to mention the lives that will be happier and safer and more fully destined for fulfillment than under the present conditions.

So we are not only spending money when we invest in the National Institutes of Health, we are saving money.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for one moment more, the gentleman is absolutely right.

If we add diabetes into that, that is some $80 billion or $90 billion more in cost to our country, not to say anything of the issue of lost productivity.

A person who has Alzheimer's today is most likely an unproductive part of our society. If we can prevent that Alzheimer's or cure it, that person, that sufferer and that family that suffers with that person will be more productive and it will save money long-term.

Just in the diabetes research, I should say the diabetes test strips and diabetes education money or provisions

that were set forth for the Medicare program, my memory is that it was about a $31 million savings the first year of having that preventive component to health care.

So I thank the gentleman for his good work. I am proud to be his partner in all of this. We will have to just work hard and persevere and help humanity by curing some of these diseases through research.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) recognizing that she is the heart and soul of the National Institutes of Health, because she has never breathed a day's worth of breath without considering the NIH.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend my very good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for scheduling this special order and for charts and for the work that he does prior to and even after this special order. He has such a tremendous commitment to biomedical research and to the National Institutes of Health.

I am also pleased to identify myself with the comments made by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) too. We do have a good, solid group of Members of Congress who do believe very strongly in biomedical research.

I am proud to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) in renewing our bipartisan commitment to double the funding for the National Institutes of Health over a 5-year period.

Madam Speaker, the NIH has been called ''the only crown jewel of the Federal Government.'' Well, it is indeed a world-renowned institution. It is located in Montgomery County, Maryland, which happens to be the district I represent. It is considered the leading force in mankind's continuing war against disease.

In fact, it is located in Bethesda, Maryland; and I think that Bethesda was appropriately named for the Biblical Pool of Bethesda, which had healing qualities. And so does NIH.

The Federal commitment to biomedical, behavioral, and population-based research is responsible for the continued development of an ever-expanding base that has contributed to medical advances that have profoundly improved the length and quality of life for millions of Americans.

Information gained from NIH research is revolutionizing the practice of medicine and the future direction of scientific inquiry. With this research, we have learned that disease is a complex and evolving enemy.

Despite the extraordinary progress that has been made in the fight against many diseases, there are still serious challenges that remain. Infectious diseases continue to pose a significant threat as new human pathogens are discovered and previously known and controlled microorganisms acquire antibiotic resistance. The risk of bioterrorism also necessitates new research on diagnostics, vaccines, and therapeutic agents.

The number of Americans over age 65 will double in the next 30 years to more than 69 million. So research is needed to help reduce the enormous economic and social burdens posed by chronic diseases, as were mentioned, osteoporosis, arthritis, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's disease, cancer, heart disease, and stroke.

As a matter of fact, one of the figures I saw recently is that, if we can just hold back the advent of Alzheimer's disease for 5 years, we can save $40 billion. This is an example of how we save money as well as enhance the quality of life.

□ 1700

NIH funded research into many of these diseases is the foundation underlying the search for answers. Without the essential role that the NIH is playing in our health care equation, we as a Nation will fail to achieve the goal of a healthy, more productive Nation. The American people want increased funding for medical research. There was a Wall Street Journal/CNN poll that indicated that more than two-thirds of those who were surveyed support doubling the NIH budget within 5 years.

The clock on this commitment began ticking in 1998 when we successfully enacted a 15 percent increase in the NIH appropriation to $15.6 billion in fiscal year 1999. Again this year we are requesting another 15 percent increase for fiscal year 2000 as the second step in achieving our goal of doubling the NIH budget by 2003.

Madam Speaker, the 15 percent increase in the current fiscal year has enabled funding of close to 10,000 new grants. That is an increase of 2,400 over the fiscal year 1998. It is not by chance that the United States is the undisputed world leader in high tech medical science and drug development. It is in large part because the Federal Government has made a commitment to fund basic biomedical research for over 50 years and create a strong partnership with the private sector to bring new life-saving techniques and treatments to patients throughout the world.

I want to mention some examples of new preventive strategies against disease which is changing the lives of millions of Americans:

Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths in American women, claiming the lives of more than 43,000 women each year. The NIH-sponsored breast cancer prevention trial tested the use of tamoxifen, a drug that was used for 20 years to treat breast cancer, as a breast cancer prevention agent. Tamoxifen reduced the incidence of breast cancer for more than 5 years by 49 percent in women at high risk for the disease.

Another example is tuberculosis. TB is the most common infectious disease worldwide. One-third of the world's population is infected with the bacterium that causes this serious disease. TB causes devastating lung disease and weight loss in patients and often attacks the nervous system and the kidneys as well. Moreover, the greatest known risk for development of TB infection is HIV infection. NIH and CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, supported scientists collaborated with researchers in Uganda where a study was conducted to test different drug regimens for their ability to prevent TB in HIV-infected adults. The researchers found that a 6-month course of an anti-TB drug reduced the risk of TB by 67 percent in HIV-infected adults. The findings from this research led the World Health Organization's global tuberculosis program to further evaluate whether TB prevention programs for high-risk groups in developing nations are an effective and economical way to reduce the risk of TB infection to the individual and the community.

Another example, Madam Speaker, is the recent evidence that kidney damage from diabetes is reversible. We have just had a discussion with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) about diabetes. One of the many serious complications that patients with diabetes encounter is damage to their kidneys. Despite improved patient survival and regulation of blood sugar, this disease continues to be the major factor of kidney failure. Researchers have known that after many years with the disease, diabetic patients gradually develop scarring in the kidney that filters the body's waste produced from the blood. As the scarring progresses, the kidneys fail, leaving the patient dependent on dialysis. Now researchers are making progress. By studying patients who had received a pancreas transplant, researchers found that kidney disease was actually reversed in some diabetic patients who had maintained normalized blood sugar levels over a 10-year period. This research will help not only diabetic patients receiving pancreas transplants but also will guide treatment strategies for other diabetic patients who are now at risk for kidney disease. Now, not only can we prevent kidney damage in patients with diabetes, but in some cases the damage can be reversed.

Madam Speaker, scientific advances resulting from NIH-supported research mean improved health and reduced suffering, job creation in biomedical research and biotechnology, and far-reaching economic benefits touching every State through major universities, government laboratories and research institutes. In global competition, biomedical research and biotechnology are areas of strong American leadership and commitment. Continued strong support for NIH will ensure that American scientific excellence continues as we enter the next century. We can afford to do no less for

this generation and for generations to come.

Before I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has been so kind about giving me this time, I want to extol the benefits, also, of the creation of the Office of Research on Women's Health. I and other Members of Congress were involved in that a number of years ago. We now have it codified, and so women are included in all clinical trials and protocols. Thanks to the Members of this Congress with the gentleman from Pennsylvania at the helm and others, we have now been able to put far more money into all elements of research, and in the Office on Research on Women's Health for breast cancer, ovarian cancer, cervical cancer, osteoporosis, AIDS in women, lupus and all of the other diseases. We also have made some advances in research for prostate cancer, kind of the equivalent of breast cancer in terms of the number of people who are diagnosed with it each year and the number who die of that disease. This is so important that we do this special order and that we carry through with our goal of doubling the budget by 2003 of the National Institutes of Health. It has been an honor to be here with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Texas whom I see has arrived for participation in this event, Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD several letters from important entities in our country supporting our effort for doubling the funding for the NIH. I will quickly read off the titles:

The American Heart Association.

The BIO organization, which is the Biotechnology Industry Organization.

The Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding. Just to give my colleagues an idea, to give our audience, the American public, a feel for how many people, how many organizations are deeply involved in the health of our country, the Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding, which is made up of dozens of organizations like the American Geriatrics Society, the American Society for Investigative Pathology, American Society of Transplantation, just to get an idea of all the various things that affect our households; Corporation for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Friends of the National Library of Medicine, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. My gosh, they cover every facet of our lives. National Caucus of Basic Biomedical Science Chairs, Oakwood Healthcare System, Primary Health Systems, and on and on and on. This is our fellow Americans joining in certain entities to advance our health care.

Joint Steering Committee for Public Policy.

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 22, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE GEKAS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GEKAS: The American Heart Association applauds your continuing initiative and leadership in the bicameral, bipartisan effort to double funding for the National Institutes of Health by the year 2003. The historically large funding increase received by the NIH for FY 1999 represented a significant step toward that goal.

Your ongoing efforts and those of the 56 cosponsors of H. Res. 89, expressing the sense of the House that the federal investment in medical research should be increased by $2 billion in FY 2000, are vital in securing the next installment to double funding for the NIH. The American Heart Association strongly supports your hard work in making funding for the NIH a top priority in the FY 2000 appropriations process.

Recent state-based polls show that an overwhelming majority of Americans favor doubling federal spending on medical research by the year 2003. NIH research reduces health care costs, provides cutting-edge treatment and prevention efforts, creates jobs and maintains America's status as the world leader in the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries.

In addition, an overwhelming majority of Americans want Congress to increase funding for heart and stroke research. According to an April 1999 national public opinion poll, 81 percent of Americans want Congress to increase funding for heart research and 78 percent support increases for stroke research. The fight against heart disease—America's No. 1 killer—and stroke—America's No. 3 killer—requires innovative research and prevention programs. However, these programs to help advance the battle against heart disease and stroke are contingent on a significant increase in funding for the NIH. Now is the time for NIH to capitalize on progress and pursue promising opportunities that could lead to novel approaches to diagnose, treat, prevent or cure heart disease and stroke.

The American Heart Association commends you for your outstanding leadership and steadfast commitment to double funding for the NIH by the year 2003. Thank you.

Sincerely,

VALENTIN FUSTER, M.D., PH.D.
President.

BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION,
Washington, DC, June 21, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE W. GEKAS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GEKAS: I am writing to indicate BIO's strong support for your efforts to double the budget of the national Institutes of Health (NIH) by 2003, as called for in H. Res. 89. We commend you for organizing speeches on this subject and ask that you read from our statement and/or include it in the printed record.

We support these increases in NIH appropriations because of their importance to the development of tomorrow's cures for the most deadly and disabling diseases, including AIDS, Parkinson's, cancer, Alzheimer's, and diabetes. Apart from helping patients, NIH funding also plays a crucial role in generating hundreds of thousands of high-wage jobs in our industry and billions of dollars in economic activity

Many of BIO's 840 members have collaborative agreements and licenses with NIH and its grantees. The dynamic division of labor between NIH, focusing on basic research, and our industry, focusing on applied research, has been a powerful catalyst for change and progress. These partnerships are the cornerstone of America's preeminence in biomedical research.

We are witnessing an explosion of new products to treat patients. In 1998, 22 new products and vaccines were approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) pushing the biotech industry's total approved drugs and biologic projects to over 80. Furthermore, biotechnology companies currently have over 300 biotech drugs and biologics in the pipeline in second and third stage human clinical trails at the FDA.

In terms of economic benefits, 2,214 new companies have been formed since 1980 that were based in part on licenses from NIH and its grantees. And in FY 1997, $28.7 billion of U.S. economic activity can be attributed to the results of academic licensing the (majority of which resulted from NIH-sponsored research), supporting at 245,930 jobs.

Past investments in NIH has helped make America the undisputed world leader in the medical sciences and drug development. The fact that America produced half of the worlds new medicines over the last ten years clearly demonstrates America's world leadership. Doubling the NIH's budget by 2003 will further strengthen America's leadership in these fields and create new medicines for patients while generating new high-wage jobs.

Finally, we wish to praise you for your superb leadership of the Biomedical Research Caucus. We have attended many of the educational events you have sponsored and believe they have contributed to the developing consensus in favor of doubling NIH's research budget.

If I or my staff at BIO can help you in your efforts to double the NIH budget, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

CHUCK LUDLAM,
Vice President for Government Relations.

THE AD HOC GROUP FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING,
Washington, DC, June 21, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE W. GEKAS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GEKAS: On behalf of the over 300 member organizations of the Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding, I write to commend you for your leadership in the effort to double the NIH budget in five years. The Ad Hoc Group firmly believes that if our nation is to continue to translate the promise of scientific discovery into a reality of better health and an improved quality of life for all Americans, Congress must maintain the commitment begun last year to double the NIH budget.

Our investment in medical research over the past decades has produced a revolution in science that has transformed the practice of medicine and significantly improved the health of our citizens. The explosion of new scientific knowledge has led to major strides in our understanding of disease at the cellular and molecular levels. This in turn has catalyzed the development of new strategies for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease. The following are some recent examples.

NIH-sponsored research has lead to the approval of tamoxifen—a drug used for twenty years to treat breast cancer—as an agent to prevent breast cancer in women at high risk for the disease. Tamoxifen reduced the incidence of breast cancer for five years by 49 percent in women at high risk for the disease. A new prevention study, scheduled to begin this year, will examine whether raloxifene also is effective in preventing invasive breast cancer in women who have not had the disease.

Autoimmune diseases, such as diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis, and lupus, are conditions where the immune system attacks the body's own cells and tissues. Basic scientists have discovered the mechanisms by which common infections can trigger some autoimmune diseases by producing proteins that are normally found in the body. Understanding how this ''molecular mimicry''

works may allow us to prevent the devastating effects of autoimmune diseases.

One-third of world's population is infected with the bacterium that causes tuberculosis (TB). Scientists supported by the NIH and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention collaborated in a study that revealed a new preventive strategy to reduce the incidence of TB in HIV-infected patients. They found that a six-month course of the anti-TB drug isoniazid reduced the risk of TB by 67 percent in HIV-infected adults.

In addition, new avenues in the development of therapeutics have opened, including new hope for the treatment and cure of Hepatitis C and the first evidence that the kidney damage from diabetes is reversible.

Advances such as these in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease depend on the development and testing of new ideas, which requires resources. Our nation still faces many health challenges. The more new ideas our scientists can generate and explore, the quicker we can conquer these challenges.

Despite the progress that had been made, infectious diseases still pose a significant threat as new human pathogens are discovered and previously known and controlled microorganisms acquire antibiotic resistance.

The baby boom generation is aging with the number of Americans over 65 years of age expected to double in the next 30 years. Research on chronic diseases as osteoporosis, arthritis, Parkinson's and Alzheimer's diseases, and heart disease will help reduce the enormous economic and social burdens on our nation.

Today, there are still too many infants and children who suffer needlessly from diseases, such as asthma and cystic fibrosis, injury, abuse or a host of societal problems. More research is needed to identify and promote the prerequisites of optimal physical, mental, and behavioral growth and development through infancy, childhood and adolescence.

The U.S. population is growing increasingly diverse. Eliminating or reducing the disproportionate share of disease and disability among minorities and the socioeconomically disadvantaged will improve the quality of life for many and also benefit the U.S. economically.

The Ad Hoc Group firmly supports the effort to double the NIH budget by FY 2003. As a second step toward the bipartisan goal of doubling the NIH budget, the Ad Hoc Group endorses an FY 2000 appropriation of $18 billion, a $2.3 billion (15%) increase, for the NIH.

Attached is a list of the more than 300 organizations that have endorsed the Ad Hoc Group proposal for FY 2000. The patients, families, scientists, health care professionals, and companies represented by these organizations and institutions stand ready to work with you and all of the supporters of medical research on Capitol Hill to realize the goal of doubling the NIH budget by FY 2003.

Sincerely,

RICHARD M. KNAPP, PH.D.,
Chairman.

Attachment.

ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING THE FY 2000 PROPOSAL AS OF JUNE 21, 1999

Academy of Clinical Laboratory Physicians and Scientists.
Academy of Osseointegration.
Academy of Radiology Research.
Administrators of Internal Medicine.
Advocate Health Care.
Albany Medical College.
Albert Einstein College of Medicine.
Alliance for Aging Research.
Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation.
Alzheimer's Association.
Ambulatory Pediatric Association.
American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology.
American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.
American Academy of Dermatology.
American Academy of Neurology.
American Academy of Ophthalmology.
American Academy of Optometry.
American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons.
American Academy of Otolaryngology—Head and Neck Surgery.
American Academy of Pediatrics.
American Academy of Physical Medicine—Rehabilitation.
American Association for Cancer Research.
American Association for Dental Research.
American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases.
American Association for the Surgery of Trauma.
American Association of Anatomists.
American Association of Chairs of Departments of Psychiatry.
American Association of Colleges of Nursing.
American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine.
American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy.
American Association of Dental Schools.
American Association of Immunologists.
American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists.
American Association of Neurological Surgeons.
American Board of Pediatrics.
American Cancer Society.
American Chemical Society.
American College of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology.
American College of Clinical Pharmacology.
American College of Neuropsychopharmacology.
American College of Physicians—American Society of Internal Medicine.
American College of Preventive Medicine.
American College of Rheumatology.
American Federation for Medical Research.
American Foundation for AIDS Research.
American Gastroenterological Association.
American Geriatrics Society.
American Heart Association.
American Lung Association.
American Medical Association.
American Neurological Association.
American Optometric Association.
American Pediatric Society.
American Physiological Society.
American Podiatric Medical Association.
American Psychiatric Association.
American Psychological Society.
American Psychiatric Nurses Association.
American Red Cross.
American Social Health Association.
American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology.
American Society for Bone and Mineral Research.
American Society for Cell Biology.
American Society for Clinical Nutrition.
American Society for Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics.
American Society for Investigative Pathology.
American Society for Microbiology.
American Society for Nutritional Sciences.
American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics.
American Society for Reproductive Medicine.
American Society of Addiction Medicine.
American Society of Clinical Oncology.
American Society of Hematology.
American Society of Human Genetics.
American Society of Nephrology.
American Society of Pediatric Nephrology.
American Society of Transplantation.
American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene.
American Thoracic Society.
American Urogynecologic Society.
American Urological Association.
American Veterinary Medical Association.
Americans for Medical Progress.
America's Blood Centers.
Association for Academic Surgery.
Association for Medical School Pharmacology.
Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology.
Association of Academic Departments of Otolaryngology—Head and Neck Surgery.
Association of Academic Health Centers.
Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries.
Association of Academic Physiatrists.
Association of American Cancer Institutes.
Association of American Medical Colleges.
Association of American Universities.
Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges.
Association of Chairs of Physiology Departments.
Association of Independent Research Institutes.
Association of Medical and Graduate Departments of Biochemistry.
Association of Medical School Immunology and Microbiology Chairs.
Association of Medical School Pediatric Department Chairs.
Association of Medical School Psychologists.
Association of Minority Health Professions Schools.
Association of Ohio Children's Hospitals.
Association of Pathology Chairs.
Association of Population Centers.
Association of Professors of Dermatology.
Association of Professors of Medicine.
Association of Program Directors in Internal Medicine.
Association of Schools of Public Health.
Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry.
Association of Subspecialty Professors.
Association of Teachers of Preventive Medicine.
Association of University Anesthesiologists.
Association of University Professors of Neurology.
Association of University Professors of Ophthalmology.
Association of University Radiologists.
Barnes Jewish Hospital.
Baylor College of Medicine.
Berkshire Medical Center.
Biotechnology Industry Organization.
Campaign for Medical Research.
Cancer Research Foundation of America.
Carolinas Medical Center.
Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine.
Children's Hospital Medical Center of Cincinnati.
Children's Hospital of Michigan.
Children's Hospital of Wisconsin.
Children's Mercy Hospital.
Children's National Medical Center.
Citizens for Public Action.
CJ Foundation for SIDS.
Clerkship Directors in Internal Medicine.
Coalition for American Trauma Care.
Coalition for Heritable Disorders of Connective Tissue.
Coalition of Patient Advocates for Skin Disease Research.
College on Problems of Drug Dependence.
Columbia University.
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Conference of Boston Teaching Hospitals.
Congress of Neurological Surgeons.
Consortium of Social Science Associations.
Cooley's Anemia Foundation.
Corporation for the Advancement of Psychiatry.
Council of Emergency Medicine Residency Directors.
Council of Graduate Schools.
Council of University Chairs in Obstetrics and Gynecology.
Creighton University School of Medicine.
Crohn's and Colitis Foundation of America.
Cystic Fibrosis Foundation.
Dartmouth Medical School.
Digestive Disease National Coalition.
Duke University Medical Center.
Dystonia Medical Research Foundation.
Eastern Virginia Medical School.
Emory University School of Medicine.
Emory University, Woodruff Health Sciences Center.
ESA, Inc.
Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology.
Federation of Animal Science Societies.
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center.
Friends of the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research.
Friends of the National Library of Medicine.
Genetics Society of America.
Glaucoma Research Foundation.
H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute.
Hackensack University Medical Center—Institute for Biomedical Research.
Huntington Memorial Hospital.
Illinois Neurofibromatosis, Inc.
Immune Deficiency Foundation.
Indiana University School of Medicine.
Inova Institute of Research and Education.
International Psycho-Oncology Society.
Johns Hopkins University.
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.
Joint Council of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology.
Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International.
Krasnow Institute for Advanced Studies.
Lehigh Valley Hospital and Health Network.
Louisiana State University Medical Center—Shreveport.
Loyola University—Chicago, Stritch School of Medicine.
Lymphoma Research Foundation of America.
Magee Womens Hospital and Research Institute.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Medical College of Georgia.
Medical College of Ohio.
Medical Library Association.
Medical University of South Carolina.
Michigan State University College of Human Medicine.
Morehouse School of Medicine.
Mount Sini School of Medicine.
National Alliance for Eye and Vision Research.
National Alliance for the Mentally Ill.
National Alopecia Areata Foundation.
National Association for Biomedical Research.
National Association of Children's Hospitals.
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
National Caucus of Basic Biomedical Sciences Chairs.
National Coalition for Cancer Research.
National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.
National Foundation for Ectodermal Dysplasias.
National Health Council.
National Jewish Medical and Research Center.
National Marfan Foundation.
National Medical Association.
National Multiple Sclerosis Society.
National Organization for Rare Disorders.
National Osteoporosis Foundation.
National Perinatal Association.
National Sleep Foundation.
National Vitiligo Foundation.
Neurofibromatosis Inc., Mass Bay Area.
New York University.
New York University Medical Center.
Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine.
Oakwood Healthcare System.
Oncology Nursing Society.
Orthopaedic Research Society.
Palmetto Health Alliance.
Paralyzed Veterans of America.
Parkinson's Action Network.
Parkland Health and Hospital System.
Pharmaceutical Research Manufacturers of America.
Plastic Surgery Research Council.
Population Association of America.
Primary Health Systems, Inc.
Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago.
ResearchAmerica.
Research Society on Alcoholism.
RESOLVE, the National Infertility Association.
Rush Medical College.
Rush Presbyterian—St. Luke's Medical Center.
Rush University.
Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Center.
Scleroderma Foundation Central New Jersey Chapter.
Scleroderma Research Foundation.
Scott and White Memorial Hospital.
Society for Academic Continuing Medical Education.
Society for Academic Emergency Medicine.
Society for Gynecologic Investigation.
Society for Investigative Dermatology.
Society for Neuroscience.
Society for Pediatric Research.
Society for the Advancement of Women's Health Research.
Society of Academic Anesthesiology Chairs.
Society of Gynecologic Oncologists.
Society of Surgical Chairs.
Society of Toxicology.
Society of University Surgeons.
Society of University Urologists.
Southern Illinois University School of Medicine.
Stanford University of Medicine.
State University of New York at Buffalo, School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences.
State University of New York at Stony Brook Health Center School of Medicine.
State University of New York Health Science Center of Brooklyn.
State University of New York Health Science Center at Syracuse.
Stratton VA Medical Center.
Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Alliance.
Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center.
The American Dermatological Association.
The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.
The Endocrine Society.
The Genome Action Coalition.
The George Washington University Medical Center.
The Jeffrey Modell Foundation.
The Protein Society.
Thomas Jefferson University.
Tourette Syndrome Association, Inc.
Tuffs University School of Medicine.
Tulane University School of Medicine.
United States and Canadian Academy of Pathology.
University of Alabama at Birmingham.
University of Alabama School of Medicine.
University of California, Davis, School of Medicine.
University of California, San Diego, School of Medicine.
University of California, San Francisco, School of Medicine.
University of Cincinnati College of Medicine.
University of Colorado School of Medicine.
University of Florida Health Science Center and College of Medicine.
University of Iowa.
University of Kentucky Center—College of Medicine.
University of Louisville.
University of Maryland School of Medicine.
University of Massachusetts Medical School.
University of Massachusetts Memorial Medical Center.
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey.
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey—New Jersey Medical School.
University of Miami School of Medicine.
University of Michigan Medical School.
University of Missouri Hospitals and Clinics.
University of Missouri—Kansas City School of Medicine.
University of Nevada School of Medicine.
University of North Dakota School of Medicine and Health Sciences.
University of Puerto Rico.
University of Rochester Medical Center.
University of Alabama College of Medicine.
University of South Carolina School of Medicine.
University of South Dakota School of Medicine.
University of Tennessee, Memphis.
University of Texas-Houston Medical School.
University of Utah School of Medicine.
University of Washington Academic Medical Center.
UPMC Health System.
Vanderbilt University Medical Center.
Virginia Commonwealth University.
Wake Forest University School of Medicine.
Wayne State University School of Medicine.
Weill-Cornell Medical College.
Wright State University School of Medicine.
Yale University School of Medicine.

JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE
FOR PUBLIC POLICY,
Bethesda, MD, June 22, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE GEKAS,
United House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GEKAS. On behalf of the Joint Steering Committee for Public Policy, representing 25,000 basic biomedical researchers, thank you for your leadership in organizing a Special Order on June 22 to discuss doubling the NIH budget in five years. We also thank you for introducing H. Res. 89, which calls for the same.

We wish to recognize your outstanding efforts through the Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus to educate the Congress about the National Institutes of Health and its ability to effectively utilize a 15%, $2 billion increase in this year's appropriation. We recognize that under current budget caps it will be difficult to achieve this goal, but we are confident that through your leadership and that of Congressman Porter, health research will be accelerated by this visionary investment.

As you well know, our country leads the world in biological science, enabled by a far-sighted national policy of federal funding for

research at our Nation's colleges and universities through the NIH and other agencies. The NIH is the major source of funds for critical research in laboratories throughout the U.S., on Alzheimer's disease, cancer, diabetes, AIDS and many other devastating diseases. This investment will provide a significant boost to those important efforts by translating the promise of scientific discovery into better health.

Through this second down payment towards doubling the NIH budget, we look forward to enhanced research in some of the research areas that have been presented at the Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus briefings this year. For instance, Dr. Robert Langer discussed ''designer tissues''. It was clear from his presentation that we are on the threshold of major discoveries that will enable the development of human tissue that will benefit those who have been injured or born with certain disabilities. Similarly, the discussion of hearing and deafness by Dr. A. James Hudspeth demonstrates how quickly treatments are moving forward from research to application in this area. It is our hope that through the 1999 Caucus briefing series, Members will see the great need for funding this important work.

Thank you for your support of biomedical research and basic science.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC S. LANDER, PH.D.,

Chair, Joint Steering Committee for Public Policy, Member, The Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research, Professor of Biology, The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Director, The Whitehead/MIT Center for Genome Research.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) who is one of the cochairs of our Biomedical Research Caucus.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding and also want to commend him for convening this special order.

I want to, Madam Speaker, rise today in strong support of H. Res. 89 which was a sense of the House Resolution that the House of Representatives should provide an additional $2 billion for the National Institutes of Health budget for the fiscal year 2000. This $2 billion additional investment would be the second down payment on a 5-year effort to double the NIH's budget.

As one of the four cochairs of the Congressional Biomedical Caucus, I have strongly supported providing maximum resources for biomedical research conducted at the NIH, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Defense research budget. This $2 billion investment in NIH's budget will help save lives and improve our international competitiveness. Our Nation's biomedical research is the envy of the world, but we must continue this investment to ensure that we maintain this preeminence.

This resolution would help to ensure more scientists have the resources they need to conduct cutting-edge research. Today, only one-third of NIH peer-reviewed, merit-based grants are funded. This additional investment would help us increase the number of grants awarded each year and ensure that young scientists continue to have the funds they need to discover new treatments for such life-threatening diseases as heart disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's, cancer and AIDS.

For many Americans, these life-threatening diseases are a very real challenge they face each day. Last week, I had the opportunity to meet with a remarkable young woman from Houston, Texas who lives in my district, Miss Caroline Rowley, who is fighting to control her juvenile diabetes. Caroline is 9 years old and must monitor and maintain her blood sugar every day to prevent life-threatening complications. In our meeting, Caroline told me how often she must prick her fingers every day in order to monitor the insulin level in her body. If she does not maintain her insulin, she can go into hypoglycemic shock and must be rushed to the emergency room to prevent complications. Clearly, Caroline believes that doubling the NIH's budget would help find a cure for her juvenile diabetes and result in a better life for her and millions of other children. I can just say as a father of two young daughters, the very sight of having to see a young girl, or any young child, have to go through this on a daily basis is not one that I cherish, and I think it is every reason why we should work hard to try and defeat that crippling disease.

I am also convinced that doubling the NIH's budget can be used wisely and will produce impressive results in biomedical research. The NIH budget currently supports the work of more than 50,000 scientists within the United States, yet many of these scientists are struggling to keep the research funding they currently receive. In this age of managed care, our Nation's teaching hospitals and academic health centers are facing challenges in meeting their mission of providing high quality care in a research-based setting. Conducting cutting-edge clinical research requires additional resources to help pay for the clinical trials and protocols conducted at academic health centers. Yet many managed care health plans are not willing to pay for these added costs. The NIH is critically important to helping our Nation's premier research centers to continue to fulfill their missions of high quality health care in an academic setting.

I also believe that investment in biomedical research is cost-effective for taxpayers. A recent National Science Foundation study found that government investments in research and development has produced big results, totaling about $60 billion a year. This study found that more than 70 percent of scientific papers identify government funding, not private research funding, as critical to new patents and biomedical discoveries.

This legislation is also consistent with the recommendations of our Nation's scientists. The Federation of American Societies of Experimental Biology recommend an NIH budget of $18 billion, an increase of 15 percent above this year's budget of $15.6 billion. This resolution would provide $2 billion more for the NIH, well on our way to meeting our goal of doubling the NIH budget over the 5-year period.

I also believe that investing in NIH helps our economy to grow. For every dollar spent on research and development, our national output is permanently increased by 50 cents or more each year. The government funds the basic research which biotechnology and pharmaceutical companies use to create therapies and treatments for cancer, diabetes and heart disease, to name just a few.

As the representative of the Texas Medical Center, one of our Nation's premier medical research centers, I have seen firsthand that this investment is yielding promising new therapies and treatments for all Americans. Earlier this year, it was announced that Baylor College of Medicine in my district will be one of three centers around the Nation that will map the human genome and accelerate the time line for completion of this project. With this new genetic map, researchers hope to understand the genetic basis for disease and provide new therapies by fixing genetic abnormalities.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I coauthored an amendment to add $2 billion to the NIH budget for fiscal year 2000. Although this amendment was not successful, I believe it is critically important to continue to remind our colleagues of the potential for successes with more investment in biomedical research. For many families, maximizing the NIH budget is an important part of their effort to fight and beat chronic diseases such as heart disease and diabetes. Recent NIH-sponsored research has shown that we have identified some of the genes responsible for diseases such as Huntingdon's disease and cystic fibrosis. As we learn more about the molecular basis for disease, we can bring new tools to defeat diseases and save lives.

As part of the Congressional Biomedical Caucus, we have also sponsored numerous meetings to discuss biomedical topics in Congress.

□ 1715

These highly successful luncheons have helped to educate Congress and staff about cutting edge research and being conducted through NIH-sponsored grants. With this new understanding, Congress can learn exactly how their investment is being used and where to focus new resources. I strongly urge the House of Representatives to support and become a cosponsor of H. Res. 89, legislation that would provide $2 billion more for the NIH budget as part of the Fiscal Year 2000 process. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Before I recognize the next one of our colleagues, I want to do some housekeeping here.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEKAS. We have been joined by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) who is in his own way a leader in various fields in health care and who joins us for this effort for which we are grateful. I yield to him.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania. I am also pleased to participate in this special order and support of doubling the NIH budget. Last year my colleagues will remember we were successful in our efforts to increase funding for the NIH. We all know how valuable the research being conducted by this institution is to our Nation's future, including its economic well-being. Advances in medical research to prevent, cure, or at least minimize the degree of financial devastation caused by such diseases is reason enough for us to fund this vital research project.

As my colleagues know, I would like to speak from a little parochial point of view, from Florida's point of view. I know how many of my constituents know how important NIH is, and in fact in 1998 the Sixth Congressional District in Florida received $53 million in funding from NIH. I want to share with my colleagues the results of an unreleased poll that came through the Research America and Alliance for Discoveries in Health. This results, I think, which I am going to speak on are pretty much conclusive and support my colleague from Pennsylvania and what he is trying to do, and I commend him for his long term effort on this project to make the public aware how important NIH is and how important this research is.

When I asked the people in the poll: Do we receive value for Federal dollars spent on medical research, 65 percent said we do get value for dollars spent. Fifteen percent responded they do not know, while 20 percent said we do not receive a value for dollars spent. When I asked: Do you support, and this is a basic thrust here, oppose a proposal to double total national spending on government sponsored medical research over 5 years, the results were very positive. In fact, I have a little graph here. From the spring of 1998 through the spring of 1999 the people who supported this doubling rose from 60 percent in the spring of 1998. In the summer of 1998 it went to 63 percent. In the spring of 1999 it went to 68 percent. So it is pretty conclusive when you talk to people in Florida how they feel about supporting or opposing a proposal to double national spending on government sponsored medical research. They overwhelmingly support it with 68 percent. When asked if Florida is a leader in medical research, the results are not quite so stellar. Thirty-six percent think Florida is a leader while 36 percent in Florida leads moderately. Seventeen percent said they do not even know, and 11 percent responded that they did not believe Florida was a leader. When I asked how important is it for Florida to be a leader in medical research, 93 percent responded that it is very, very important, and that is remarkable.

I agree with my fellow Floridians, and that is why I am here tonight, and that is why I am a cosponsor and supporter of the resolution to double NIH funding.

I also want to place in the RECORD an article by Wayne McCall who is a neighbor of mine. He is President of the National Alumni Association in which he talks all about this funding. So I would like to put this article into the RECORD:

[From the Alumni Scope]

WE CAN'T AFFORD TO LIMIT UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

Some in Florida feel that state university faculty should focus primarily on their role as teachers. They feel research is secondary—if not a complete waste of time. They argue that research, by its very nature, is successful only through inefficient and exorbitant expenditures of time, energy and money.

Such a view is short sighted. Research is critical to the future of our country and the world. The majority of the world's technological and medical breakthroughs are founded on university-based research. New ideas link university scientists and scholars to businesses. Today's scientific breakthrough achieved through university research becomes tomorrow's miracle drug.

Creative activities are an essential link in the university's mission of teaching, research and service.

And, the University of Florida excels in research. In 1992, its faculty attracted more than $235 million in research contracts and grants. The College of Engineering, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences and College of Liberals Arts and Sciences won major portions, as did medical researchers in UF's Health Science Center.

The health center's $57-million-per-year research program is a vital seedbed of discoveries that yields leads for improved diagnostic tests and treatments for disease. Research findings during 1992 and 1993, reported in many of the world's leading scientific journals, include potential advances for better health care for us all.

For example, UF researchers have successfully restored limited limb movement in cats with spinal cord damage. A UF neuroscientist has found evidence that structural abnormalities in the brain region covering language comprehension may be linked to dyslexia. Florida scientists recently discovered a method to deliver hormones that govern communication between the brain and body cells through the blood-brain barrier to aid treatment of certain brain diseases, including Alzheimer's.

Perhaps the most exciting development in the university's medical research mission is the new UF Brain Institute. An $18-million federal grant has been awarded and will be matched with other funds to construct a $58-million facility in which scientists will work to probe the mysteries of the brain.

There are countless other examples of economic and consumer research, agricultural advances, discoveries in chemistry, psychology and engineering that help keep us more productive, healthier and safer.

Historically, Florida has gotten more quality from its universities for less money than any other state in the country. But this accomplishment is in danger if Florida's legislative leaders continue their recent trend of failing to fund higher education adequately. Since 1989, UF alone has lost more than $50 million in state funding. By the time you read this, the 1993 legislative session may have ended, and that toll could be even higher.

In a state with the fourth-largest population and the fifth-largest economy in the country, Florida's legislative leaders must protect what previous generations have built. University research is an important and worthwhile part of that investment.

WAYNE MCCALL,
President, National Alumni Association.

This article points out that the many success stories in the State of Florida in university based research, none is more important nor more exciting than development in the university's medical research mission than the Brain Institute that is at the University of Florida in which scientists will work to search out the entire mysteries of the brain.

So, my colleague from Pennsylvania is doing yeoman service here in his effort to double the NIH budget, and, as he knows, I and others have been a long advocate, that the dollars we provide for research today will reap vast savings in the future, and I think that is a key to this whole solution. That is why I am also original cosponsor of the gentleman's biomedical research revitalization resolution of 1999, and I commend him for his efforts here, and I hope more of my colleagues will support him this year, in the 106th Congress. We can make an effort to accomplish this task.

Mr. GEKAS. We thank the gentleman for his contribution to this special order.

We now recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) who has been vocally in support of our efforts ever since he has been in the Congress, so we yield to him.

Mr. LAZIO. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership, for allowing us to display our commitment to the doubling of the National Institute of Health budget, including the budget for the National Cancer Institute. I want to say this is one of the most exciting times to live in America. We have an explosion of research that brings great promise. We are seeing that through the efforts of the National Cancer Institute new efforts in terms of mapping the human being through the human genome project. Angiogenesis analysis and inhibitors, the increase of clinical trials and molecular therapy are all exciting and promising areas of discovery. If we can just reach out and redouble our efforts, we can bring the promise of a cure and of our understanding that much closer than would otherwise be the case.

I also want to send acknowledgements to somebody very close to me, my wife, Patricia, who happens to be a

breast cancer advocacy unit leader who it is our anniversary today as well, and she is back in New York, but I want to commend her for her great work on behalf of cancer victims throughout our region.

Let us focus, if we can right now, on the invaluable benefits that biomedical research makes to the quality of life and to the promise of preserving human life. It makes necessary the sustained significant commitment to research efforts at NIH, our Nation's premier research institution, and reaffirms the commitment and the professionalism of the great NCI team headed by Dr. Richard Clauzner. Increasing the budget of the NCI will enable extraordinary opportunities for research success and real progress in cancer prevention, detection, treatment and survivorship. Current Federal funding for cancer research, however, is inadequate to make the kind of difference in the lives and the one in two American men and one in three American women who will develop cancer over his or her lifetime. We must dramatically increase our Federal investment in cancer research a relatively paultry 2.3 percent of the total cost of cancer in these United States at a mere $10.75 per person.

Cancer is quickly becoming the number one killer in America. Five 747 jumbo jets crashing every day for a year equals the 563,000 Americans who will die this year from cancer. Conservative estimates project that by 2010 and 11 short years cancer will become the leading cause of death as incidents increases 29 percent and mortality 25 percent and an annual cost of over $200 billion. These statistics indicate that much more aggressive effort is required to combat cancer and to reduce human suffering and lives lost to cancer, and yet while cancer is a greater threat than ever, only 31 percent of approved cancer research projects receive funding today. We must seize this opportunity to quicken the pace of research by funding the most research initiatives possible, and we know what that brings:

For example, I have had the pleasure of holding forums as the founder and chairman of the House Cancer Awareness Working Group, and I want to thank so many Members for playing a role in this. We know that through a commitment through NCI for childhood cancer we have increased mortality rates for one of the most devious and troubling forms of cancer, and that is cancer for effecting children. But we also know by getting children into NIH protocol hospitals and by ensuring that they are in clinical trials we are saving more children. We need to bring that same promise to adults.

We must do it for Enri Nuss of New York and all those like her who are fighting lymphoma today. We must do it for the Judy Lewises of the world who are fighting breast cancer today. We must do it for Jeffrey Theobold, a young man I am proud to have called a friend who died just recently from cancer at the young age of 8. We do it for all the family members who suffer with cancer and are victims on a daily basis.

The costs, both human and economic of cancer in this country are catastrophic. Our national investment in cancer research is the key to reduce spiraling health care costs. Research has shown that for every dollar invested in research, $13 in health care costs is saved; for every dollar invested in research, $13 saved. But it is more important to give cancer victims and their families the peace of mind that everything possible is being done to cure this devastating disease.

I want to thank my colleagues here in Congress who have been advocating for increased funding, and particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) who has been just a stalwart and a leader on this issue, and I am so pleased and proud to serve with him over the last few years. I am glad that we are going to resist the President's recommended budget on NIH who advocates a mere 2.4 percent increase this year for the National Cancer Institute and a 2.1 percent for NIH as a whole. This is no time to withhold resources for medical research, Mr. President.

I want to concur with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and encourage all of our colleagues to support doubling of the budgets of NIH and NCI because it is the right thing to do for America, and it is the right thing to do for the economy, it is the right thing to do to restrain health care costs, and certainly the right thing to do for America's families and the victims of cancer throughout our country.

I want to thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity to join you today and to be your partner and to discuss this vitally important topic.

Mr. GEKAS. We welcome your continued contribution, and we thank you for your participation today.

We now yield just for a moment before we get to the gentleman from Florida to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) who wants to make an introduction.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I just want to say that I have the Russell Thomas children with me, Becca, Anna, Rachel and their niece, and they are learning about democracy firsthand, and thank you for your courtesy to let me introduce them.

Mr. GEKAS. By all means, and welcome the young people because part of what we are discussing here today right now has to do with maintaining healthy lives for the children of our country.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. And you are doing an outstanding job in that.

Mr. GEKAS. We thank you for that.

And now I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) who has been waiting patiently in the wings and has heard our colleagueswho have participated in this project proceed. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you for recognizing me for just a few minutes to talk about the subject that you are involved in here tonight, and that is adequate funding for research. I think it is very fitting that I be here tonight representing the State of Florida, and the State of Florida today is in mourning. We are in mourning for the wife of our Lieutenant Governor who passed away at 2:20 on Sunday afternoon, Mary Brogan. Anyone who knew Mary Brogan knew she was a fighter, knew she was always at her husband's side even when he was the Commissioner of Education in the State of Florida and through his election as Lieutenant Governor with our current Governor Jeb Bush. Today they held a memorial service in our State capital for Mary Brogan. Mary Brogan fought breast cancer. How important it is that we continue our fight for research, for adequate funding, for the National Institute of Health, for cancer research, so that we do not have to have another memorial service for another beautiful lady like Mary Brogan. She was only 44 years old, but she left behind many great memories. She even, when she was diagnosed with breast cancer and even before, became a strong advocate for research, for work such as you are dedicated here tonight.

□ 1730

We miss Mary Brogan. We salute her fine work, her courage right to the end, and I think it is a fitting memorial to Mary Brogan and others who have been victims of cancer that we pick up the responsibility of seeing that there is adequate funding, that there is adequate research, and that these agencies go forward to find a cure for a horrible disease.

So I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for his work, for his efforts tonight, and for allowing me to spend just a moment memorializing a wonderful lady with a wonderful smile who I will always remember.

I am grateful for the work of the gentleman.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, we thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for his comments.

The chart that we have here, before I introduce the next speaker on our list here, is entitled, The Promise of NIH Research for Health. Every one of our colleagues spoke about a particular subject in which they were interested or in which they saw progress, and that is what the NIH does. Every single investigation that the NIH conducts into a known disease, or an unknown disease for that matter, results in improvement in our body politic as far as the health of our citizens is concerned and helps preserve and protect our treasury as well.

Just to give an idea of some of the subject matters that were touched upon by our colleagues, earlier detection of cancer with new molecular technologies, that falls right into place with some of the subject matter; medications for the treatment of alcoholism and drug addiction; new ways to relieve

pain; earlier detection of cancer, which we heard so much about incidents of cancer from our colleagues, with new molecular technologies, et cetera. Everything that NIH does touches upon every family.

The next chart, please. In the meantime, I will offer into evidence the written documentation that backs the charts that we are presenting here.

History has demonstrated that government initiatives and support for research and development can reduce the time required to bring benefits to the American public. The benefits of this national investment in biomedical and behavioral research are realized on several levels: reducing pain and suffering; improving the quality of life; advancing the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease and disability; and contributing to a stronger economy through health care cost savings and increased productivity of our citizens.

1998 health care costs for the major diseases are estimated as follows: Heart Disease: $128 billion; Cancer: $104 billion; Alzheimer's Disease: $138 billion; Mental Disorders: $148 billion; Arthritis: $65 billion; Depression: $44 billion; Stroke: $30 billion; and Osteoporosis: $10 billion.

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) plays a critical role in facilitating innovations that lead to significant reductions in health care costs. In a series of case studies published in 1993, the NIH identified 34 examples of clinical trials and applied research studies that have resulted in savings in treatment costs and reductions in lost productivity due to disease, disability, and premature death. Together, the examples yield an estimated annual potential savings ranging from $8.3 billion to $12 billion.

THE PROMISE OF NIH RESEARCH FOR HEALTH

Identify genetic predispositions and risk factors for heart attack and stroke.

New approaches to treating and preventing diabetes and its complications.

Genomic sequencing of disease-causing organisms to identify new targets for drug development.

Earlier detection of cancer with new molecular technologies.

New ways to relieve pain.

Diagnostic imaging for brain tumors, cancers, chronic illnesses.

Assess drugs for their safety and efficacy in children.

Medications for the treatment of alcoholism and drug addiction.

Rigorous evaluation of CAM practices (complementary and alternative medicine).

Clinical trials database—help public gain access to information about clinical trials.

Understand the role of infections in chronic diseases.

Vaccines for preventing HIV infection, middle ear infection, typhoid, dysentery, TB, E. coli food contamination

Human genome sequence to assess predisposition to disease, predict responses to drugs and environmental agents, and design new drugs

New means of detecting and combating agents of bioterrorism

New ways to repair/replace organs, tissues, and cells damaged by disease and trauma

Understand and ameliorate health disparities

Improved interventions for lead poisoning in children

New interventions for neonatal hearing loss

Safer, more effective medications for depression and other mental illnesses

New approaches to preventing rejection of transplanted organs, tissues, cells

New treatments and preventive strategies for STDs (sexually transmitted diseases)

New approaches to restoring function after spinal cord injury

EMERGENCY FUNDS NEEDED FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

THERE ARE SERIAL KILLERS LOOSE!

Killers also known as tuberculosis (TB), malaria and aids.

''These killers took six times as many lives in the past 50 years, as wars over the same period.'' (World Health Organization June, 1999 Report).

Victims of all infectious diseases: Number 1 killer in the world; number 3 killer in the U.S.; 11 million killed globally in 1998; and 180,000 killed in the U.S. in 1998.

''I am confident that a major pandemic will be repeated, even through the world is better equipped to deal with it.'' (Nobel Laureate Joshua Lederberg—Future Speaker at Biomedical Research Caucus Briefing on 10/20/99, ''Biological Warfare.'')

THE CONGRESSIONAL BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH CAUCUS

We organized a biomedical research caucus ten years ago for the purpose of informing members and staff about the latest development in biomedical research and the treatment of diseases.

We now have nearly 100 members and have had 80 briefings.

First, Dr. Harold Varmus and now Dr. Michael Bishop, chancellor, University of California at San Francisco have been our advisors and recommended speakers and subjects to us.

We have covered a great number of topics, including cancer, alzheimer's, diabetes, learning disorders, and I want to include in the RECORD at this point the eight caucus topics we have scheduled for this year. And I will note that we will be hearing about stem cell research, heart failure and biology warfare.

These caucuses are sponsored by the Joint Steering Committee for Public Policy which is chaired by Dr. Eric Lander of the Whitehead Institute at MIT. Four scientific societies, the American Society for Cell Biology, the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, the Biophysical Society and the Genetics Society of America make up the steering committee.

Also, we have been offered the opportunity to bring these caucus briefings to interested people throughout the country through knowledge television broadcasts. This will provide cutting edge research information to our constituents so that they can understand the hard decisions we must make on NIH funding.

CONGRESSIONAL BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH CAUCUS

1999 SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

March 3, 1999—Designer Tissues, Robert Langer, The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

March 24, 1999—Hearing & Deafness, A. James Hudspeth, The Rockefeller University.

April 21, 1999—Learning Disorders, Paula Tallal, Rutgers University.

May 19, 1999—The Sequence of the Worm Genome: What it Means for Human Biology, Martin Chalfie, Columbia University.

June 16, 1999—Nitric Oxide: The Serious Side of Laughing Gas, Solomon Snyder, The Johns Hopkins University.

September 15, 1999—The Potential of Stem Cell Research, John Gearhart, The Johns Hopkins University.

October 6, 1999—New Approaches to the Study of Heart Failure, Eric Olson, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center.

October 20, 1999—Biological Warfare, Joshua Lederberg, The Rockefeller University.

Before we go to the next one, we recognize the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), who himself has been a stalwart defender of the faith, as it were, in our efforts on behalf of doubling the funding for NIH.

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

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for yielding and congratulate him for organizing this particular discussion.

Everyone knows what a tremendous asset the National Institutes of Health has been to our Nation. It is truly one of the jewels of the research effort within this nation. I appreciate the gentleman yielding time for this particular discussion and for the comments that I have to make, because I wish to broaden the discussion, not just from the National Institutes of Health and their dependence upon biological knowledge but some of the background for that knowledge and where it comes from and how that relates to our research efforts today.

As we have heard, biological knowledge is in the midst of an explosion that is generating tremendous advances in our knowledge and technological capabilities, and particularly in developments for health care. Specifically, we are making very rapid progress in the tools that we have at our disposal for the treatment of disease and other medical afflictions.

The National Institutes of Health has, to a large extent, been our steward through this astounding growth phase of the life sciences. The leadership at NIH has been deliberate and patient in its investment in fundamental research projects which have matured to produce knowledge we can use to improve diagnostic tests, choose more effective treatments or even design new drugs to target specific diseases.

With the completion of the Human Genome Project, we may soon move toward a medical environment where particular forms of disease are treated with therapies customized to an individual's genetic makeup and clinical manifestations. However, the NIH has not been the only supporter of such novel and groundbreaking research. Nor has biomedical science been the sole source of our medical advances.

In fact, the recent surge in biological research has evolved through a synergistic relationship between all scientists, and that is the point I wish to make this evening. As a physicist, for example, I can point to a number of contributions from my field that have enhanced our biomedical capabilities in the laboratory and the doctor's office.

Significantly, the medical applications of these projects were not foreseen at the time they were funded and that illustrates the importance of supporting and sponsoring basic research, which eventually does result in such beneficial effects to the human race.

As an example, the discovery of x-rays, which is a curiosity over 100 years ago when discovered by Rsntgen, as we know x-rays have tremendous medical applications today. It is hard to find any one of us who has not had numerous x-rays.

At the same time, what many of us do not know is that x-ray crystallography, which allows us to examine the details of protein structure as well as electromicroscopy, which allows us to look inside the cell and its working components, the organelles, both have been extremely important in also helping improve health care and diagnosis and treatment.

I have also described on the floor before another important tool, that is, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, MRI, which is a fascinating development because it shows the importance of basic research in very esoteric fields of physics.

In this particular case, nuclear magnetic resonance developed in the early 1950s, resulting in Nobel prizes for Ed Purcell and Felix Bloch, was a completely esoteric field, of interest only to those studying nuclear structure. It allows us to measure nuclear magnetic moments, electric quadrupole moments, as well as nuclear spins.

Another esoteric development at that time was developing data gathering and analysis techniques for discovering elementary particles in physics, totally unrelated esoteric fields within physics and yet they combine to result in MRI, which is the most advanced and superb diagnostic tool we have available today and certainly essential to the work done at NIH in other areas.

Beyond physics and chemistry, biology is dependent upon seemingly unrelated fields to support its growth. A prime example today is computer science. Digital analysis of tissue samples, rapid dissemination of information, both in the form of raw data between scientists and education information for public health uses, data bank compilation and analysis, and biological modeling programs, are all examples of how progress in biomedical research is sustained by growth in other scientific disciplines.

As was recommended in the Science Policy Report prepared by the Committee on Science last fall, adopted by them, and then adopted by this House as H. Res. 578, the Federal Government has an irreplaceable role to play in the Nation's basic research endeavors through stable and substantial funding reports.

I just want to make certain that everyone understands we have a responsibility to ensure that our cumulative research portfolio is balanced among the various disciplines, and I support Dr. Harold Varmus for his fine work in this and his recognition of our dependence upon many other sciences.

I'd like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me to participate in this important discussion of the research priorities facing our nation as we enter the 21st century.

As we have heard, biological knowledge is in the midst of an explosion that is generating tremendous advances in our knowledge and technological capabilities. Specifically, we are making rapid progress in the tools that we have at our disposal for the treatment of disease and other medical afflictions.

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) has, to a large extent, been our steward through this astounding growth phase in the life sciences. The leadership at NIH has been deliberate and patient in its investment in fundamental research projects which have matured to produce knowledge we can use to improve diagnostic tests, choose more effective treatments, or even design new drugs to target specific diseases. With the completion of the Human Genome Project, we may soon move toward a medical environment where particular forms of disease are treated with therapies customized to an individual's genetic make-up and clinical manifestations.

However, the NIH has not been the only supporter of such novel and groundbreaking research. Nor has biomedical science been the sole source of our medical advances. In fact, the recent surge in biological research has evolved through a synergistic relationship of all the sciences.

As a physicist, I can point to several contributions from my field that have enhanced our biomedical capabilities in the laboratory and the doctor's office. Significantly, the medical applications of these projects were not foreseen at the time they were funded. I have described one of these tools to you on this floor before, that of Magnetic Resonance Imaging—a result of studies in nuclear and particle physics—crystallography, which allows us to examine the details of protein structure, and electron microscopy, which allows us to look inside the cell at its working components, the organelles.

Beyond physics and chemistry, biology is dependent upon other seemingly unrelated fields to support its growth. A prime example today is computer science. Digital analysis of tissue samples, rapid dissemination of information (both in the form of raw data between scientists and education information for public health nurses), data bank compilation and analysis, and biological modeling programs are all examples of how progress in biomedical research is sustained by growth in other scientific disciplines.

As recommended in the Science Policy Report released by the Committee on Science last fall, and adopted by this body as H. Res. 578, the Federal Government has an irreplaceable role to play in the Nation's basic research endeavors through stable and substantial funding support. However, we also have a responsibility to ensure that our cumulative research portfolio is balanced among the disciplines to sustain the overall health of our research investment.

I would like to close with a quote from Dr. Harold Varmus, the Director of NIH. Speaking at the Centennial Meeting of the American Physical Society this past March, Dr. Varmus stated that ''one of [his] convictions about medical research [was] that the NIH can wage an effective war on disease only if we—as a nation and a scientific community, not just a single agency—harness the energies of many disciplines, not just biology and medicine.''

I agree with Dr. Varmus, and I also agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and my other colleagues. We should capitalize on the advances which our past research investments are yielding in the health-related fields by increasing funding, but we must do so responsibly. We must not sacrifice today's fundamental research projects for quick advances in one field. Rather, we should concurrently nurture today's biomedical success while investing in tomorrow's unknown promises.

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

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for yielding, I want to commend him for having this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to the Members: America has always been up to the challenge, whether it was building the transcontinental railroad to unite our West Coast with the rest of the Nation after the civil war; putting a man on the moon; or soldiers coming back from a war; devising a GI bill; the interstate system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with the biggest challenge of all and that is the challenge that confronts each of us daily, and that is the challenge of disease. So I am proud to be a part of this effort in combatting it.

I did want to mention two people, Dr. Beatrice Hahn of UAB, who has actually, as a result of an NIH grant, traced over a 20-year period the origins of AIDS; and also Dr. Robert Castleberry and Dr. Peter Emmanuel, who have found the origin of a very rare form of childhood leukemia which only affects children under the age of 5. That is all as a result of NIH funding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention two teams of University of Alabama in Birmingham (UAB) researchers both of which have made progress in conquering or controlling two of our most prolific diseases, AIDS and Leukemia. The first team, led by Dr. Beatrice Hahn and her husband Dr. George Shaw, have waged a 20 year quest which resulted in the discovery of the origin of HIV1.

THE ORIGIN OF HIV–1: UAB RESEARCHERS LEAD DISCOVERY EFFORT

(Synopsis Research News, Feb. 2, 1999)

UAB scientists have discovered the origin of Human-Immunodeficiency Virus Type 1 (HIV–1), the virus that causes AIDS in humans. This finding by an international team of scientists led by Beatrice H. Hahn, MD, of UAB, solves a 20-year-old puzzle regarding the beginnings of the AIDS epidemic, which now afflicts some 30 million people worldwide. Dr. Hahn presented her study on January 31 at the 6th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections in Chicago. A paper detailing the discovery appears in the February 4 issue of the journal Nature.

Dr. Hahn, a professor of medicine and microbiology at UAB, is senior author of the paper. Feng Gao, MD, research assistant professor of medicine at UAB, is the paper's lead author.

The researchers identified a subspecies of chimpanzee *(Pan troglodytes troglodytes)* native to West-Central Africa as the natural reservoir for HIV–1. ''We have long suspected a virus from African primates to be the cause of human AIDS. However, exactly

which animal species was responsible was unknown,'' says Dr. Gao. Viruses related to HIV–1 had previously been found in chimpanzees and were given the designation SIVcpz (for Simian Immunodeficiency Virus). However, only three such infected animals were identified, and one of these harbored a virus so different from HIV–1 that most scientists questioned a direct relationship to the human virus.

SOPHISTICATED MOLECULAR TECHNIQUES

The recent breakthrough came when Dr. Hahn and her colleagues identified a fourth SIVcpz infected chimpanzee and used sophisticated molecular techniques to analyze all four viruses and the animals from which they were derived. The researchers found that three of the four SIVcpz strains came from chimpanzees that belonged to the *Pan troglodytes troglodytes* subspecies. The fourth virus strain, which was genetically divergent from the other three, came from an animal that belonged to a different chimpanzee subspecies, termed *Pan troglodytes schweinfurthi,* native to East Africa. The scientists then discovered that all known strains of HIV–1, including the major group M (responsible for the global AIDS epidemic), as well as groups N and O (found only in West-Central Africa), were closely related only to SIVcpz strains infecting *Pan troglodytes troglodytes*.

The puzzle's final piece was put in place when the researchers realized that the natural habitat for *Pan troglodytes troglodytes* overlaps precisely with the region in West-Central Africa where all three groups of HIV–1 (M, N, and O) were first recognized. Based on these findings, Dr. Hahn and her colleagues concluded that *Pan troglodytes troglodytes* is the origin of HIV–1 and has been the source of at least three independent cross-species transmission events of SIVcpz.

While the origin of the AIDS epidemic has been clarified, an explanation for why the epidemic arose in the mid-20th century, and not before, remains a matter of speculation. ''Chimpanzees are frequently hunted for food, especially in West-Central Africa, and we believe that HIV–1 was introduced into the human population through exposure to blood during hunting and field dressing of these animals,'' says Dr. Hahn. And she believes that, while incidental transmissions of chimpanzee viruses to humans may have occurred throughout history, it was the socioeconomic changes in post-World War II Africa that provided the particular circumstances leading to the spread of HIV–1 and the development of the AIDS epidemic. ''Increasing urbanization, breakdown of traditional lifestyles, population movements, civil unrest, and sexual promiscuity are all known to increase the rates of sexually transmitted diseases and thus likely triggered the AIDS pandemic,'' adds Dr. Hahn.

''The importance of the current findings could be far reaching,'' says George Shaw, MD, PhD, a Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigator at UAB and a principal author of the paper. ''Chimpanzees are identical to humans in over 98% of their genome, yet they appear to be resistant to the damaging effects of the AIDS virus on the immune system. By studying the biological reasons for this difference, we may be able to obtain important clues concerning the pathogenic basis of HIV–1 in humans and possibly new strategies for treating the disease more effectively.'' He further adds that a better understanding of exactly how the chimpanzee's immune system responds to SIVcpz infection compared to that of humans is likely to lead to the development of more effective strategies for an HIV–1 vaccine.

BUSH-MEAT TRADE

Finally, the authors of the paper note that transmission of SIVcpz could still be ongoing. ''The bushmeat trade—the hunting and killing of chimpanzees and other endangered animals for human consumption—is a common practice in West-Central Africa and represents an ongoing risk for humans,'' says Dr. Hahn. ''Subsistency hunting has always been a part of West-Central African culture, but increasing logging activities in the past decade have provided unprecedented access to remote forest regions and have led to the commercialized killing of thousands of chimpanzees, gorillas, and monkeys. It took us 20 years to find where HIV–1 came from, only to realize that the very animal species that harbors it is at the brink of extinction.''

''We cannot afford to lose these animals, either from an animal conservation or a medical investigative standpoint,'' she says. ''It is quite possible that the chimpanzee, which has served as the source of HIV–1, also holds the clues to its successful control.'' Dr. Hahn and her colleagues hope that, as a consequence of their research, there will be additional measures taken to discourage chimpanzee poaching and to preserve this and other endangered primate species.

The team of scientists responsible for the AIDS discovery include UAB's Ya-Lu Chen, Cynthia Rodenburg, and Scott Michael, as well as Paul Sharp and Elizabeth Bailes from the University of Nottingham in England; David Robertson from the Laboratory of Structural and Genetic Information in Marseilles, France; Larry Cummins from the Southwest Foundation for Biomedical Research in Texas; Larry Arthur from the Frederick Cancer Research and Development Center in Frederick, Maryland; and Martine Peeters from the Laboratory of Retroviruses at ORSTOM in Montpellier, France.

The research was funded by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

The second team led by Dr. Peter Emanuel and Dr. Robert Castleberry, were involved in a 13 year effort to save our youngest citizens. Dr. Peter Emanuel at UAB is one of the first recipients of the K24 awards. The K24 award is an individual grant to aid in patient-oriented research and to allow the individual to mentor younger trainees. Dr. Emanuel and his colleague, Dr. Robert Castleberry, also at UAB, have been investigating for over a decade a rare but very deadly form of childhood leukemia which affects children under the age of five. Over their thirteen years of research in this disorder they have emerged as the world's leaders for this childhood leukemia, have led the investigations revealing the cellular and genetic mechanisms which cause this leukemia, and have discovered new therapies for this dreaded leukemia. As a result of this K24 award and other grants from the NIH and the Leukemia Society of America, Drs. Emanuel and Castleberry are about to start a new treatment protocol for this childhood leukemia which will cover all of North America. This treatment protocol will include chemotherapy, bone marrow transplantation, an experimental drug, and a vitamin A derivative, the latter two being developed as a result of discoveries made in the laboratory and taken to the patient bedside, so-called ''Translational Research.'' This protocol, being conducted in close conjunction with the National Cancer Institute (NCI), will begin in the coming months. In addition, a North American registry and a web site for families and physicians alike are all in the works.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, we want to acknowledge the presence of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), but we have no time to yield to him but we thank him for his participation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for another 3 hours so we can complete our message but I do not think I will get it. I see some heads shaking over there, but we thank everyone for the time that has been accorded us.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H. Res. 89, calling for a $2,000,000,000 increase in the Federal investment in biomedical research in fiscal year 2000. Such an increase is vital to ensure that Congress fulfills the commitment it made last year to double the budget of the National Institutes of Health over five years.

I support H. Res. 89 with the hope that this increase will enable the National Institutes of Health to accelerate its research efforts in two particular areas that I feel have been neglected in the past. The first area is Ovarian Cancer. Each year more than 14,000 women die of Ovarian Cancer in the United States. There are no reliable methods for early detection so most women are diagnosed in the late stages when the five-year survival rate is only 15–20 percent. Even more tragic is the fact that a large portion of these women are only in their 20's and 30's when struck with this disease.

While the general population has grown more and more familiar with some cancers in recent years, ovarian cancer continues to fall below the radar of the general public. Until recently, little research was done exclusively on ovarian cancer, and to date, no early detection method for ovarian cancer has been developed. As a direct result, mortality rates for Ovarian Cancer have remained the same for the past 50 years. This is truly disheartening.

Such destruction compelled me to introduce legislation to address these research inadequacies. Every year since 1991, I have introduced legislation to promote and advance the ovarian cancer research and public education effort. In this Congress I have introduced H.R. 961, the Ovarian Cancer Research and Information Amendments of 1999.

The Ovarian Cancer Research and Information Amendments of 1999 has three components. First, it authorizes $150 million of ovarian cancer research, one half to be spent on basic cancer research and one half on clinical trials and treatment. Of this research, the bill requires that priority be given to: developing a test for the early detection of ovarian cancer; research to identify precursor lesions and research to determine the manner in which benign conditions progress to malignant status; research to determine the relationship between ovarian cancer and endometriosis; and appropriate counseling, for women who participate as subjects in research, including counseling about the genetic basis of the disease.

Second, the bill provides for a comprehensive information program to provide the patients and the public information regarding screening procedures; information on the genetic basis to ovarian cancer; any known factors which increase risk of getting ovarian cancer; and any new treatments for ovarian cancer.

Finally, it requires that the National Cancer Advisory Board include one or more individuals who are at high risk for developing ovarian cancer.

It is time that we commit to ovarian cancer research the resources it deserves and give women a fighting chance in the war against ovarian cancer.

Doubling the budget for NIH will also strengthen our commitment to research in eye disease and vision disorders conducted at the National Eye Institute (NEI).

Given the demographics of the American population, blinding eye and vision disorders pose a tremendous challenge to our health care system and income support programs. By the year 2030, the elderly population in the United States is expected to double and more than 66 million Americans will be at risk for blinding eye disorders. Cataracts afflict 29 percent of Americans between ages 65 and 74; glaucoma afflicts over 2 million Americans and is the leading cause of blindness in African Americans; age-related macular degeneration afflicts 1.7 million Americans; and diabetic retinopathy is the most frequent cause of new blindness in our working population between the ages of 24 and 74. The incidence of these diseases promises to increase as the 'baby-boomers' age.

Today, eye and vision disorders cost society $38 billion every year. This cost will grow exponentially unless existing research opportunities are vigorously pursued.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues to remain firmly committed to doubling the NIH budget, and furthermore, to ensure that the National Eye Institute receives a corresponding increase. Unfortunately, an analysis of funding trends over time indicates that the increases in the NEI budget have not kept pace with the increases received by the NIH. Since 1985, the NIH budget has grown by 60 percent while the NEI budget has grown by only 24 percent. When the appropriations over the past five years are averaged, the NEI has received the second smallest increase of the NIH programs. This is appalling given the serious diseases afflicting the aging eye. I am concerned about the commitment to eye and vision research reflected in this trend and have introduced legislation, H.R. 731, calling for a doubling of the NEI's budget over a five-year period. I invite all of my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this legislation.

When asked what sense do you fear losing the most, a majority of Americans respond that it is their vision. We, as representatives, have an obligation to make our commitment to eye and vision research at the NEI as strong as our commitment to the biomedical research enterprise at NIH. I urge my colleagues to support a 15 percent increase for NIH and NEI in Fiscal Year 2000, which will keep this Congress on track to doubling the budget of these institutions.

I urge my colleagues to make biomedical research a priority and support doubling the research efforts at the National Institutes of Health and to support increasing research efforts at the National Eye Institute and for Ovarian Cancer at the National Cancer Institute.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr GEKAS, for arranging this Special Order, and I rise in strong support of Mr. GEKAS' House Resolution 89, calling for the doubling of the NIH budget by Fiscal Year 2003. As a member of the Biomedical Research Caucus and as someone who has personally benefited from the advances in biomedical research, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there isn't an American today that has not benefited from the ground-breaking medical advances made by the National Institutes of Health. Future investments in NIH hold the key to long-awaited breakthroughs in life-threatening diseases and ailments that plague our society. Biomedical research is not only responsible for improving the lives of Americans and savings in health care, but it is also vital to our economic competitiveness. America is the leader in medical technology and that is why it is so important that we continue to invest in research so we do not lose our competitive advantage in this critical field.

In my district in Boston, several teaching hospitals and academic research facilities are leaders in producing biomedical research advances that have improved health care and the quality of life for patients, not only in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but throughout the world. This vital research produces new knowledge and technology, and it also provides the knowledge necessary for developing earlier, cost-effective diagnosis, less invasive surgical procedures, more effective rehabilitation and improved patient care. In 1998, Massachusetts teaching hospitals received $421 million in funding from the NIH, which represents 47 percent of total NIH funding to independent teaching hospitals throughout the country. The NIH funding to teaching hospitals and universities in Massachusetts makes my home state the medical Mecca of the world.

Increasing the NIH budget will enable the medical community to continue its breakthroughs in finding cures for heart disease, AIDS, cancer, diabetes, cystic fibrosis, Alzheimer and many other life-threatening diseases. Increased funding is also critical to attracting our best and brightest students into the medical research field. It is vital that the government foster an environment in which medical research can flourish.

With increased investment in the NIH, more grants and research centers will be funded and NIH will be able to direct funds to previously underfunded areas of biomedical research. One area that I hope we will renew our nation's commitment to is eye and vision research. I am increasingly concerned about the impact of blinding disorders on our nation as America ages. One out of every four Americans 75 years of age and older suffers from serious vision loss which is not correctable with glasses. For example, mascular degeneration is an irreversible loss of central vision and is the leading cause of visual impairment among the elderly. Also, diabetic retinopathy is an inevitable complication in patients with long term Type 1 and Type 2 diabetes and is the leading cause of blindness among Americans aged 25–74. Given the demographics in the American population, eye research is critical. Over the next thirty years, the number of Americans aged 75 and over will double. Unless we develop medical cures for these ailments, millions of Americans will lose their independence because of eye disorders.

In recent years, our nation's investments in eye and vision research conducted through the National Eye Institute (NEI) has just not measured up to the strength of our commitment in other areas of biomedical research at NIH. The NEI has received the second smallest increase of all NIH programs when you look at the average of appropriations from the last five years. Since 1985, NIH has grown more than 60 percent, while NEI has grown by only 24 percent. I fear if this trend continues, it will result in a disastrous situation when the demographics of the next millennium are considered.

In order to reverse this trend I have joined my colleagues, Congresswoman PATSY MINK, as a cosponsor of her legislation, H.R. 731, which specifically calls for a doubling of the NEI budget over five years. I urge all of my colleagues to support in these efforts to increase funding in biomedical research and to continue to make solid investments in the health and well-being of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative GEORGE GEKAS for his leadership and commitment to biomedical research.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in American dramatist Tennessee Williams' play of the 1950's, ''Cat On a Hot Tim Roof'', ''Big Daddy,'' fearing that a tumor found in his body is cancerous, speaks of ''a man not having a pig's advantage.'' He refers to the human race's unique ability to conceive of its own mortality. Truly, the number of men and women throughout the world daily battling illness and disability is a constant reminder of the reality that humanity is at war with disease and death. What Big Daddy did not acknowledge, and also what most of us often fail to recognize, is that the human ability to conceive of our mortality does not confine us to the status of the disadvantaged. Instead, it affords us an advantage in terms of our capacity to treat and even cure disease should we focus our resources—combining our intellectual faculties with financial and technological resources in the biomedical field—toward the common goal of fighting disease.

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) is the organization in the U.S. where such resources are directed toward the discovery of treatments and cures for illnesses. Research at the NIH ranges from various forms of cancer to disorders which are cardiovascular, psychological, and neurological in nature. It extends also from immune deficiency disorders to diabetes and cystic fibrosis.

Because the NIH seeks to protect, treat, and preserve what is common to all humans—life—the benefits of NIH research are not confined to any specific race, sex, religion, or geographic region. Some of the major advances of the NIH in the past fifty years which serve the public include vaccines against polio, hepatitis B, and many other infectious agents; penicillin and other antibiotics; recommendations for health-promoting diet and lifestyle, including simple amens to lower the incidence of heart disease; replacements for many hormone and vitamin deficiencies; new methods for contraception; tests to protect the blood supply from hepatitis B and C viruses and HIV; new surgical methods, including organ transplantation and implantation of pacemakers and artificial joints; effective therapies for certain leukemias and cancers; drugs effective against mental illnesses; new therapeutics, such as blood cell growth factors, from recombinant DNA technologies; in vitro fertilization methods; and genetic testing for many inherited diseases. Needless to say, the list could go on forever. As our nation has historically been a leader in biomedical research, increasing Congressional funding to support the work of NIH would be a proactive step to continue our commitment to fight humanity's war against disease. Increasing the federal investment in biomedical research by $2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 would provide the scientific and medical communities

the resources necessary to continue to improve the quality of life for Americans and human beings worldwide.

As an original co-sponsor of House Resolution 89 and as co-chair of the Biomedical Research Caucus, I think the fact that the 106th Congress has witnessed for the first time in over 20 years an Administration's request for civilian R&D to exceed that for defense is just one reflection of the escalated need to prioritize biomedical research in the next century. We are presently at the close of a century which the average life expectancy in the United States has increased by nearly thirty years. As stated by Dr. Harold Varmus, director of NIH, such statistics make victory over disease and disability a goal that is realistic. For example, research sponsored by the NIH will map and sequence the entire human genome by 2005, leading to a new era of molecular medicine that will provide unprecedented opportunities for the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and cure of diseases that currently plague society.

However, while we commend the medical field for the developments over the 20th century which have prolonged life for Americans, we must also recognize that the work is far from complete. With the aging of our nation's population, neurodegenerative diseases, such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease, threaten to destroy the lives of millions of Americans, overwhelm the Nation's health care system, and bankrupt the medicare and medicaid programs. Incidentally, NIH researchers will inevitably face new puzzles about the human body, heredity, environmental insults, and infectious agents.

The bottom line is that the 25 institutes and centers of the NIH, each focusing on particular diseases or research areas inhuman health, receive their funding primarily from Congress. Ninety percent of NIH's budget is already committed to multi-year grant recipients for research, as well as the infrastructure of the Institutes and Centers. New scientific opportunities and earmarks compete for the remaining 10 percent, and these scientific inquiries would likely benefit public health. While overall funding for R&D has been reduced in recent years, biomedical funding at the NIH has nearly doubled over the last decade. Still however, about 75% of the research grant proposals submitted to NIH do not receive funding, leaving many scientists no choice but to find other careers. New discoveries in biomedical sciences require individual experimentation, and the prospect of winning the victory over disease becomes narrower and narrower as more scientists cease exploring for explanations, treatments, and cures.

In order to fully understand this issue, it is important to keep in mind the larger repercussions of the work of the National Institutes of Health. A present commitment to medical research in the U.S. means an eventual reduction in health care expenditures. Thus, allocating funds to the NIH is an investment that has the potential to yield favorable returns not only in terms of the quality of human life, but in economic terms as well. Furthermore, ''since our country leads the world in pharmaceuticals and research, in [the] development of technologies and biomedical advancement'' required to ''hone in on the eradication of disease, not only will we be steadily moving towards the goal of preventing'' and curing disease, but ''at the same time we will fashion a new leadership, economic worldwide leadership, for our country in producing the wherewithal by which to fight those diseases. What that means is more jobs, more enterprise, more prosperity, while helping save humanity from the ravages of the diseases in every corner of the world,'' even those too often unattended.

A discussion of a budget of billions of dollars for one organization can make the NIH funding issue seem impersonal, when it is exactly the personal level which makes the need for increased federal funding for NIH most clear. The debilitating and devastating effects of RETT syndrome, a neurological disorder which leaves little girls physically and mentally handicapped by three years of age, is just one example of a medical mystery in which the thousands of diagnosed individuals and their families must place all their hope in the NIH. Girls with the disorder show normal development until 6–18 months of life, then appear to arrest in development or regress in previously acquired skills. Traditional testing methods for the disease are inadequate because the inflicted child can not speak or gesture. In the early stages of the disorder, girls may exhibit the autistic features of withdrawal and isolation. Cognitive functioning appears to be severely impaired, but true understanding and intelligence are difficult to measure due to apraxia: the desire to move and respond, but incapability of directing movements.

The percentage of girls with RETT syndrome (about 50 percent who are able to walk are lucky. However, they do so in a broad based gait, which is often accompanied by shakiness of the limbs and torso. Other symptoms include: spasticity, curvature of the spine, and poor circulation of the legs causing loss of mobility. Many girls have abnormal breathing patterns such as hyperventilation and breath holding.

RETT syndrome has only recently been recognized in the United States. Several thousand people have been diagnosed with RETT syndrome this year, and it is estimated that many thousands more have gone undiagnosed. The prevalence of RETT syndrome is reported to be from one in ten thousand to one in fifteen thousand live female births.

There is currently no test for RETT syndrome. The girls must meet certain clinical criteria for diagnosis. Extensive laboratory investigations have not revealed a cause. But there is a suggestion that as the syndrome is confined to girls, a genetic basis may be indicated. More research is needed by many areas of the National Institutes of Health to give further insight into the disease in hopes of finding a cause, treatment, prevention, and cure. It is also well-documented that the research of RETT syndrome has an impact on similar neurodegenerative diseases and disorders such as Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, Huntington's disease, and the obvious autism and cerebral palsy. Clearly, increasing funding for NIH research and development would be instrumental in learning more about these diseases to help the victims, the families who care for and love them, and for all of us, who inevitably have a genetic predisposition for a disease or an environmental or lifestyle factor that places us at risk to develop an illness or disability for which we will one day place all hope in the NIH.

House Resolution 89 expresses Congressional approval of a federal expenditure of which every American would be a beneficiary. Whether it be through the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, or cure of one's own disease, or that of a family member; whether it be through positive repercussions for the nation's health care system; whether it be through the creation of jobs and enterprise through the medical industry—in some way or another, each and every citizen benefits from an investment in biomedical research. Should the 106th Congress increase funding for the NIH, the U.S. will continue to lead the world in biomedical research.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the world's leader in medical research. We spend more each year on research to cure and prevent disease than any other nation, and we are at the forefront of developing new and innovative treatments for diseases ranging from heart disease to breast cancer to AIDS.

Funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is a vital part of the Federal government's effort to improve the health of all Americans. Recognizing this fact, both Congress and the Administration have pledged to work together in a bipartisan way to double NIH's funding over the next several years.

But, we need to match action with words. While I have strongly supported efforts in the past to increase NIH's funding, and I will continue to do so in the future. Yet, there is great uncertainty over whether Congress can fulfill this commitment and maintain the fiscal discipline demanded of us by the balanced budget agreement.

The fact is, we must fulfill this commitment. Medical research is not only economically expedient, it is necessary to bring an end to the suffering of millions of Americans who have debilitating and terminal conditions. it is only through continued and expanded biomedical research that this Nation can hope to understand, prevent and cure the diseases that threaten our lives and the lives of our children.

We have already accomplished great things, in the field of biomedical research as I previously mentioned. But what we have accomplished yesterday will pale in comparison to what we can accomplish tomorrow. There is no doubt about it, we are on the cusp of a revolution in biomedical research. We can either embrace the revolution crush it before it begins.

The choice should be obvious. It is simply common sense that the most cost-effective way to treat diseases is to either cure them or prevent them. Prevention, while ideal, is not going to be completely effective. Experience has taught us that disease will occur no matter what steps are taken to prevent it.

So, we need to find a cure. Only by performing research into the nature of disease can we hope to unlock their secrets. Once a cure is discovered, it becomes a simple matter of administering the medication/vaccine. The difficult part is finding the cure. Research is the key and without dollars there can be no research.

I urge all my colleagues to renew and strengthen their commitment to making biomedical research a top priority as we enter the next millennium. Our children and their children will thank us as they live longer, and healthier lives.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for organizing this special order and for his

tireless efforts to educate our colleagues on the importance of biomedical research.

I stand today as one of what I am pleased to say is a growing number of members of this body who believe that biomedical research must be one of Congress' highest priorities in allocating scarce federal funding.

The role of such research in combating disease is well known. Federally-supported biomedical research creates high-skill jobs, helps retain U.S. leadership in biomedical research and development, and supports an industry which generates a positive balance of trade for our country. Research provides great hope for effectively treating, curing and eventually preventing disease and thereby saving our country billions of dollars in annual health care costs. For example, in terms of health care savings, the development of the polio vaccine alone—one of thousands of discoveries supported by NIH funding—has more than paid for our country's five decades of investment in federal biomedical research.

I serve as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which funds NIH—as well as the departments of Education, Health & Human Services and Labor—and I have made funding for biomedical research one of my highest priorities. For fiscal year 1999 (FY99), Congress was able to provide a 15 percent increase for the NIH. This increase raised the total appropriation for NIH to $15.65 billion which is $2 billion above the level provided for fiscal year 1998 and $850 million above the amount that the President requested. I believe this to be the necessary appropriation for the NIH to adequately fund their vital and life-saving work.

Last year's appropriation was the first installment of what we hope will be a five year effort to double funding for the NIH through such annual increases of approximately 15 percent. In my judgment, it is clear that incredible opportunities presently exist for progress on a host of diseases and that such a commitment of resources is fully justified. Unfortunately, the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request for NIH includes an increase of less than two percent, an amount that would not even keep place with inflation. And the balanced budget agreement of 1997 also imposes very tight caps on discretionary spending that will make it hard for Congress to find the necessary resources.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, we must all actively work to build support in Congress for a second 15% increase and to find the resources necessary to make this funding level a reality in the coming year. Such priority treatment for the NIH is wise and appropriate. For quite literally, the health of our economy, of our people and our future prosperity all ride on the dividends that this research pays.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GEKAS, for arranging tonight's Special Order. It is essential that Congress moves forward in its commitment to double the medical research budget at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Researchers at the NIH are developing cutting-edge treatments for hundreds of diseases from cancer to Alzheimer's to diabetes. Increased funding for NIH research and development will allow millions of Americans to lead healthier lives. I would like to submit for the record letters from researchers in my District that have benefited from NIH-sponsored initiatives.

HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Boston, MA, June 21, 1999.

Hon. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CAPUANO: I am writing to thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and your staff last week, as one of a group of young scientists I was pleased to be able to discuss with you issues concerning biomedical research and funding in this country. I greatly appreciate both your interest and concern in these matters and hope that you will be able to participate in the Special Order, scheduled for Tuesday, June 22nd, to discuss the need for doubling funding to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) over the next five years.

My training in the department of Molecular Medicine at Cornell University was supported by the Federal Government through an Institutional Training Grant in Pharmacology awarded by the NIH. As a Postdoctoral Fellow in the department of Medicine at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center. I am currently the recipient of a National Research Service Award. My research regards the regulation of cell growth although very basic this type of work contributes to our understanding of cancer and will hopefully lead to more effective treatments for cancer in the future. it is an exciting time to be involved in biomedical research, the new cross discipline nature of the field allows for biologists, chemists and physicists to come together in multiple areas and has lead to the development of Programs in Chemical Biology such as the new Institute of Chemistry and Cell Biology at Harvard Medical School. These types of collaborative efforts should lead to new drugs and treatments in the future.

The past commitment of our country has brought us to the forefront of biomedical research and medical care in the world. With our investment leading to new technologies and a highly trained work force we are now in a position to make this financial commitment payoff. The federal government's contribution to biomedical research has brought us to a new time of molecular approaches to medicine and with the human genome project well under way it seems feasible that we will soon be able to prevent, treat, and even cure many diseases from which our society suffers. As the single largest contributor to biomedical research the federal governments continued commitment is critical to realizing these goals and should allow for an improved quality of life for Americans and of course lead to a decrease in the expenditures for national health care in the country. Additionally expenditures for biomedical research on the governments part stimulate economic growth in the private sector creating jobs in the Biotechnology and Pharmaceutical Industries, this is of particular relevance in the 8th district.

It seems clear that staying to the goal of doubling the NIH funding in five years (H. Res. 89) we must find a way to increase the proposed $320 million increase to $2 billion in fiscal year 2000. Although current budget caps make this difficult I believe that the peoples interest would be served by a continued commitment to biomedical research by the federal government. The bipartisan support that this issue receives and the support of the public should justify the requested increased funding to keep us on track.

Please feel free to contact me if I can be of any assistance to you and your staff on issues requiring scientific expertise or if you would like to form a scientific advisory committee to deal with complex scientific issues I would be happy to participate. Again thank you for your time and consideration in this important matter.

Sincerely,

JUDITH A. GLAVEN, PH.D.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY,
June 18, 1999.

Hon. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CAPUANO: Thank you for taking the time to meet with me last Wednesday regarding our efforts towards doubling the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF) budgets over 5 years. As a Department of Defense (DOD) Breast Cancer Research Predoctoral Fellow at Tufts University in Boston, my research and academic pursuits have benefited greatly from the appropriations made to funding agencies such as the NIH, NSF and DOD. While at Tufts, DOD and NIH funding enabled my doctoral research on the inhibition of breast cancer growth and metastasis to go forward. Consequently, my coworkers and I have been able to demonstrate that the introduction of a soluble form of an important receptor on the breast cancer cell surface can competitively inhibit the binding of this receptor to its target, which is located in the matrix surrounding the cancer cell. By cutting off this interaction, we have slowed the ability of cancer cells to grow and migrate through the surrounding milieu, thereby inhibiting tumor growth and metastasis of breast cancer cells in a mouse model system.

This work has exciting implications, but without the continued support of the NIH through grants to the laboratory of my doctoral mentor, Dr. Bryan Toole at Tufts University, and the DOD predoctoral grants to the students in his laboratory, the continued development of this research could be lost. Furthermore, there is so much remaining to be understood regarding the growth and movement of the many different kinds of cancer cells. Since the work of Dr. Toole and his coworkers has the potential to be generalized to many different types of cancer, as evidenced by the fact that several tumor types appear to contain this important receptor at the surface of their cells, this research could be important to inhibiting the growth and movement of many types of cancer cells. Still, a great deal of work remains so that we may truly understand the mechanism behind this inhibition in order to manufacture therapeutics that specifically target tumor cells without damaging surrounding normal tissues. Therefore, the support of NIH and DOD programs is integral to the progression of our own cancer research, as well as to the work in other laboratories across the country. It is through the continued support of many different federally-funded laboratories that we will come to a collective understanding of the communication systems within the tumor cells themselves, thereby enabling us to find more efficient ways of attacking and exploiting these pathways in order to eradicate this fatal disease.

Even though the majority of the funding from federal agencies goes directly to Tufts laboratories doing basic science and fundamental biomedical research, there are a number of notable research and education programs that benefit from grants to the university from the NIH and the NSF as well. One exciting educational program, funded by the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (under NIH) and led by Dr. Claire Moore, is the Summer Research Program for Undergraduate Minority Students, where minority students from around the country are brought to Tufts University to do summer research and participate in enrichment activities, such as field trips and seminars on basic biomedical and

translational research. In addition to their one-on-one interaction with the research faculty at Tufts, minority students are also exposed to fundamental laboratory techniques and are given guidance on how to apply for graduate study in science, as well as to professional schools for medicine and dentistry. Training grants from the NIH are also very important to funding the work of graduate students in the majority of programs at the Sackler School of Graduate Biomedical Sciences, as well as the M.D/Ph.D. program (Medical Scientist Training Program) at Tufts University, since they promote cross-over research between several biomedical and clinical disciplines. Furthermore, Tufts University offers a unique Pathobiology Course, under the direction of Dr. Irwin Arias, for basic scientists that involves patients, pathology, and hospital-based learning. This course helps bridge the gap between basic research and clinical diseases and promotes a better understanding of pathobiology and disease-related processes for Ph.D. graduates.

As you can see, increased support of the NIH, NSF and other federally funded programs is essential to ensuring that these research efforts and educational programs continue to thrive. In the United States, and internationally, there exists a highly educated work force dedicated to their research and the training of others. Doubling the NIH budgets will safeguard their important investigations and bring us one step closer to understanding the basis of life and the diseases that threaten it. Steady and increased levels of support to these programs will keep research on track by promoting cross-disciplinary research that brings scientists together across different fields and towards finding the answers to the difficult questions we face. I urge you and all members of Congress to embrace this course of action and secure an additional 15% increase to the NIH this year. The students, post-doctoral researchers and principal investigators in Massachusetts and across the country remain committed to their scientific pursuits and to ensuring that others will be appropriately trained to continue the fight against disease. All that we ask is that you commit the funds necessary to help us do our jobs and do them well.

Sincerely,

REBECCA MOORE PETERSON, PH.D.,
Cell, Molecular and Developmental Biology,
Tufts University.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GEORGE GEKAS, for organizing this important discussion about increasing funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH). NIH is the world's leading biomedical institution. As a strong supporter of NIH, and of biomedical research as a whole, I rise to support the effort to increase the NIH budget by $2 billion for Fiscal Year 2000.

NIH research touches many aspects of our lives. There are twenty-five separate institutes which make up the NIH, each with a specific function and mission. Each institute conducts research about a myriad of diseases and ailments, including diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, muscular dystrophy, and kidney disease. This research is then used to develop treatments and cures. New treatments are currently under development for diseases like AIDS, forms of cancer and muscular skeletal diseases, to name a few. Without the initial research conducted and sponsored by NIH, the treatments we have today would not be available. Our lives are better off today than they would be without biomedical research and the efforts of NIH scientists.

There is a real need to develop treatments and cures for diseases. I don't know anyone who would not want to develop a cure for AIDS or cancer. This movement to increase spending for NIH research is not just a money dump into another federal agency. Rather, it is an investment for our future. Congress needs to ensure that we have the best preventative medicine and treatments available. The best way to move into the 21st Century is to increase NIH funding and to develop treatments and cures that will keep our citizens healthy.

The effort to increase the NIH budget by $2 billion next year is just one piece of our goal to double the NIH budget by 2003. These funds would provide the means for NIH to take advantage of the boom in biomedical technology, to continue to recruit the best and brightest scientists, and to provide the information necessary for medical professionals to use the treatments developed by NIH scientists properly.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 89, a bill to express the sense of Congress to increase NIH funding by $2 billion for Fiscal Year 2000. As I, and the rest of my colleagues, have explained tonight, the future health of Americans depends on it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for arranging this special order tonight, to focus on the importance of doubling America's investment in health research over the next five years.

I am honored to be an original cosponsor of H. Res. 89, to double our national investment in health research. This research is the gift of America's hard-working taxpayers to this generation and the next—not just to Americans, but to the world.

Furthermore, for us to take fullest advantage of this investment, we must take care to invest it wisely. So in addition to increasing our work in basic health research at the National Institutes of Health, we should treat in a similar fashion our investment in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and in the programs of the Health Resources Service Administration, which are vital to putting in practice the things we learn through basic health research. As a strong fiscal conservative, and as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, I am committed to working with my colleagues to achieve these goals within a limited federal budget.

Rather than to address this issue myself, I have asked several of my constituents and leaders in the field of health research to address this issue themselves. With the consent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point several letters, emails and notes that describe in further detail the importance of doubling our investment in health research.

SAN DIEGO, CA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: I am writing in support of your efforts to double the amount of funding to medical research in the next five years. As a person who has suffered through the pain of seeing a father slowly and but surely fade away from the ravages of Alzheimer's disease and as one who is now in a higher risk category as a result, I can only hope that there is a cure or effective treatment by the time I reach my seventies (which is not that far away). I know that the incidence of Alzheimer's disease in this country is supposed to double or triple in the next fifty years. Can we afford to wait any longer to get a handle on this dread disease? I think not . . .

Additonally, my son Pete was struck with grand mal epilepsy four years ago at the age of 24. Needless to say it has drastically changed his life. His seizures, thus far, have not been controlled by any of the medications presently on the market. His wife recently said that when he leaves in the morning she worries whether this will be the last time she sees him alive. He has recently told me he doesn't think he can have children in his uncontrolled state. He said it wouldn't be fair to his wife or the children. He is losing hope . . .

Your proposal to double medical research funding is something that is very personal to me and my family, and I whole heartedly endorse your efforts. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help.

Thank you for caring,

RON HENDRIX.

SAN DIEGO, CA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: I was copied on your email and would like Congressman Cunningham to know how medical research, and in particular arthritis research has helped make my life better.

I acquired rheumatoid arthritis when I was 12 years old. By the time I was 18, the arthritis had damaged my knees so severely that all of the cartilage was worn, causing a tremendous amount of pain with every step so that I could barely walk.

Due to medical research, instead of being relegated to a wheel chair for the rest of my life, I became a candidate for total knee replacement surgery. After both knees were replaced, I could walk pain free for the first time in years. I was able to complete college, and eventually law school, and today I have a very satisfying career as an employment law attorney in a well respected firm.

In addition to being able to support myself, I sit on the board of the local chapter of the Arthritis Foundation and am chair of the Public Policy and Advocacy committee.

Since those first surgeries, I have had a number of other surgeries including total hip replacements and been on a number of arthritis drugs which have also made a tremendous difference in my life. Medical research has allowed me to have a life and to do many things I would not otherwise have been able to do.

But there is still much work to be accomplished. There still is no cure for arthritis, a disease that affects more than 40 million people in the United States and impacts the economy to the tune of over 65 billion dollars a year in lost wages and medical expenses. Although arthritis can strike at any age, the aging of the baby boomers is expected to result in over 60 million Americans with some form of arthritis by the year 2020.

We need to stop this disease now and the only way to do it is to step up our medical research efforts. Thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

NANCY KAWANO.

SAN DIEGO, CA.

DEAR REP. CUNNINGHAM: In November 1997, we received the awful news that our beautiful, active 21-year-old daughter, Beth, had been diagnosed with acute myelogenous leukemia. While I had worked with cancer researchers for 10 years, nothing prepares a parent for the magnitude of such a diagnosis.

Beth was immediately hospitalized and started on chemotherapy while her physicians at UCSD Thornton Hospital raced to put her into remission. This is a devastating illness and, in her case, carried with it a low probability for survival. Her best chance for life depended on quickly locating a suitable donor for bone marrow transplantation,

treatment that was only possible thanks to research funding that had been provided to her doctors.

Chances of a parent matching closely enough to be a bone marrow donor for their child are exceedingly small—only 3 percent. Miraculously I matched, though not perfectly. A less-than-perfect match meant Beth's body would reject the life-giving cells. Thanks to new research, however, the physicians were able to employ advanced techniques to purge certain rejection-causing cells, called T cells, from my donated bone marrow before transplanting it into Beth.

After my stem cells were purged and ready for infusion, Beth underwent total body radiation to remove any possible cancer from her body. She was again hospitalized, given more chemotherapy and, several days later, given my stem cells.

It was a difficult journey, but on June 24, 1997, she was given a second chance at life. Now two years later, thanks to the technology and the National Institutes of Health-funded research that preceded her care, she is alive, well and thriving.

We are forever grateful to the UCSD Bone Marrow Transplant team for their tireless efforts. And we appreciate the support of you and your colleagues for increased medical research funding—so that the children of other parents will also be cured, and live the fruitful lives that they were meant to live.

Sincerely,

BEVERLY GONSOWSKI.

DEL MAR, CA, *June 21, 1999.*

Hon. RANDY CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: There is a war raging within the brain of my twelve year old son, Skyler. His attacker is epilepsy, an insidious neurological disorder for which there is currently no cure. Seizures, ranging from massive convulsions to momentary lapses of attention are the hallmark of this enemy which afflicts an estimated 2.5 million Americans. Epilepsy doesn't discriminate; it can affect anyone, of any gender, ethnicity, at any age, at any time.

My son was a perfectly healthy and normal child until the fateful day eight years ago when he was gripped by his first 'grand mal' seizure. To this day, diagnostic workups have failed to uncover a cause. Systematically, anticonvulsant medications were tried but were unsuccessful in controlling the seizures which over time have continued to increase in severity and frequency, stealing away the health and safety of my child, his capacties to learn and develop; the frequent assaults damaging his developing brain.

Epilepsy is a major unsolved health problem in our country. Despite recent advances, 750,000 cases, like Skyler's are virtually resistant to current drug therapies. For many patients whose seizures are controlled, the side effects of the medications can be debilitating, even fatal. A chronic condition, not only does epilepsy often require a lifetime of continual medical treatment, it provides a formidable barrier to normal life, affecting educational attainment, employment and personal fulfillment. The social and psychological consequences of epilepsy, forever fraught with stereotypes, misunderstanding and negative attitudes, are enormous. The economic burden shouldered by families, local and federal government agencies is estimated to be $12.5 billion in direct and indirect costs.

Mr. Cunningham, all treatment options for my son's epilepsy have been exhausted. Yet he continues to have seizures every day and night of his life. I would gladly sacrifice my life to give Skyler a healthy brain. His health, cognitive functioning, and his life, however, are solely dependent on future breakthroughs in epilepsy research which can only be realized through increased funding to the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke. I applaud your support of the goal of doubling the federal medical research investment over the next five years, which I truly believe will bring more effective weapons for the prevention, eradication, detection and management of the heinous disorder, epilepsy. My son's future depends on it.

Sincerely,

TRACEY J. FLOURIE.

AMERICAN PUBLIC
HEALTH ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC

CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: Prevention research, in contrast with biomedical or clinical research, takes place after a scientific discovery is made, and seeks to determine whether the discovery is working as intended, or if not, why not. Also, in contrast to biomedical research, which receives more than $15 billion annually in NIH funding alone, prevention research received its first congressional appropriation only this year, at the level of $15 million. The nation's prevention research program is administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and actual research takes place at the national level as well as in local research settings, primarily known as prevention research centers. Because prevention research is the ''follow-through'' element of scientific discoveries—ensuring that our new findings are having the intended results—it is highly deserving of federal funding. Following are four specific examples of the integral link prevention research provides with other research and other pieces of the public health continuum:

Measles Elimination—An outbreak of measles across several cities in the late 1980s showed with painful clarity that children were not being effectively vaccinated against this preventable disease. Although we had invested in the discovery and testing of the measles vaccine, we were not achieving the hoped-for result: eradication of the disease. A prevention research campaign was undertaken to ascertain why measles had again taken hold. Two factors were discovered: not enough preschool children were receiving their measles shot, and a single vaccine against measles was, in many cases, insufficient to prevent the disease. Based on this information, CDC adopted a two-dose vaccination policy for all children, and set a nationwide vaccination goal of 90 percent immunization for all two-year-olds. These strategic changes have brought about the highest measles immunization coverage levels ever achieved (91 percent), and the interruption of measles transmission in the United States. In this example, without prevention research, an extremely effective tool—the measles vaccine—would have gone underused because we would not have known the proper dosage for protecting the public health, nor would we have known that the critical age for preventing transmission of the disease is age 2.

Preventing Perinatal HIV Transmission—According to CDC's most recent estimates, each year more than 6,000 HIV-infected women give birth in the United States. An investment in biomedical and clinical research resulted in the finding that zidovudine (ZDV), given during pregnancy, labor and delivery, and to infants after birth, could reduce the risk of mother-to-child HIV transmission by 66 percent. Subsequently, the Public Health Service issued two sets of guidelines: first, that all pregnant women receive HIV counseling and voluntary testing, and second, that ZDV therapy be provided to pregnant infected women. Although these guidelines have had a significant positive impact, nevertheless, about 500 children are still born HIV-infected in the United States annually. Prevention research studies are underway to evaluate the relative contributions of a number of factors—for example, the lack of prenatal care, poor provider adherence to the guidelines, poor patient adherence to the therapy regimen, and ZDV resistance—to the ongoing problem of perinatal HIV transmission.

Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program. When the need to increase utilization of lifesaving breast and cervical cancer early detection services for underserved women became a priority in the 1980s, the barriers to early detection were believed to be primarily financial, and in fact many women avoided screening, at lest in part because they could not pay for the services. But prevention research has demonstrated that a variety of factors affect women's screening behaviors. Some of these factors are complex, like cultural and individual believes about health and health care. Research also shows that such simple factors as whether physicians recommend screening to their female patients also play an important role in whether women are screened for breast and cervical cancer. CDC now recognizes and incorporates all these findings in its breast and cervical cancer early detection program. Without the benefit of these prevention research discoveries, our investment in the ability to detect and treat breast and cervical cancers would go underutilized among a substantial percentage of the population whom these scientific advances were designed to benefit.

Using New Tools to Understand Old (and New) Diseases. At the CDC research station in western Kenya, scientists are using GPS (global positioning systems) to map 7,500 households, rivers, roads, and medical facilities within a 75-square-mile area. By linking the map to an epidemiologic database, the GIS program (geographic information systems) provides information on how many cases of malaria occurred in each household, whether the malaria strains were drug-resistant, whether mosquito breeding grounds were present, and whether children died. Epidemiologists will use this map to answer questions that couldn't be easily answered before: Does proximity to mosquito breeding grounds increase child mortality? Does proximity to a medical facility decrease child mortality? Is drug resistance spreading in a predictable pattern? Public health officials can also use the map to target intensive vector control measures to households that harbor large numbers of mosquitoes. These same tools can be used to shed light on newly emerging public health issues, as well as persistent problems. This research is clearly not biomedical nor clinical in nature, yet it is as essential to the prevention of disease as is understanding the pathogen itself.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these examples of prevention research. Please don't hesitate to call if you have questions or wish additional information about any of the items listed here.

Sincerely,

DONNA CRANE,
Director of Congressional Affairs, American Public Health Association, Washington, D.C.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO,
La Jolla, CA, June 21, 1999.

Hon. DUKE CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: As the director of the National Partnership for Advanced Computational Infrastructure (NPACI), led by the San Diego Supercomputer Center (SDSC) and the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), I strongly endorse the increase in the budget for medical research as proposed in the bill HR–89 you are cosponsoring. As you no doubt know, the NPACI/SDSC mission is to advance science and we do this through engaging in computational science research and supporting the computational science research community nationwide, including many involved in medical and related research. Researchers associated with NPACI/SDSC are working on solving problems ranging from mining information from large data sets to unlocking the mysteries surrounding Alzheimer's disease. Researchers gain access to NPACI/SDSC resources through the peer review process and requests for access to our computing resources exceed those available by factors of two to four. Excellent computational science at the basic research level is being turned down for lack of available funding and resources.

We are also participating in cutting edge research in enabling technologies for computing such as advanced networking and security, visualization, data-intensive computing, and scalable parallel computing. These technologies now more that ever are the cornerstone for further advances in the applications of medical research.

On a personal note, I have witnessed first hand the results of medical research having severely fractured my leg in a skiing accident several years ago. Through advances in orthopedic medicine and a lengthy physical therapy, I'm now back close to 100% functionality, which was very much in doubt initially. We still have a long way to go in this area however, so I personally reiterate my support for the funding increase.

I can be of any assistance to you as you contemplate this and other legislation in scientific or technological fields, please do not hesitate to contact me at 619–534–5075 or skarin@ucsd.edu.

Sincerely,

SID KARIN.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO,
La Jolla, CA, June 20, 1999.

Hon. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DUKE: As we enter the next millennium we must ask two questions: What do we most want to provide for our children and grandchildren? What should our most important national goals be? I believe that our most important National priority should be to invest in the long-term, and difficult, fight against disease by doubling the budget for biomedical research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

Each year one million or more of our citizens die prematurely of diseases that could be cured if we simply understood more about their origins, causes, and progression, or if we had the knowledge and understanding to construct desperately needed engineered organs and tissues to repair damaged ones. Millions more of our citizens are disabled, or unable to realize their full potential because of the ravages of disease. For them too, hope lies in better understanding of the basis and treatment of disease. Only the Federal government, through its support of the NIH, can win these battles by illuminating the secrets hidden inside human cells, understanding the chemistry and biology of living organisms, and using that information to design cost-efficient and effective preventative and therapeutic measures for disease.

In my view, our society has a moral obligation to aggressively seek the treatments that our desperately ill citizens need. However, in addition to the moral imperative to fight disease and promote health, there is also compelling evidence that solving health problems will be economically beneficial to our Nation. Restoring lost productivity to those incapacitated by disease will save billions of dollars annually, and will also relieve many of the overwhelming financial burdens on Medicare and other health care programs that our society has created to help those who are ill. For example, expensive, and ultimately treatable diseases of the elderly such as Alzheimer's, diabetes, and cancer play a large and growing role in skyrocketing medical costs to our society. Finally, two of the most economically promising long-term industries where our Nation has a substantial competitive advantage are the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries. These industries are driven by the Federal investment in biomedical research in the public sector, which in turn leads to discoveries that are developed and brought to market by the private sector.

I know how passionately you believe that we must not waiver in our battle against disease. I stand prepared to fight with you to persuade your colleagues in the House and Senate.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE S.B. GOLDSTEIN, PH.D.

MOLECULAR MEDICINE 2020: A VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF MEDICAL RESEARCH AND HUMAN HEALTH*

What will medical practice and patient care be like in 2020? We believe that ''Molecular Medicine'' can be the basis for human health in 2020, but only if the U.S. expands its investment in biomedical research by significantly increasing funding for the NIH.

The practice of Molecular Medicine will consist of new prevention, diagnosis, and treatment methods that directly target the molecular, cellular, or physiological defects causing disease. These medical methods will be based on precise, non-invasive imaging and diagnostic techniques. They will be implemented with directed, rationally designed molecular and pharmaceutical therapies, and they will be rooted in a deep understanding of normal human cellular and molecular physiology and genetics.

While unimaginable only 25 years ago, Molecular Medicine is now achievable because of recent rapid progress, and an enormous burst of new scientific opportunities emerging from years of sustained public investment in NIH-sponsored basic biomedical research. Thus, we are already beginning to gain ground in our fight against many dreaded diseases, including cancer, cardiovascular disease, and stroke. As we look forward, we can realistically hope to develop increasingly effective treatments and preventive measures for these diseases, as well as for the scourges of Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, obesity, degenerative diseases of aging, and emerging infectious agents. To realize these goals, and to capitalize upon past investments and many recent discoveries, we must renew our National resolve and reinvigorate our research efforts, so that we can accelerate the arrival of the new era of Molecular Medicine.

To hasten the earliest possible development of Molecular Medicine, and to ensure that it becomes a reality by 2020, we must act now to expand the foundation of biomedical research and discovery. This foundation can only be built by: a) Developing new interdisciplinary methods, insights, and understanding; b) Attracting, training, and sustaining the most talented and vigorous young research scientists; and c) Nuturing the vitality of a scientific effort that has never held more promise. This augmented research base will lead directly to ever more precise diagnostic, prevention, and treatment methods based upon research in Biology and Medicine in collaboration with Chemistry, Physics, Engineering, and Computation. Most important, increased investment could launch new and far-reaching initiatives in Functional and Physiological Genomics. These new projects would have the goal of understanding the normal functions of the many genes discovered in the complete genetic blueprints of humans and diverse model organisms by the Human Genome Project. Such an effort will lead to a detailed understanding of normal cellular, molecular, and integrative organismal physiology, which in turn will allow us to create therapies targeted directly to the cellular, genetic, and physiologic defects that cause disease and organ dysfunction. These new efforts will also allow us to defend our citizens against the ever-present and increasing danger of emerging pathogens and viruses by developing the next generations of vaccines and antibiotic drugs. All of these advances will depend upon new partnerships in technology development and clinical translation carried out by outstanding scientists with access to the most innovative and developing instrumentation.

Our country is poised to take full advantage of the last 50 years of steady investment in biomedical research and the many resulting opportunities created from recent rapid progress. Significant new investment now will dramatically accelerate the rate of discovery and lead to the imminent creation of a Molecular Medicine to combat our most dreaded diseases.

*Preamble to a Report from a FASEB Conference on Priorities for an Expanded NIH Budget (http://www.faseb.org/opar/MolecularMedicine.html), chaired by Dr. Lawrence S.B. Goldstein, April, 1998.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY
PREVENTION COALITION,
SAN DIEGO, CA, *June 19, 1999.*

Rep. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM,
Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR DUKE: The San Diego County Prevention Coalition wishes to express our support for your goal of doubling our federal medical research investment over the next five years as recommended by H. Res. 89. Most of our 230 organization members who are working with at-risk substance abusers appreciate the wonderful medical research coming from the National Institutes of Health, specifically NIDA. Their research has had a great impact on addicts and many of their families.

We are an alcohol, tobacco and other drug prevention organization with a five-year track record of fighting abuse and the unifying voice of prevention for San Diego County. We have substantial community support from our 310+ members representing 230 local organizations and agencies. We have the support of Senators, Congressmen, the State Deputy Director for Prevention Services, the San Diego County Sheriff, Supervising Juvenile Judge, the County Health Director, the County Board of Supervisors, numerous business and community leaders, law enforcement officers and educational officials.

We thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

ALAN SORKIN,
Executive Director.

PARENTS & ADOLESCENTS RECOVERING TOGETHER SUCCESSFULLY,
San Diego, June, 19, 1999.

Rep. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM,
Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR DUKE: Parents and Adolescents Recovering Together Successfully (PARTS) is a non-profit organization dedicated to reducing the number of child addicts and believes that proactive prevention and intervention within the family is the best solution for fighting the devastating long-term effects of teenage substance abuse. Much of what we teach is based on federal medical research.

We wish to support your goal of doubling our federal medical research investment over the next five years as recommended by H. Res. 89. The National Institutes of Health, and specifically NIDA provide valuable medical research to us and impact many of our families.

My Best,

ALAN SORKIN,
Executive Director.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SAN DIEGO,
LaJolla, CA, June 21, 1999.

Hon. DUKE CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR REP. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you for taking the time to highlight the important benefits to patients of the research funded through NIH and other agencies. I believe our gene therapy research outlines the value of that funding.

Recent developments in molecular medicine have made possible the use of gene therapy as a weapon in the fight against cancer. Here at UCSD, we have been able to genetically modify human leukemia cells in a way that induces a powerful, killing response from the immune system. In laboratory experiments, we found that the immune response prompted by the modified cells destroyed active leukemia cells lurking nearby. When we moved from the laboratory to Phase I clinical trials, we focused on patients who have chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL), a currently incurable condition afflicting more than 50,000 people per year in the United States.

The Phase I results were very encouraging. Eleven patients were each treated with a single injection of their own modified leukemia cells, and all but one had a significant drop in the number of leukemia cells found in their blood, and a reduction in the size of their lymph nodes. This was the first time that a response this dramatic had been seen in the history of treating this disease with a single treatment. A San Diego Union-Tribune article describing the first phase research—and highlighting some of the ways that breakthroughs in medical research literally shape the lives and futures of our patients—is attached.

We are now working on the larger, Phase II study that will involve multiple injections over time. Although this study has not yet begun, we have already been contacted by about 200 people from around the world seeking to serve as volunteers.

Thanks again for all the help and support of you and your Congressional colleagues for supporting increased medical research funding. These dollars make possible the cutting edge medical research we hope will some day lead to cures of terrible diseases like CLL.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. KIPPS, M.D., PH.D.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL BARNES MOODY

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend and great American, Mr. Samuel Barnes Moody. Sam Moody, who was my very special friend and was very special to me personally, was born on June 2, 1920.

Last week, Sam Moody passed away in central Florida. I first met Sam Moody in my civic activities in central Florida some years ago. However, I never really knew much about his background until some years ago when I invited Sam and several other veteran leaders to a small luncheon gathering.

As we sat together, I asked each of the veterans to relate some of their military service recollections after lunch to our group. Sam Moody started off rather hesitantly but he began telling an incredible story.

Let me say a little bit about Sam Moody. He joined the old Army Air Corps on November 15, 1940. After his basic training, he was shipped out to Manila in the Philippines where he arrived on Thursday Thanksgiving Day, 1941. Some 18 days later, World War II broke out. Sam Moody and his group found themselves on Bataan and eventually they ran out of food and supplies in April of 1942.

Sam went on to tell the story that on April 9, 1942, he and more than a thousand others took part in the famous Bataan Death March. Over 10,000 men, women and children died. Somehow God spared Sam Moody.

He was then cast on a ship, a transport. This story is relayed in his autobiography from this event entitled Reprieve From Hell, and I strongly recommend that to every American, particularly every young American. In this transport, hundreds of other Americans were crammed into the hull of a ship that was torpedoed by an American submarine. Many, many, many died. Somehow Sam survived. God spared Sam Moody.

Also as a prisoner of war, Sam Moody served under incredible conditions when he arrived in Japan, under torturous and malnutrition conditions, along with hundreds and hundreds of others. Of 36,000 American servicemen, less than 10 percent survived, but somehow God spared Sam Moody.

In 1946, after his release and return home, Sam Moody went back to Japan to testify for the American government at the International War Crimes trial. Sam was probably the only enlisted survivor to testify in these trials to help bring justice to those who had killed and tortured so many.

At these trials, Sam Moody met Madeleine, who was working for General MacArthur. They married and have two wonderful children, Betty and Steve.

Sergeant Sam Moody leaves behind a wonderful family, to whom I extend my very deepest sympathy. Sergeant Sam Moody also leaves behind a record of incredible service and devotion to our Nation and a country he dearly loved.

Sam Moody also leaves behind an incredible record of his service and survival from World War II and the Bataan Death March, which I recommend again to every Member of Congress and every American. It is called Reprieve From Hell.

□ 1745

Sam Moody went to be with his Maker last week. We will miss him.

THE NECESSITY OF THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL STATUTE

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), who is from my committee, for allowing me to interrupt his one hour special order.

Mr. Speaker, today the Independent Counsel statute expires. There has been a real heralding by many people in the legal community for the demise of this law. I would like to tonight talk just a little bit about that law and why something like it is absolutely necessary.

For the past 3 years my committee has been investigating illegal campaign contributions. We are now involved in investigating espionage and lack of security at our nuclear laboratories, and the possibility that these things had something in common.

One of the biggest problems that we have had has been a reluctance by the Justice Department, under Janet Reno, to cooperate with our committee. It has been extremely difficult to get the Justice Department to work with us to get to the bottom of these scandals.

If we have an administration that has broken the law, if we have an administration or people in an administration who have become corrupt, and we have an Attorney General who is appointed by the President who is blocking for the administration, how do we administer justice? How do we get to the bottom of illegal activities, if we have an administration that has broken the law and a Justice Department that is controlled by the administration who will not bring those who broke the law to justice?

I think that that is what we have today. We have had a number of people that have taken the Fifth Amendment. Our committee has faced over 121 people who have taken the Fifth Amendment or fled the country in the campaign finance scandal, 121 people. That is unparalleled in American history.

We have asked the Justice Department and Janet Reno time and time and time again to work with us to bring these people before the committee to explain to the American people why Communist China, Macao, Egypt, Taiwan, South American countries, have been giving campaign contributions to the Democrat National

Committee and the President's reelection committee, and we have gotten absolutely no cooperation from the Justice Department.

In fact, if Members look at the administration and the Justice Department, we will find they have, in effect, erected a stone wall between what happened and the American people. How do we break through that stone wall? What mechanism do we use to bring people to justice who broke the law, who may have even endangered America's national security?

The only way we can do that is to have somebody outside the system investigate and prosecute those people who have broken the law. Unfortunately, now that we no longer have an Independent Counsel statute, we have no mechanism with which to do that.

Maybe the Independent Counsel statute was flawed, maybe there were some problems with it, but it should have been perfected, in my opinion, so there was a mechanism to investigate people in an administration that might be corrupt without going through the person that they appoint to be the Attorney General who might be blocking for them, as I believe has been the case with this Attorney General and this Justice Department.

So tonight I am one of those voices, I am sure, that is crying in the wilderness, because I believe we need something like an Independent Counsel statute to ensure that justice will be done in this country.

Right now, now that the Independent Counsel statute has expired, if we have a president now or in the future who breaks the law or if we have people in his administration who break the law, and the President has appointed an Attorney General who is willing to block for him and keep the facts from coming out where there might have been corruption, then there is nothing that can be done for the American people to count on to bring these people to justice.

So I would just like to say that although the Independent Counsel statute may have had some flaws, we should not have junked the whole thing, we should have found an alternative. I am sorry that we did not.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN AMERICA, AND INEQUITIES IN THE NATION'S MONETARY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. This evening I hope to touch on some issues that are not often discussed here on the floor of the House, and along with me I am happy to welcome the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

I want to begin by touching on an issue that I believe is perhaps the most important issue facing this country. It is not talked about enough, but it is something that all of us should be deeply concerned about. That is, Mr. Speaker, in the last election, 36 percent of the American people voted. That means almost two-thirds of the American people did not believe it was important enough for their future to come out and vote.

What is even more alarming is that among people 24 years of age or younger, we had, if Members can believe it, 18 percent of those people voting. Eighty-two percent said they were not interested in voting. That is frightening unto itself, but it bodes very poorly for the future because there is very good evidence that if young people do not vote, it is much less likely that they will vote in the future.

So what happened in recent elections is that fewer and fewer people are participating. The vast majority of low-income people do not vote. Most working people do not vote. But then, on the other hand, we have upper income people who do vote, and upper income people who contribute heavily to both political parties and into the political process. So the voices of working people and low-income people are virtually not heard in this institution. Their needs are not taken account of as legislation is dealt with.

But for those folks who have the money, the wealthiest one-quarter of 1 percent who make 80 percent of the campaign contributions, Congress continuously does their bidding, pays attention to their needs. I think we have a vicious circle, that as Congress pays more and more attention to the needs of the wealthy and not to working people, not to the middle class, then the vast majority of the people turn off even further from the political process and say, hey, this Congress does not represent me. Why should I vote?

Tonight I want to touch on a number of issues. But before we get going, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, following on that point, the question really is, for whose benefit is the country run and the economy run?

If we ask, and I have asked, groups of students in my district, now, who do you think has the most impact on the economy in the United States in government, most people would guess the President. Some talk about the Secretary of the Treasury. A few guessed the Congress, the House and Senate. But virtually none say, well, Congressman, I know who it is, it is the Federal Reserve. It is that appointed, unelected, group of extraordinarily wealthy individuals, for the most part, who meet in secret.

Today they met in secret downtown in Washington, D.C., in their marble palace, sitting at their exotic long boardroom table, marble, with nice exotic hardwoods, and they made a decision that I suppose does not sound that important to most people, but the impact will be tremendous.

Again, it goes essentially to who really runs this country. They decided to raise interest rates by one-quarter of 1 percent. That does not sound like a lot, except there are tens of millions of Americans who tomorrow will wake up to find that their mortgage rate went up, their credit card rate went up, their adjustable car loan went up.

In fact, it is computed that that one-quarter of 1 percent increase will cost a family money. Here is a family that has a $100,000 mortgage, a $15,000 4-year car loan, and $2,000 on a credit card. It sounds pretty middle class to me. It will cost them $6,913 for the mortgage, $84 on the car loan, and $16 on the credit card; $7,013, that one-quarter of 1 percent rate.

I suppose that would be justified if there was a reason to do it. What is the reason? Are we worried about inflation, which is at or near historic lows? I do not think so. It might be that the Fed is worried about higher wages. The gentleman and I have talked about that previously. Sometimes the Federal Reserve gets worried when the unemployment rate drops below 5 or 6 percent.

They had a rule for years saying it should not go below 6 percent. Then they said maybe 5 percent. They get worried, because what happens if unemployment drops?

Mr. SANDERS. What will happen is then, horror of all horror, wages may go up. Let me just touch on that very important point.

We hear every day on the television, we hear it on the radio, we read it in the newspapers, that we are living in the midst of one of the great economic booms in our history. Maybe that fear that with low unemployment wages might go up has in fact prompted the Federal Reserve to do what it did today.

But I want to, for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, give a chart which very clearly belies this nonsense that there is an economic boom for the middle class or for working people.

According to information assembled by the Economic Policy Institute, and I do not think there is a lot of debate about this, in 1973 the weekly earnings, the real average weekly earnings of workers in the United States, was $502, okay? In 1973, the weekly earnings, average earnings, were $502.

In 1998, in the midst of a great economic boom, the weekly earnings were $442, a 12 percent reduction in real wages. The reality is that in order to compensate for the lowering of real wages, the average American today is working significantly more hours. People are working two jobs, people are working three jobs.

So if the Fed thinks that they have got to once again increase unemployment to dampen wage increases, I would have very strong disagreement, because in reality today the average person in the middle class is struggling. The gentleman and I have discussed it before. It is true in Oregon, it is true in Vermont.

How many people that we know are working two jobs, three jobs, 50, 60, 70 hours a week to pay the bills? The idea that anybody in a public position of trust would take action which would result in lowering wages, forcing people to work even longer hours, is to my mind an outrage.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman will continue to yield, let us think about this again. If this unelected group, the Federal Reserve Board who meets in secret, some of whom work for banks and in fact can individually profit their employer without any conflict of interest rules, if they raise interest rates, and they did not raise them because wages are running away and people are seeing big increases in their wages, they must have had another reason.

The pundits tell me that perhaps that other reason is that they are worried about the bubble in the stock market. I have a little problem about that. The question is, if you whack the people on Main Street by raising again, as these statistics show, their payment for their $100,000 mortgage, $15,000 car loan, and $2,000 credit card, and a lot of folks have more than that on their credit card, if they are going to pay $7,000 more for those loans because of this one-quarter of 1 percent increase, how is that going to somehow translate to a message to the people on Wall Street, the speculators, who are driving up, what did Greenspan call it, irrational exuberance on Wall Street?

If he is worried about this irrational exuberance on Wall Street, why did he not do something about Wall Street? They have the tools. Right now on Wall Street with just a $1,000 investment, you can on margin go out and buy a whole bunch more stock. They could control that. There are steps they could take to directly control that.

But no, they are going to whack the people on Main Street and say, see, we are going to cause some of you to lose your jobs, drive up unemployment, maybe we will drive down wages. We are going to cause this disruption in the economy, and we are hoping that will percolate up to Wall Street. This is kind of a bizarre way to run an economy, but I think it has something to do with who they work for, the major banks, and what lack of control the Congress has.

No one knows what the Federal Reserve does or why they do it. It is all secret.

□ 1800

Congress has ceded all authority to them in the making of money and controlling interest rates and basically managing the economy. They are managing it for their banker friends who are deathly afraid of inflation or deathly afraid of higher wages for the corporate CEOs, but not for average folks.

I think that is an extraordinary turn of events. I think it brings us back again to who makes the contributions, who basically runs this organization when it comes to election time, and to whom are many of our colleagues beholden. It, unfortunately, is not the average people on Main Street, but it is those people on Wall Street. It is those people in the banking industry, the pharmaceutical industry, the insurance industry, and others.

In fact, I noted today in the paper that, in this presidential race, George W. may not even take public matching funds because he has raised so much money and intends to raise so much money, obscene amounts of money is flowing in so fast, they cannot count it, that he just does not think he will need those public matching funds and those constraints on spending.

Now, one has got to wonder who those people are contributing all that money and what they expect to get in return.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let me interrupt the gentleman from Oregon, if I might, by giving some facts and figures. Mr. Speaker, I will also include for the RECORD, information about campaign contributions and lobbying expenses.

Last week, and I hope to get into this a little bit, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and I talked about the issue of pharmaceutical drugs, about the crisis that exists all over the United States where we have elderly people and people with chronic illnesses who cannot afford the high cost of prescription drugs.

We talked about the fact that the same exact drug manufactured in the United States of America is sold for significantly lower prices in Canada, in Mexico, and in Europe, and that the American consumer is being ripped off.

We talked about the huge profits of the pharmaceutical industry and the fact that the United States is perhaps the only major Nation on earth that does not regulate the price that pharmaceutical companies can sell their product. Lo and behold, apropos of what the gentleman from Oregon was talking about, now let us just see how money works and the relationship to the very high cost of prescription drugs in this country and to lobbying expenses and campaign contributions.

It turns out that, for the first 18 months of the last election cycle, the pharmaceutical industry had lobbying expenses of over $74 million and made more than $7 million in campaign contributions, which put them at the very top of any industry in America.

So if consumers want to know why we are paying so much more for the exact same prescription drug in this country as the Canadians and the Mexicans and the Europeans do, then they might well look to the reality that the pharmaceutical industry is pouring huge sums of money, not only into Congress, but into State legislatures throughout this country.

They are number one. They are at the very top of the list of people who spend money on lobbying expenditures or campaign contributions, followed, I might add, not very far behind, by the insurance industry, which might help us explain why we are the only Nation in the entire industrialized world that does not have a national health insurance system.

So whether the issue is banking, whether the issue is interest rates, whether the issue is the high cost of pharmaceutical drugs or all of the other absurd priorities that exist in this Congress, I think one of the important factors to examine is who makes the campaign distributions, who puts money into lobbying; and that tells us a whole lot about the end results which we see.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Vermont raised the insurance industry, some of our colleagues spoke at an earlier hour about the need for a Patients' Bill of Rights. As the gentleman pointed out, the insurance industry is the second greatest funder of congressional campaigns and has been particularly generous to the majority party.

We found in the last Congress that we were able to get a very truncated Patients' Bill of Rights through the House, and the Senate did not act at all because of the fear on the part of the insurance companies that it might impinge upon their profits.

Let us just talk for a minute about what that means. I have talked to some folks from the Heart Association who are very concerned. They spent years educating Americans to, when they have got that pain, they should go to the emergency room. Well, guess what, now with an HMO, one does not go to the emergency room, one is supposed to call the insurance company first in some plans and talk to a clerk somewhere who one may have awakened from their late evening nap, and ask them for permission to go to the emergency room. Sometimes it is denied. Take an aspirin and call the doctor in the morning.

The Heart Association is very worried about the message we are sending here. So part of the Patients' Bill of Rights is called a prudent person rule. If one has got an extreme pain in one's chest and one thinks one is having a heart attack, one does not have to call a clerk who works for the insurance company to get permission to go to the emergency room.

Of course, they say they do not deny permission, they just will not pay for it if one goes. Now, how many Americans can afford a $500 or $1,000 visit to the emergency room? Not very many. So this is extraordinary. So that is one thing in the Patients' Bill of Rights.

There is another case in Virginia, a young woman who fell off a cliff, broke her back. They medivac'd her by helicopter. When she got to the hospital, they worked on her right away. She was in serious condition. Her insurance company later refused to pay because she lacked prior authorization.

I asked, when was she supposed to make the call? On her cell phone as she fell through the air? Or perhaps she

should have asked to use the radio in the helicopter while she was being medivac'd.

No, these are absurd things. These are no brainers for the American people. We should have the right, we pay our insurance premiums, to have that kind of fair treatment. But guess what, the insurance industry does not think so, and a majority of my colleagues here in Congress do not think so, because they are much more attentive to the insurance industry then they are to the needs of their constituents. That is an outrage, and that should change.

I am one of many who have signed a petition here in the House to force a Patients' Bill of Rights to the floor of the House because the Republican leadership refuses to let the bill be heard.

We have over 180 people on that bill, and I tell my colleagues we will not be denied; and if the American people would begin to speak up to their representatives, they would not. But again, we are back in this circular situation where the people who fund the campaigns have more at risk and are more likely to be heard than the people who are being denied the care in their insurance plan.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon touches on perhaps the most fundamental issue that we can discuss; and that is, in the midst of all of the media hoopla about how great the economy is doing, the reality is that there are tens and tens of millions of people who are hurting very badly and, in many ways, are in worse shape today than they were 20 or 25 years ago. The gentleman is touching on one area, and that is the area of health care.

Now, I want to know one simple thing. It would seem to me that, if the economy is booming, what that would translate to, among other things, is an improved health care system for all of the people. It makes sense to me. The economy is booming. That means that more and more people have health insurance, better quality of health care, better able to go to the physician of their choice, the specialist of their choice, more access to prescription drugs. That is what a booming economy would seem to me.

But the reality, as the gentleman has just indicated, is very much not that. The reality is that we have some 43 million Americans who have zero health insurance. The reality is that we have tens of millions of Americans who have very large deductibles and co-payments. That means that, if they get sick, they hesitate to go to the doctor, because they do not have the cash to pay for the visit.

The end result of that is that doctors now tell us that the patients that they are seeing are far sicker than the patients that they used to seeing because people do not have the money to pay because they have high deductibles.

In terms of prescription drugs once again, at a time when the average profits in 1998 for the 10 largest pharmaceutical companies in this country were $2.5 billion, that was the average profits for the 10 largest pharmaceutical companies, we have people in the State of Vermont, people all over this country, elderly folks, sick people who literally have got to make the choice as to whether they purchase the prescription drugs they need to keep them alive to ease their pain or whether they heat their homes in the winter, whether they buy the food that they need.

Ah, but the pharmaceutical industry, enjoying huge profits has all kinds of money available for campaign contributions to maintain the status quo.

I will submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a chart which I think the American people would be interested in hearing about which talks about how much more senior citizens in the United States pay for prescription drugs than do seniors in other Nations.

If a product used, one of the more commonly used prescription drugs in this country used by seniors, cost $1, in Germany that product costs 71 cents; in Sweden, 68 cents; in the United Kingdom, 65 cents; Canada, 64 cents; France, 57 cents; and Italy, 51 cents.

But once again, getting back to the gentleman's point, if we are talking about a so-called booming economy, I would think that what the health care system would be doing is making it easier for people to get in, making it easier for people to get the quality care. As we both know, as a result of the growth of managed care and HMOs, that is very often exactly the opposite of what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, part of the problem there, I want to go back to the point about seniors and the cost of drugs. But just on the issue of access to health care and the fact that so many people have been deprived to access to health care, part of the problem is the fact that more and more Americans are working in temporary jobs.

In fact, the number of Americans in the last 25 years holding temporary jobs without benefits instead of full-time jobs with benefits has gone up by a factor of eight, eight times as many people. The largest employer in America now is not General Motors. It is not Microsoft, it is a Manpower, Inc., a temporary employing employer.

Now, those people are forced to take jobs, generally at wages lower than what they earned in their last full-time job, with no benefits, including no insurance benefit. Now, that is a crisis for many families in this country, and that is something that needs to be dealt with.

They say, well, if they had insurance at their last job, they can purchase it under COBRA. That is right. We did provide relief for a few people with the Federal law that says they can purchase the same health care they had. But guess what? When people lose their jobs, most people cannot afford $350 a month premiums to come out of their unemployment insurance and still put food on the table, pay the rent, and pay the light bill. They cannot afford that.

But talking about that, I have done recently, with the help of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), a survey of seniors in my district in terms of the prices they are paying for commonly prescribed drugs for seniors. The results are absolutely extraordinary. I will be releasing the survey next week. But it turns out that many seniors are paying 4 to 7 times as much as people who have health insurance, full health insurance for exactly the same drugs over the counter.

Now, there is something wrong with that. The insurance companies have gone to the pharmaceutical industry and bargained a good price. They are getting a great price. A senior walks in and buys the same prescription over the counter, sometimes they need essentially a life-saving prescription, and they pay 4 to 7 times more. They cannot afford it.

The President is trying to deal with that in his proposal with a minimal beginning of prescription drug coverage. That would be an improvement over the current system. But much more can and should be done dealing with the prices these insurance companies charge.

The gentleman from Vermont has tried for a number of years to make a very simple point, a lot of drugs are developed after the public has spent a lot of money developing the research for particular drugs. In fact, one drug that is very effective for uterine cancer was developed by the National Institutes of Health. All the research was done, all the processes on how to make it. The bark out of which the first drugs were made before they developed an artificial process came off of Federal land.

So we have taxpayers pay to discover and develop the process for the drug. Taxpayers own the property from which the natural substance, the bark, is coming from. Guess what, the Federal Government gave an exclusive right to Bristol-Myers Squibb to market this drug with no price caps. Guess what? With no sunk costs, they did not go through a lengthy development process, and very low cost to get the product. They were charging outrageous prices because women desperate with this type of cancer needed the drug.

Now, the gentleman has proposed a simple principle. They should repay the Treasury for that research. They should repay the taxpayers. Now, has that become law? It seems to me most Americans would agree that would be fair.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would say that the pharmaceutical industry, which spends over $80 million in the last election cycle in opposition to any serious reform was successful in helping to defeat that proposal. But we will be back, and we are going to be back with another good proposal.

That is that one of the outrages that currently exists, as I mentioned earlier, is that the same exact prescription drug manufactured by an American company is sold in Canada, Mexico, and around the world for far lower prices than it is sold in the United States.

I know the gentleman intends to release a study in Oregon, but we have already released one in the State of Vermont. What we found is that, for the most commonly used prescription drugs that senior citizens need in Vermont, those drugs cost 81 percent more than in Canada and 112 percent more than in Mexico.

□ 1815

And in response to that absurdity, I have introduced legislation which would allow American pharmaceutical distributors to be able to purchase their products from Canada, from Mexico, and from any other country to take advantage of the lower prices so they could resell those products back in the United States at far lower prices than is currently the case.

I know the gentleman knows that the problem here is not with the independent pharmacist. That person has no choice but to sell the product for a high price because he is purchasing it for a high price. Well, now we are going to let competition reign. Now we will let the distributors buy at a lower price in Canada, Mexico or anyplace else. This is exactly the same product that is sold in the United States for a far higher price.

And I should mention that, as a matter of fact, on July 7 I intend to take a van of senior citizens and people with chronic health problems to Canada. It is only an hour and a half away from us. We are going to go to Montreal and we are going to purchase prescription drugs and we are going to show the degree to which prices in Canada are so much lower than they are in the United States.

In my State already many people are going over the border to Canada to take advantage of the lower prices. I know in the southern part of this country people are going to Mexico. That is an absurdity. Americans should not have to skip over the border, north or south, in order to get a discount on drugs manufactured by American pharmaceutical companies. That is an outrage. And we are going to do everything we can to see that the American consumer is treated the same way that the Canadians, the Mexicans, and the Europeans are treated.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Is the gentleman telling me these are exactly the same drugs? These must be generics or something like that.

Mr. SANDERS. No, these are the same drugs manufactured in the same factory, often in the same bottle, often in Puerto Rico. The same exact products.

I want the pharmaceutical industry to tell the American people why if they go to Europe, if they go to Mexico, if they go to Canada they can purchase the product that they sometimes need to stay alive. The gentleman and I both know of the horror stories of people struggling to combat their illnesses, a question of life and death, and not being able to afford these outrageously high prices.

And as the gentleman indicated a moment ago, to add insult to injury, the taxpayers of this country pour huge sums of money into research and development. And then, when they develop the product, instead of saying to the pharmaceutical company that is going to distribute it, that is going to sell it, that they have to sell that product, because it was developed with taxpayer money, they have to sell that product at a reasonable price, instead of that the NIH gives the product over to the pharmaceutical industry who then sells it at any price that they want, meaning that the taxpayer who helped to develop the drug often cannot even afford to purchase the drug that he or she developed, which is an issue that must be addressed.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have also recently found out, which causes me great concern in my district, that there is a problem with retired military getting their prescriptions filled. We have no active military base in Oregon, and they are not eligible for a mail order program which is maintained by the military, so what they have been doing is pooling together with volunteers to go up to Washington State with all their prescriptions, and then have a person go and fill a couple hundred prescriptions and load them in a van and drive them back down to Oregon.

Now, this is another example of Americans who have been made a promise, in this case veterans, that we would take care of them; that we would take care of them for life, and now they are not getting their prescriptions filled. In fact, the military has proposed that they do not want to have this volunteer van service anymore. And I said, well, then, how about making these people eligible for mail order prescriptions? I have a Blue Cross/Blue Shield card, so I can get some product out of a pharmacy in Florida for an absurd price if I want to way wait a week or 10 days. So I said, how about the military setting up something like that. Well, that is difficult. We are still fighting over that.

But that is just another category of people that are getting hit. They cannot afford to go to the pharmacy and buy these things. They have to get them through the military, and now they are being told they cannot do that.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman touches on an issue I know both of us have worked on, and that is veterans' rights, and this gets again back to the issue of the so-called booming economy and the priorities being established in the Congress.

Now, it seems to me that in terms of veterans, these are men and women who have put their lives on the line. They did what their government asked them to do. They signed a contract, sometimes in blood, with the United States Government. And I regard it as completely unacceptable that the government reneges on the contract that it signed with those people.

And when we talk about priorities and we talk about the so-called booming economy, I find it hard to understand how any Member of this Congress could support on one hand huge tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country, who in recent years have seen extraordinary increases in their wealth, and then with the other hand say to the veterans of this country, well, gee, I guess we are having problems with prescription drugs, we just do not have the money to help. We may have to downsize the VA hospitals. We may have to cut back on the quality of care that we give.

Now, what a sense of priorities it is to say to millionaires and billionaires, oh, we hear your pain, we are going to give you huge tax breaks; but to the veterans of this country, to the senior citizens of this country, to the working people of this country, gee, we are sorry, we just do not have the funds to help in your hour of need.

Now, we have talked about health care, we have talked about prescription drugs, we have talked about the Federal Reserve, and we could go on and on, but the bottom line is that what goes on in this country increasingly is that the people on the top are doing extraordinarily well, the people in the middle are working longer hours for lower wages, and the people down below are hurting very severely.

I find it basically wrong, and there is no other word that I can use, that in the United States of America today we have the most unfair distribution of wealth and the most unfair distribution of income in any industrialized society. We have a situation in which the wealthiest 1 percent of the population now own 40 percent of the total wealth of this Nation, which is more than the bottom 95 percent. We have just 1 percent or more wealth from the bottom 95 percent.

As the gentleman knows, in recent years, we have given huge tax breaks to upper income people at the same time as we have cut back on the needs of our veterans and we have cut back on the needs of many, many other people. So when I go back to Vermont, people say to me, middle class people say, gee, we cannot afford to send our kids to college; how can you be in a Congress which can provide huge tax breaks for those people who really do not need it?

So I think we have to get our priorities right. And what our priorities should mean is that we should join, in my view, the rest of the major countries in this world and say that health care is a right of citizenship, not a radical idea; that every man, woman, and child should be entitled to health care

because they are citizens of this country; that we should be putting more money into higher education so that middle class families do not have to go deeply into debt to send their kids to college; so that the young people do not have to get out of college $20,000, $30,000, or $40,000 in debt.

So I would suggest that maybe the Congress would want to start focusing on the needs of ordinary people rather than just those people who make the campaign contributions.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, I am surprised we got back to campaign contributions, but I think the gentleman is making an excellent point. Again, the question is on behalf of whom does this body make policy day in and day out and to whom is the majority beholding?

They are talking about a vision. They have a vision for a future, a tax system, which the gentleman was just talking about, and it is an interesting vision. And the vision is that we should do away with death taxes. Of course, in the last Congress we acted so that anyone with assets of less than $1 million in the very near future will be subject to no death taxes. But they are worried about those people with assets of over $1 million; that they might have to pay taxes upon transferring them to their heirs. So their vision is we would do away with all inheritance tax and then would reduce the capital gains tax to zero.

Now, here is the ultimate absurdity, and this is not about wealth envy or something else, it is about everybody carrying their fair share of the burden in our society, and somewhat that depends upon the ability to pay. We can only squeeze so much out of a minimum wage worker. But if someone has a lot of discretionary income, they can afford to pay a little bit more. But in their vision that they have put forward to us, there will be zero inheritance tax and zero capital gains tax.

Now, let us just say if someone was lucky enough to be, well, let's say Bill Gates' child, that person, and he says, by the way, that he is going to give most of the money away to charitable undertakings. And that is wonderful, and I think the American people will appreciate that gift. But let us just say he reserves a billion dollars for his child, and the child gets a billion dollars when they graduate from college. Well, under this vision of the future, that child would pay zero dollars on taxes for the inheritance. And if that child chose to invest the money for a living as opposed to working for wages, they would pay zero dollars in Federal taxes, zero dollars in FICA taxes.

So it sort of begs the question, as the elite make more and more of their money off unearned income, why is it that wage-earning people have to pay 28 or 31 percent, or even the people at the top, 39.6 percent of their income in taxes, but these other people who do not have to work for wages, who are lucky enough or skillful enough to just live on unearned income, pay at the rate today of 18 percent with a vision of going to zero?

Mr. SANDERS. Let me see if I understand what the gentleman is saying. It is a very radical concept. Is the gentleman suggesting that somebody who works by the sweat of their brow for 50, 60, 70 hours a week trying to make $25,000, $35,000, or $40,000 a year to maintain their family at a level of dignity and decency, that those people should be paying less in taxes than people who make millions of dollars investing in the stock market?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, I was not even taking it that far, but that is an interesting point.

Mr. SANDERS. It is radical, I know.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That is pretty radical. The gentleman sometimes is known to be out there a little bit.

But I will take it back to a simpler prospect. A person who works 50 hours a week, say a retail clerk, and brings home $40,000, $50,000 a year in a good union job. That is possible. Let us not even go to the issue of someone with a very large income and someone with a modest income. Let us say two people earned $40,000 a year. One earns $40,000 a year by investing money they inherited, the other earns $40,000 a year by working 40 hours a week in a wage-earning job. The person who earns $40,000 a year is paying taxes at about the rate of 28 percent and the person who invests for a living is paying 18 percent.

Now, I have a hard time understanding why that is fair; why the person who does not work for wages pays a lower rate. And, of course, if the person who works for wages is self-employed, not only do they get socked with a 28 percent rate, they also get socked with paying the FICA tax on both sides, so their tax rate suddenly jumps up around 40 to 50 percent. But their vision for the future is that 1 percent or so who can just live off investments should pay no taxes to the Federal Government.

Now, my question would be how then are we going to maintain the government and who is going to pay?

Mr. SANDERS. Well, I think while it is certainly not fair, it is understandable. Because once again we have got to deal with the reality that the wealthiest one-quarter of 1 percent of the population make 80 percent of the campaign contributions. Unless I would be very mistaken, and I do not think I am, when these guys kick in $50,000 or $100,000 or $1 million, and their corporate friends kick in huge sums of money to both political parties, maybe that is the reason that they are making those contributions.

After all, imagine just trying to live on a couple hundred million dollars a year when one can get a tax break and earn even more money. My guess is that when they go to these $50,000 a plate dinners, they are not sitting there saying, raise the minimum wage, that is why we contributed $50,000; expand the Pell Grants; provide health care to all people; cut the cost of pharmaceuticals so that ordinary folks can afford it.

□ 1830

My guess would be that people who contribute huge sums of money to the political parties are not quite so interested in the needs of the middle class and working families of this country but rather their own interests. And one of their own interests is to pay less and less and less in taxes, and that certainly has happened in recent years.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, certainly, then, we can expect that we will take up campaign finance reform soon here on the floor of the House.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, we certainly would like to do so. But once again, money is talking.

The American people in poll after poll say they want changes in the obscenity of the current campaign finance system. But the monied folks, hey, they like the system the way it is.

See, in a democracy we have one person, one vote. If we have money, if we do not have money, we get one vote. But in the current system, we have one person, one vote. But then the other person has one vote plus the ability to contribute endless sums of money and have access and impact on the legislative process. So for those folks who have the money, they do not want to see campaign finance reform.

It is a real outrage that the House leadership has refused to bring back onto the floor a reasonably conservative bill that would ban soft money that passed overwhelmingly here last year. They do not want to bring it back. And they are going to wait and wait so that it will become impossible for the Senate to act and will continue this charade by which big money pours into both parties and to the presidential candidates and which Government continues to work on the needs of upper-income people rather than the middle class.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making an excellent point there, and it is very disturbing to me and many other Members of this chamber.

I believe the gentleman has probably signed what is called the discharge petition. That is, a majority of Members of this House if made to vote would vote for campaign finance reform, but the leaders of the Republican party are attempting to protect their Members from making that vote.

In the last Congress, Speaker Gingrich managed to delay and delay and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) managed to offer many, many, many mischievous amendments. But ultimately, finally, the House passed its judgment. As the gentleman says, overwhelmingly, faced with the obscenity of today's campaign finance system, an overwhelmingly majority of this House said we have to take these minimal steps towards reform. Our constituents demand it.

But now here we are a little more than a year later, same place, a majority support reform, but we cannot get a bill to the floor of the House. The Speaker says, well, I will only bring it up later in the year, late enough so that we know it will not go anywhere in the Senate and then we will be launched into the presidential campaign year. And we all know that we are not going to reform campaign in the middle of the most expensive presidential campaign in the history of the United States.

Mr. SANDERS. What is really very clear, I do not think there is any debate on this, is the Speaker and the House leadership understands that if that bill came before the House, as the gentleman has just indicated, the vast majority of the people would vote for it because they would be embarrassed to go back home and say, ''we voted against campaign finance reform.'' But if it does not come before the floor of the House, they do not have to make that vote.

Now, we are running out of time. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has recently made I think a very important contribution in terms of this whole discussion over Social Security. As the gentleman knows, we hear very often about how Social Security is going bankrupt, there is no money in it, and blah, blah, blah, which happens to be untrue.

Right now, if the United States Congress does nothing, which I think is not a good idea, I think we should act, Social Security will be able to pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for the next 34 years. So that is not a system on the verge of bankruptcy. But as we become an older society and as people live longer, there are problems that we must address.

I know the gentleman has just recently introduced very, I think, interesting Social Security legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Yes. Just one point beyond that for people who are being stampeded into the idea that we have to destroy the system to save it.

Even if Congress did nothing, as the gentleman says, for 35 years Social Security could deliver on 100 percent of promised benefits and after that 73 to 75 percent of promised benefits into the indefinite future. That means it has a 25-percent that starts 35 years from now.

Does that sound like a system we need to destroy, the most successful social system this country has ever seen that has been responsible for lifting tens of millions of seniors out of poverty?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I find it very ironic and interesting that time and time again, and I guess we are not going to have time today to talk about corporate control over the media, a very dear subject to me, but I find it amazing that we hear Social Security crisis, bankrupt, no money available, and the young people by and large believe us by now because they have heard it so much, when there is no debate.

If the Congress does nothing, Social Security will pay out every nickel owed to every eligible American for the next 34 years.

We have crises today. We have people sleeping out on the street. Elderly people cannot afford their prescription drugs. Veterans are not getting the health care they need. But those, apparently, are not crises. But this noncrisis is now being subjected to a situation where people want draconian response which would destroy the system.

But maybe the gentleman wants to say a few words.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would pause at something, but I do want to explain my plan, that that has something to do with the fact that if it were broken up into 70 to 80 million pieces that there would be an awful lot of commissions out there for brokers. And all the intense pressure here in Congress to break Social Security up and make it into individual accounts is coming from Wall Street, the same people of course who are contributing tremendous amounts of monies to people's campaigns.

But let me explain a simple fix for Social Security. About half the American people pay more in Social Security taxes to the Federal Government than they do income taxes. We should deal with that issue. We should give them some tax relief.

Now, we also want to make certain that the system is solvent for the future. So I put those two ideas together. If we did one thing, if we lifted the cap, right now if they earn $72,600 they pay Social Security on every penny they earn. If they earn $15,000, $20,000, $40,000, up to $72,600, Social Security on every penny they earn. If they earn a million dollars, they only pay Social Security on the first $72,600. That means their effective rate of tax is less than one percent; and it is over 6 percent for Social Security alone, not the Medicare portion, for individuals who earn $20,000 a year.

So lift that cap. If we lift the cap and say fair is fair, everybody will pay the same amount on all they earn, that sounds like the flat tax that my colleagues over here are always pushing, then that would raise more than enough money to fix the system and make it solvent forever.

But I want to take some of that money and invest it in tax relief. We could also exempt the first $4,000 of earnings for every wage-earning American. That means everybody who earns less than $72,600 a year, that is 95 percent of wage-earning Americans, would get a tax break under this proposal. And then with a few other changes in Social Security, investing some aggregate amount of the surplus, taking away from Congress which borrows it and spends it and replaces it with IOUs into index funds and other investments, we could ensure, and I have a letter from Social Security saying my plan would do this, the solvency of Social Security for 75 years, which is as far out as they project it, while providing tax relief for 95 percent of Americans.

I also deal with two other problems. I give five child care dropout years so that the families that cannot afford child care or choose to stay home with their kids in their formative years will not be penalized in their ultimate Social Security benefits; and then finally, a slight increase in benefits for people over the age of 85 who are at a very high rate of poverty.

We could do all that by lifting the cap on the wages. That is, everybody pays the same amount. But, unfortunately, I believe that a lot of people who are talking about financing campaigns are probably in that same category.

Mr. SANDERS. Very interesting. They do polls and they ask the American people, how do you think we should deal with the Social Security situation?

The one alternative is to raise the age at which they get benefits. The other solution is to cut back on benefits. And the American people respond. Then they said, what about raising the cap, exactly what are my colleague is talking about. Poll after poll shows the American people think that is a very good idea. They think it is appropriate.

As the gentleman just indicated, if they raise the cap, not only can they can create Social Security solvency for the 75 years that the actuaries actually want, they could actually have a tax deduction for low and medium income workers, which makes a lot of sense to me.

But amazingly, despite the fact that this is an idea that the American people want, how many people in the Congress are even prepared to talk about that idea? Not a whole lot.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, I am circulating a letter to all our colleagues this week asking them to sign on to the bill, which I will introduce when we return from the July 4 break.

I think that certainly there will be many who will be interested in a progressive Social Security reform, a way to cut taxes for 95 percent of wage-earning Americans and assure the future of Social Security for generations to come. It sounds like a pretty good deal to me. And we will see if, for once, we can overcome the influence of those few wealthy people who spend so much financing the campaigns, particularly on the majority side of the aisle here.

Mr. SANDERS. I think we are coming toward the end of our time. I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for all of the work that he does in the Congress and for his participation this evening.

I would like to conclude on this note. We have touched on a number of problems, but that does not make us pessimistic. It is my belief, and I know I speak for my colleague as well, that if

working people and middle-income people and young people get involved in the political process, if they let the Congress and the President hear from them, if they make the political leaders of this country understand what their needs are and they will get involved, we can turn this country around.

We should not be proud that the wealthiest people have seen huge increases in their income and their wealth at the same time as we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any industrialized nation. We should not be proud that 43 million Americans have no health insurance and that we are the only country in the industrialized world without a national health insurance system. We should not be proud that the CEOs make over 300 times what their workers make and that in the midst of the so-called economic boom, the average American worker today is earning less than was the case 25 years ago.

But ultimately to turn that around, to make the Government of the United States work for the middle class, work for working families, rather than for upper-income people, people are going to have to get involved in the process. They are going to have to vote. They are going to have to be informed about the issues. They are going to have to run for office. They are going to have to revitalize American democracy and pay tribute to the founders of this country who gave us the radical concept of democracy.

So I would hope that all of our people, especially the young people who are turning their backs to our Democratic system, get involved and stand up and fight for the rights of ordinary people.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining me this evening.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

COLORADO CATTLE CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite those Members of the Republican Conference who may be monitoring tonight's proceedings and have something that they would like to add in the next hour during this special order to come on down to the floor and join in. I secure this hour every now and then on behalf of the Republican Conference just for that purpose.

One of the topics I wanted to discuss was with respect to some good news in agriculture over the last couple of weeks. Because while the bull is still loose on Wall Street, months after the analysts and pundits first began warning in ernest of overpriced stocks and certainly financial meltdowns, another young crop of fresh-from-college-20-somethings with a computer and a catchy slogan has launched their initial public offerings and made millions.

Granted, short of cashing in their stock options, their net worth is only on paper and few Internet start-ups have yet to post real profits. But the investor cash fueling the IPO madness is real, and leading economic indicators suggest no predicted slowdown in the economy.

□ 1845

Consumer spending is up while unemployment rates are down. Business sector productivity, personal income and new home starts, all important indicators, are all on the rise.

Yet while that bull stampedes through the streets of New York, many of the cattle along the dusty cattle roads of eastern Colorado are going nowhere. That just might change soon. Until this month, the Clinton administration has done little to help America's cattle industry and cattle ranchers in their decades-long trade dispute with the European Union over U.S. growth hormones which meant that Colorado's cattle intended for slaughter and export to European consumers were banned and banned on the basis of dubious science.

Under prior World Trade Organization rulings, the European Union was required to drop its ban on U.S. beef imports absent risk assessments and scientific justificaton by May 13, 1999. The European Union refused to do so and in response the United States was notified of the World Trade Organization's intent to impose a 100 percent retaliatory tariff on approximately $202 million of European Union products. This level of retaliation is estimated to be far short of the true value of U.S. beef that would be exported to the European Union absent the ban, but it is enough to get the attention of those nations which might utilize unfair trade tactics in the future.

Colorado agriculture increasingly depends upon the export market to expand sales and increase revenues and to expand world trade and agriculture has a significant impact on both the U.S. trade balance and on specific commodities and individual farmers. The cards are stacked against farmers and ranchers to begin with. No sector of the economy is subject to more international trade barriers than agriculture. The import quotas, high tariffs, government-buying monopolies and import bans imposed by other nations coupled with the overwhelming number of trade sanctions and embargoes imposed on other countries by our own government cost the American agriculture industry billions of dollars each year in lost export opportunities. These barriers continue to grow despite the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, and the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. Without question, they are devastating the ability for American producers to compete effectively, particularly at a time when exports now account for over 30 percent of U.S. farm cash receipts and nearly 40 percent of all agricultural production.

This particular dispute over the presence of growth-promoting hormones dates back to 1989 when the European Union put into effect a ban on the production and importation of meat containing such compounds. Growth-promoting hormones are widely used in the United States as well as other top meat exporting countries to speed up growth rates and produce leaner meat for consumers who display an increasing preference for reduced fat and cholesterol diets. Hormones used within the U.S. are regulated by the United States Department of Agriculture and are ones which occur naturally in an animal's body or that mimic naturally occurring compounds. The European Union banned the production and importation of meat derived from animals treated with hormones following an incident where a young boy was harmed after ingesting a concentrated quantity of an unregulated hormone produced in Europe. Citing extensive scientific evidence that U.S. growth hormones have been proven safe, the United States challenged the European Union's ban on the basis that it violates a 1994 Uruguay Round agreement on sanitary and phytosanitary measures. The sanitary and phytosanitary standards agreement requires a scientific basis for measures which restrict trade based on health or safety concerns. The World Trade Organization ruled in 1997 that the ban did indeed violate several provisions of those sanitary and phytosanitary standards agreements and ordered the European Union to eliminate the meat hormone ban by May 13, 1999. When the ban was not lifted last month, the United States decided to take action in the form of retaliatory tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to pick up a newspaper today without reading about the extraordinary resilience of the United States economy and the significant profits being reaped by corporations and investors alike. Yet it is also difficult for me and other Members of Congress representing rural districts to talk with our neighbors back home, conduct town meetings or read through our constituent mail without learning of yet more foreclosures, defaults and farm auctions. Most of these people are not sharing in the windfall. Indeed, farm country is still in serious trouble and there is no evidence things are getting better. Low commodity prices, disease, weather-related problems, coupled with declining export opportunities, weak demand and over-regulation have taken a devastating toll on agriculture. Real farm income has fallen dramatically over the last 2 years and real families are feeling the effects. While Congress recently helped

stave off disaster in rural America with an emergency assistance package, it is evident that more needs to be done and more needs to be done to establish real long-term solutions across the board. That is why the decision to retaliate against the European Union for its unfair ban on U.S. beef, even if for just a fraction of the overall monetary damage to the U.S. and U.S. producers, is a step in the right direction and a significant win for Colorado ranchers and farmers, and I would submit for ranchers and farmers throughout the rest of the country.

It is abundantly clear that in addition to free trade, America must guarantee fair trade. If I, other members of the majority and my colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture can continue to compel the Clinton administration to pursue additional rightful corrective actions like this one, it might just give our farmers and ranchers back home a fighting chance and allow them to run with the bulls.

I recently had an opportunity to hear back from a number of State legislators in Colorado. Their concern on the floor of the Colorado House of Representatives was one for another economic issue, in this case the cause of balancing our Federal budget. As State legislators, my former colleagues and current friends in the General Assembly realize that it is important for the Federal Government to get its financial house in order. The State legislature recently sent to Congress a resolution that it adopted in both houses of the State legislature. It is a House Joint Resolution, 99–1016. It is based on a number of items. The resolution was drafted and offered by State Representative Penn Pfiffner from Colorado and also State Senator Ken Arnold from Adams County in Colorado. It concerns the General Assembly's support for legislation that would require a balanced Federal budget and the repayment of the national debt.

They cite a number of statistics, that the Federal Government has accumulated a $70 billion budget surplus in 1998, the first surplus since 1969, and is considering policies for using that 1998 surplus and expected surpluses for 1999 and future years.

The Federal Government has amassed a national debt of more than $5.7 trillion and in 1999 Federal tax dollars will be used to pay $357 billion in interest just to the national debt.

The costs of servicing the national debt have become an increasingly large portion of the Federal budget, rising from under 10 percent of the budget back in 1978 to 22 percent of the budget in 1997.

Paying down the national debt will relieve future generations of the burden of paying the costs of servicing the national debt, says the Colorado State General Assembly, and they are right.

Paying down the national debt does not exclude the use of Federal moneys for tax relief or for saving Social Security for future generations.

Paying down the national debt will foster economic growth and stability.

The American Debt Repayment Act which provides for budgetary reform by requiring a balanced Federal budget for each year beginning with Federal fiscal year 2000 and requiring a repayment of the entire national debt by the end of Federal fiscal year 2029 has been introduced in both houses, here and in the other body across the hall.

The Colorado General Assembly urges the Congress in the following way. It says:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 62nd General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

Number one, that we, the members of the General Assembly, support the objectives of the American Debt Repayment Act to pay down the national debt and maintain a balanced Federal budget; and, two, that the members of the General Assembly strongly urge the United States Congress to commit to a plan to repay the national debt before approving a budget resolution.

These kinds of resolutions, Mr. Speaker, are important. States adopt these kinds of resolutions in their State General Assemblies on a routine basis. This is just one example. It is signed in this case by the Speaker of the House, Russell George, and the President of the Colorado State Senate, Ray Powers. These resolutions are taken to heart and utilized by many of us here in Washington. These are the voices of the front lines when it comes to government. In our strong tradition of federalism, we, of course, have separated the duties and responsibilities of governing our great Nation into generally three levels, the local level, the State level and the Federal level, and I am one who fundamentally believes as the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution suggests that it is States that bear the greatest responsibility in organizing and leading our societies through the political process. And so when States issue memorandum such as these and memorialize Congress to act in a certain way, Members of Congress should take heed, Members of Congress should pay attention, Members of Congress should respect the opinions of those who truly are on the front lines of leading our society. Those 50, as a Supreme Court Justice once observed, laboratories of democracy, the States, really do understand the importance of a strong economy and a responsible Federal budget and a responsible Congress when it comes to managing the fiscal affairs of the entire Nation.

I want to jump to another subject for a moment. This is a much more personal one but one that is being carried out in a public way. I met a woman recently, I was speaking at an education conference in the State of Florida and a woman after the conference came up and gave me her business card and gave me some information about a program that she runs, because in the discussion about education and looking out for the future and the well-being of our children, she has a program that she has initiated and is carrying out with great success in Florida that she told me about and asked me if I would not come to this floor at some point in time and share her thoughts and her objectives of her program with my colleagues. Her name is Tina Hesse. She is the abstinence coordinator for the Brandon Crisis Pregnancy Center in Brandon, Florida. She is one who comes to this particular mission of hers with tremendous commitment and compassion. She is one who has a personal story to tell and one who found herself at a young age to be with child and her credibility on the matter is one that she utilizes in a very positive way now to reach out to a number of young children all across Florida and hopefully even tonight throughout the country, because when she gives her presentation on teen sexual abstinence in high schools, her message is a personal one.

She says, and I quote, I had a teen pregnancy when I was in high school, so I know where kids are in terms of their contemplation of sexual activity.

She is 31 years old now and delivers a very powerful message to children, primarily in schools but in other settings as well. Her program is called ''Be the One'' which began as a West Palm Beach pregnancy center program in the early 1990s. Hesse said the program title means be the one to wait to have sex.

There is a quote in an article that I am referencing here from the Tampa Tribune, May 20, 1999:

Hillsborough Secondary Education Supervisor Tom Schlarbaum, who approved the abstinence program, describes Hillsborough's present sex education program as abstinence-based compared to the abstinence-only approach of ''Be the One'' but he says, ''The abstinence-only focus gives teachers another way to get a different message across.'' In his opinion it is an important one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wanted to point out on the subject of welfare reform just how well our country has done since the welfare reform.

Approximately 42 percent of the people who were on welfare in 1994 are off welfare now. We kind of take it for granted, well, welfare reform is working, but if we go back and we look at the struggle we had getting common sense welfare reform that was compassionate in that it wanted to help people, not push anybody out the door, not cut off anybody's insurance benefit or transportation or housing, yet at the same time say if you are able to work, you ought to be required to work. Yet despite that, the President vetoed the bill twice. The minority leader, Dick Gephardt, said this on the floor of the House in March 1995:

''A Republican welfare bill will throw millions of children out on the street

without doing anything to move people from welfare to work.''

□ 1900

The gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) said on July 17, 1996, it grieves me to be here this evening to see the end of a period of almost 60 years in which this country's belief in its responsibility to the poor is going to be shattered. This is not reform. This is destruction of the basic guarantees of our democracy.

Here is Representative Sam Gibbons on the floor, March 21, 1995: If Attilla the Hun were alive today and elected to Congress, he would be delighted with this bill that is here before us, and proud to cast his vote for H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act. It is the most callous, cold-hearted, just listen to this rhetoric, the most callous, cold-hearted and mean-spirited attack on this country that I have ever seen in my life; just fighting that kind of irresponsible rhetoric to the rolls decreasing that were on welfare, people working, people feeling good about themselves, the teen pregnancy rates going down, the crime rates going down; people like this woman who are back in the education system or back in the workforce feeling good, happy, independent, no longer shackled by this government system which encourages dependence.

Mr. SCHAFFER. If the gentleman remembers, at the time when that debate was unfolding here on the House Floor, the gentleman is right that a number of the more liberal Members of Congress, who view the government as the primary entity in organizing our society, believed that the American people really would not rally around the cause of helping the poor, of helping those who have become dependent on a welfare system, not just dependent but locked into a cycle of poverty that seemed to be never ending; that these liberals on the House floor who came to believe and approached the debate from the perspective that, my goodness, nobody else will be able to stand in the balance.

I appreciate the comments about the reduction in teen pregnancy and what a positive result that has had. People like Tina Hess have really filled the void where government once was viewed as the sole provider of these kinds of services. She is one who has found a way, through a nonprofit corporation, to go into schools and deliver a curriculum that is helping to continue to reduce these numbers.

Let me read one more final quote from one of the students. She said that the slides on sexually transmitted diseases show students how their lives can become miserable. A lot of teens think AIDS, or STDs, sexually transmitted diseases, will never happen to them but after a presentation at a school called Bloomingdale last week, one student wrote, and I am quoting the letter from the student, all this talk about pregnancy and STDs is going to make me stay a virgin until I am ready.

Now that is the kind of response that has really flourished throughout the country where those who have made some poor decisions, but who also take their role as citizens seriously, have managed to provide a real leadership role in the community to help drive these welfare case numbers down. It is remarkable.

In States like mine out in Colorado, over the last 2 years there are now 50 percent fewer families on welfare than there were just 2 years ago.

Mr. KINGSTON. In the testimony of the people, here is a bus driver in Milwaukee, when welfare reform first started there were a lot of complaints; people were afraid how they would fit in. Everything was new and different, but now many people have gotten into it and the morale and self-esteem has been boosted. We can tell they feel good. Most of the people are happy, too. Look into their eyes. They are happy. The eyes tell no lies.

Here is a former welfare mother: I could have succeeded long ago but I had kids and I was an over protective mother. I did take advantage of the welfare system, but now we are not living month-to-month running out of food. I earn $11.49 an hour. I am still in poverty but I know it is not going to last forever. Just a total turnaround.

Here is an article from the New York Times, July 27, 1998: With caseloads falling at a startling pace for minorities as well as whites, taxpayers seem well satisfied with the new ethos of time limits and work demands, and yet here again going back to 1995 here was a quote from one of our colleagues, they are coming for the sick, the elderly, the disabled. I say to my colleagues, we have the ability, the capacity, the power to stop this onslaught. Another one said that welfare reform was like Nazi Germany.

So often we in our society seem to work ourselves up into a froth; fear of the unknown. What we need to do is to have a little more self-confidence and self-reliance.

I love the story from the gentleman about this educator also.

We have passed in this Congress, under Speaker HASTERT, the Educational Flexibility Act, which has already passed the Senate and signed by the President, but the ed-flex bill gives local school systems more control, less Washington micromanagement, less bureaucracy breathing down their necks. Now, even though that is successful, we are starting it and most school systems say, yes, we want to run our show locally, we are trying to go a little bit further and do something called Straight A. What the Straight A program calls for is a charter between individual States and the Federal Government, and basically the Federal Government says that if the States meet certain outcomes and have high results, then we will free them from certain Federal regulations.

My school boards in the 18 counties that I represent in southeast Georgia, they are ready for that. They know they have the ability to educate children better in Georgia than Washington can educate Georgia children. So they are confident about it.

I am sure in Colorado, and I visited the gentleman's people, they are full of that good old western pride that made our country so strong and they are as independent as anybody. I am sure they are going to be delighted to get into this Straight As program.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Absolutely.

Our governor, Governor Bill Owens, is one who is looking forward to a day when there is greater flexibility to allow not only him but the rest of the Colorado General Assembly, and not to mention our school board leaders who are elected officials accountable directly to the people, these are the folks where they actually know the names of the students and the teachers and the administrators, all of these folks are looking forward to the day when they will be unleashed from the Federal rules and regulations that hamper their ability to teach children in an effective way.

We spend billions of dollars here in Washington and yet for the billions we spend the actual proportion of Federal funds that actually reach a classroom is relatively small, somewhere on the order of 7, 6, sometimes as high as 9 percent, in some needy or poorer school districts, but for that small, relatively small, portion of Federal funds that make up an overall classroom budget, the strings and the red tape and the requirements and mandates attached to that minority of cash is overpowering.

There are school districts in my State that have to hire people just to fill out the Federal paperwork so that they can get the money.

This is money that comes to Washington. The American taxpayers are working hard every day and paying their taxes. The money comes here to Washington, D.C. The Congress then, through its formulas and so on, divvies up this cash in a variety of ways and then there is this huge bureaucracy not too far from where we are now that then goes to work on this money. By the time that cash makes its way back to Colorado and back to the State of Georgia and every other State in the Union, there is just a fraction left for the kids.

That is what our Straight As proposal is designed to resolve, not to spend more money in Washington. We do not need to do that. We can actually increase the proportion of dollars that make it to a child by cutting all these silly rules and regulations.

I know there are people over there in the Department of Education who are nervous about this discussion, nervous about the debate and they oppose straight As, and with good reason. Our goal is to get rid of a lot of those people. I will be candid and frank with the gentleman and with them and with the American people. I frankly care more about my children in public schools

and all of the children of my friends and neighbors back in Colorado than I do about these people down the street here in the Department of Education. I want the money to get to the kids and to the teachers who know how to teach, rather than the bureaucrats who know how to provide paperwork and produce more headaches for communities around the country.

This Straight As proposal, it is a big thing. There are 760 Federal education programs. The ed-flex bill that we passed dealt with, I think, 9 of them; 9 significant ones. It was a big step in the right direction.

To follow up, to take the next logical step, to show the American people that we are serious about moving authority out of Washington and empowering our local communities, this Straight As proposal is a significant one.

I might add that we have almost 100 cosponsors now in this Congress, including on our side of the aisle, the Republican side, every Member of that committee is on board, every Member of our Republican leadership is on board. It is a bipartisan bill. We have Democrats who are cosponsors of Straight As. This is a big initiative and an exciting one, and the gentleman is right, before I turn it back over to the gentleman, to suggest that the education leaders in my State, and I would bet in the State of the gentleman also, and the other 48 states, are really getting excited about the prospect of receiving their cash back without Federal strings attached.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think that the question also on the subject of money is, do we want the dollars that we earn, that we work hard 40, 50, 60 hours a week for, do we want that money, those tax dollars, that portion of our income, to go to a bureaucrat in Washington or do we want it to go to a teacher in a classroom?

One of the things we have been pushing are more dollars to the classroom, not tripling the bureaucracy in Washington who is micromanaging our school system, and I think that is important. I think the local flexibility is the key, though.

In Colorado, the gentleman certainly had the big tragedy in Littleton that we are all aggrieved about, but we need to ask ourselves, maybe Washington is, in fact, part of the problem. Maybe pushing large, impersonal schools, where the teachers do not know the students as well, maybe the teachers are afraid to question kids who are acting suspicious or odd or peculiar because they are afraid of being sued themselves, and this kind of atmosphere really has been fostered by this large centralized government that has grown in the last 10 years in our country.

If people could run their own communities, their own schools and their own lives, I think we would have a much better society.

It is interesting, while this administration rushes out after the Littleton tragedy to pass more gun control laws, they have completely ignored the fact that last year there were only 8 prosecutions for possession or discharge of a firearm in a school zone, and only 8 prosecutions for possession of a handgun or ammunition by a juvenile, and 6 prosecutions for the transfer of a handgun or ammunition to a juvenile.

As the gentleman knows, in Littleton 23 existing gun control laws were broken. We have all of these on the books, but this administration is not prosecuting. What a difference it would make if they would prosecute. We do not know how it would have affected Littleton, but we do know that there are a lot of laws on the books that this administration, this Justice Department, has chosen not to enforce.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Right.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think it could make a tremendous difference.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The whole theme here is one of local government. Local government is the closest to the people, the most accountable to those who are paying the taxes, and all three of these topics that we have discussed here really center around the theme of local authority and the notion that centralizing power and decision-making in Washington is a recipe for failure.

Going back to the welfare issue, when the debate took place on whether to reform the welfare system, the gentleman is right, there are people who said we cannot watch Washington give this authority up; it will hurt people.

We are seeing now in the debate on education reform the exact same dynamics. People here in Washington are saying, wait a minute; we cannot cut the Federal bureaucracy in Washington. That will hurt schools.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will stop there.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Sure.

Mr. KINGSTON. This particular president has been very wise in appealing to the population of the country. He talks about less Washington power and welfare reform, even though he vetoed the bill twice. He talks about more control of education locally. Now, unfortunately, we know, after 7 years that he does not always do what he says he is going to do, but maybe all politicians are that way, at least a little bit.

□ 1915

But it is interesting that members of his party are often out of step with what he is in fact saying himself.

In a case in point, in social security, we had a long debate about the lockbox concept, and the concept of a lockbox is so that the Federal government would quit mixing social security funds for peoples' retirement with operating expenses to run government agencies. We passed that after a long debate. There were a lot of procedural tactics to keep the bill off the floor, but once it got on the floor it was passed on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis.

It went to the Senate, which up until this week has not moved on the bill and had no plans to move on it until the President finally came around and said it. But it is that fear, the fear-mongering that we hear over and over again. It is the same people saying the same irresponsible things to scare America's educators, America's children, America's seniors, the environment, and whatever. It is just a fear-mongering tactic.

Somehow, once we get through there, it is not as bad as they thought, for some reason.

Mr. SCHAFFER. It is the culture of Washington that suggests to all of us here when we become a Member of Congress that no one in America can lead a successful life without somebody from the Federal government getting involved in their day-to-day affairs.

The gentleman and I came here as part of a new Republican majority to throw that type of mentality out of the city. It is taking a long time. That mentality that I just described has deep roots in this town. But systematically, day by day, we are proving them wrong. We are showing that trusting the American people is a recipe for success, and we are seeing it now with an economy that is just cruising along and doing extraordinarily well. We are seeing that now with a discussion on the House floor and over in the White House about what to do with surplus revenues, if Members can imagine that.

We are now talking about millions of Americans who are no longer dependent on the welfare system because we trusted local and State governments and the ingenuity of the American people to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. We just helped the Federal government get out of the way. That works.

Listen to this quote, going back to the welfare discussion for a moment. ''The AFDC world is very insular.'' I am reading a quote from a high school counselor in Milwaukee, AFDC being the Aid to Families With Dependent Children program, which is really one of the primary programs in welfare.

Mr. KINGSTON. Which incidentally is now temporary aid to needy families.

Mr. SCHAFFER. He says the AFDC world was very insular. ''I don't think people left their neighborhoods. Now we are seeing a lot of mobility, people getting out more, families having a lot more exposure to services, like counseling and parenting classes. It seems like everywhere I go there is a sense of business in the streets, a lot of activity.''

For a high school guidance counselor to make these observations in Milwaukee tells us where he is making these observations. He is seeing this in his children that he is serving. He is seeing this in the neighborhoods, where education becomes the important order of the day.

I think the message of this high school guidance counselor and others who make these same observations is a

message that needs to be told at the time we are debating education reform. It is the next step. If welfare reform worked by getting the Federal government out of the way, by empowering States, empowering local communities, and treating Americans like Americans again, perhaps we ought to try the same thing when it comes to schools: Get the Federal government and its 760 Federal programs out of the way, and let those principals and administrators and locally-elected school board members and teachers and parents do what they know how to do, which is teach children and care about them and build strong communities.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think it has worked for welfare reform, and we need to, I think, be bold in our initiatives with social security, with Medicare, with tax relief, and all of our other issues that we are dealing with in this Congress.

The agenda, as the gentleman knows, that we are working on under the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) is the BEST agenda.

B is for building a strong military, one that can fight a war on two fronts, defend our country, one that is ready and modernized and has a good quality of life for the soldiers; E, E is for education, local control, excellence in education; S is for saving social security; and T is for lowering taxes through spending reductions and through revenue that does not go to social security.

One of the interesting things on the tax relief is that right now Federal taxes currently consume 21 percent of America's gross domestic product, the highest percentage in the history of our country.

Last year tax revenues grew by about 9 percent, and the average American now works 129 days in order to pay off their total tax bill. This is an all-time high. When the gentleman and I were raised, our parents, say in the fifties, paid 5 percent Federal income tax on average. In the 1970s it was 16 percent. Today it is 25 percent Federal income taxes.

What is really telling to me is that individuals and families who are earning $50,000 a year pay about 82 percent of the total Federal income tax revenue. Let me repeat that. Individuals and families earning $50,000, and I suspect that would probably be about 90 percent of the people who watch C–Span, they are paying 82 percent of the total income revenue, income tax revenues to the Federal government. That is a huge disproportionate tax burden.

Mr. SCHAFFER. They are overpaying, too. The interesting thing about Washington, and what may frustrate many of these taxpayers who are working hard and know where every dollar of their income goes and where their taxes hurt, I turned on the news yesterday and discovered that the President of the United States woke up yesterday and found $1 trillion laying around, discovered that there is $1 trillion in additional surplus revenue that the Federal government has all of a sudden found.

That is a great thing, I think. What it shows is that the economy was even stronger than they realized over at the White House; that the entrepreneurial spirit of the American people is even more inspired than perhaps the White House gave it credit for.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this about that surplus that people often are missing in Washington. That surplus is projected on unrealistic spending restraints. We can say, we are going to have this surplus, but that is making a huge, a huge assumption that we are going to continue on a very moderate spending path which the gentleman and I know every day a new special interest group comes to us and says, break these spending caps, spend more than projected.

To me, that is one thing that is wrong with the surplus. The other thing is, as the gentleman has already pointed out, it makes a big assumption that the economy is going to continue to roll along at the current rate.

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is right. In order to make that happen and to encourage that kind of economic growth, the kind that we have experienced over the last 6 years, we have to make sure we do the right things that help foster economic growth.

I want to ask the gentleman, just in terms of speculation and knowing the nature of the city, when there are extra dollars laying around, whether they are real or perceived extra dollars, can the gentleman define for the House what the gentleman thinks the debate will be over the next few months or years around this $1 trillion surplus that the President tripped over yesterday and accidentally discovered?

What does the gentleman think will happen next on the House floor? Does the gentleman think we will have the courage to give that money back to the taxpayers?

Mr. KINGSTON. There is a double-edged sword to bragging about the surplus. Number one, when we go out and talk about the surplus, we feel good politically because we say, look, some of our policies have worked, and for the first time since 1969 when Woodstock was held at Yasgur's farm, the budget now is balanced, or it is not in deficit. There is still this huge Federal debt, but just the annual spending is not a deficit. So there is a political punch to Democrats and Republicans about it.

But the down side is that we are also sending a signal out to the special interest groups that, hey, there is plenty of money here, come and get it, and wink wink, nobody will mind if we break our spending caps, the bipartisan budget agreement of 1997, because we have new money, and no one likes new money better than Washington's special interest groups.

I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but it is not unique to us at all. Every single day a new group comes up and asks us to break that spending cap, that 1997 agreement. There are legitimate concerns. It is not just coming up with frivolous things, it is just that hey, we have legitimate concerns, and do we really have to go back and do the hard work of reinventing government or reinventing the status quo and figure out a better way to build a mousetrap? Can't you just give us more money this year? We hear it from health care, from education, from all kind of government bureaucracies.

I am very, very concerned that that anticipated surplus is not going to be as large as we want it to be because we are going to use it as an excuse to relax our austerity.

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is actually the point I wanted to make, because I do not care who we are, whether we are a liberal over there in the White House or on the other side from where we stand, we do not just find $1 trillion laying around. We either know it was there, or maybe a portion of it. We just do not magically wake up one day and discover, hey, we have $1 trillion more cash than we thought.

The point I was intending to get to here is this: That waving that $1 trillion surplus figure around to the American people really does send the green light, it sends the go signal to all of the lobbyists, all of the special interests, and even to many Members of this very Congress that, start smiling, it is time to spend again. We have money laying around.

We really do not have huge piles of cash laying around Washington, D.C. There are lots of games and lots of manipulations that go into bragging about the size of this debt.

There is no question that over the past few years, since the Republicans have taken over the control of Congress, we have slowed the rate of growth in Federal budgeting. We have done so to the extent that we have allowed the economy to catch up with us. But we do not have the trillions and trillions of dollars laying around Washington, D.C. to begin to start celebrating and spending.

Mr. KINGSTON. The odd part is, and just in a personal home, it is fun to buy a new boat or a new car. I have had one new car in my life, and I have never owned a new boat, so I really do not know the feeling, but I know it is a lot more fun to buy maybe a new TV or a new stereo than it is to buy a new drier or to get a new set of tires for your car.

In politics it is the same way, it is far more glamorous and sexy to go out and create a new government arts program or a new program for some special interest group that is going to help a limited number of people but it is going to sound real good to all, and we rush out and do that rather than pay down the debt.

With a $5.4 trillion debt, I strongly urge, and I know the gentleman has been fighting for it, that we include not just debt service but debt payment

in every budget that we have. We should have, and last year our colleague, Mark Neumann, advocated I think it was a 25-year budget debt paydown that would have paid off the national debt I think by the year 2025, or maybe even sooner than that.

That should be the center of the debate, not what are we going to do with this new money.

That debt right now, we do pay interest on it, and that interest I think is something like I believe $500 per person, so a family of four pays about $2,000 a year in taxes servicing the national debt. That is $2,000 a year that could be used for college tuition, for groceries, for a vacation, for a couple of months of house payments.

That money is absolutely gone to the bondholders. It does not buy better education, better health care, better national security, it is just gone.

Mr. SCHAFFER. People in Washington like to take the credit for the strong economy and take credit for balancing the budget, and we deserve some credit, I think. As I mentioned, we did slow the rate of growth in Federal budgeting over the last 6 years. That has allowed the economy to catch up. But the American people are the ones that really deserve the credit.

We can help in a number of ways. There are many people here in Washington who believe that we were wrong to cut taxes over the last couple of years. We reduced the capital gains tax, we reduced inheritance taxes, we managed to provide a $500 per child tax credit. There are an assortment of other taxes that we managed to knock down just a little bit.

We have not repealed them or pulled back the overall tax rate nearly as much as we can and perhaps should. But those people who criticized us for trying to reduce the tax burden and provide tax relief are also wrong, because what we found was that by leaving more cash back home in the hands and pockets of those people who earn it, we have inspired those individuals to become more productive with their own capital, with their own wealth. They have created more jobs. They have made wiser investments.

□ 1930

It is, in fact, that heightened level of economic activity that is saving the country today. That is the reason we balanced the budget. That is the reason the President believes that, if those American people continue to do the same things, make the same wise investments, perform strong economically as they have been, over the next 15 years, that there will be the surplus.

But it really means for us, I think, that we need to find more ways to ease the burden on American families and American business owners and people who are creating wealth and continue to shrink this government. Those are the assumptions the President has built into his numbers, but I do not believe that he has the commitment that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and I do and the rest of the Republican majority to actually stick to those budget caps and actually see the surplus grow.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we do not see any signs of it in the rhetoric that we are going to stick with this bipartisan agreement that everybody signed off on.

But to get back in terms of tax reduction, one of the big problems, and the gentleman from Colorado knows the expression, I think it is attributed to Jesse James, but I am not sure, ''Why do you rob banks?'' ''Because that is where the money is.'' Why do the rich get tax reductions? Because they are the ones paying the taxes.

Now, I know that is real hard to accept when one builds political careers on class warfare and class division, as many politicians do. But the reality is, if one wants to give tax relief, one has got to give it also to the people who are paying the big taxes.

As I pointed out before, households earning more than $50,000 are paying 82 percent of the income taxes right now. We have got to let them have some tax relief. But what is the benefit of that? Job creation. The entrepreneurs that the gentleman is talking about.

Ted Turner in Georgia makes a tremendous amount of money. Do my colleagues know what, in schools all over America, they should be teaching kids how they want to be an entrepreneur, they want to grow, they want to have capitalization, they want to be independent.

Now, not everybody is going to do that, be able to do that, and we want to have all kinds of jobs and options for people. We want to help those who never will be independent. But the reality is, let us do not punish Ted Turner when he gets to be where he is.

I mean, has it been good for the state of Georgia and Atlanta for CNN to be located there? Absolutely yes. Is it good, all those jobs? Yes. Are those people also, many of them who work for him, wealthy? Yes. Is that good? Yes. They buy lots of shoes and cars and stereos. They spend all kinds of money which creates jobs in Atlanta, Georgia.

But we go at this thing with the myopic that they are rich. It can only be attributed to luck, not hard work and enterprise. Therefore, there is an injustice about it, and we have got to punish them for being rich. We hear that over and over again.

But in this time of the surplus and the surplus, not all of it is coming from Social Security, but Americans are paying about $500 a year more than the government needs to operate.

Now, I do not know anybody who likes overpaying a bill. I do not care who it is, if it is Bill Gates or the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), nobody like overpaying.

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is right.

Mr. KINGSTON. So one are overpaying one's taxes by $500 more a year if one is an average family than we need in this room, in this Chamber, in this Congress to operate one's government with.

Mr. SCHAFFER. It was Willie Sutton, by the way. Willie Sutton was the bank robber who told the judge, when the judge asked, ''Why do you rob banks?''

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Colorado intimate with bank robbers? How does he know these fine things?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I remember that. It was Willie Sutton.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I only remember Shakespeare and Winston Churchill, so the gentleman can correct me any time on bank robbers.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I remember that in particular because there is another Willie in this town who looks at obtaining cash in much the same way. When asked why he prefers taxes to be high rather than low and why he prefers additional spending rather than less, the answer is much the same way. We are going to continue to tax the American people $500 more than they need to be paying because that is where the money is.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman has heard the old story about the man is driving down the road and sees a pig, and three of the pig's legs are wrapped up in bandages. Actually, he has three wooden legs. He says, what is the story about this pig.

He says, oh, that pig is a magic pig. It has really done a lot. He said, one time the family was burning, the House was burning, and that pig ran in and pulled us all out of bed and saved the entire family. Another time, my son was drowning, that pig dove in the lake, swam out there and picked him up and kept him from drowning and pulled him back from shore. On another occasion, my little girl was in an automobile accident, and the car was burning, and the pig leaped through the window and pulled her out and saved her.

The guy from the city said, well, that is amazing. That is a remarkable pig. But tell me, what about the bandages.

He said, well, it is obvious. You do not eat a pig like that all at once.

That is what the government is doing to the American entrepreneur, the American small business person, and the hard-working taxpayer in general, just grinding them down.

Some statistics that I wanted to say, the Census Bureau says that the average household now pays $9,445 in Federal income taxes, which is twice as much as it was in 1985. The typical American family pays more in taxes than we spend on food, clothing, housing, and transportation combined. It is very similar to the story. You just do not eat a pig like that all at once, you grind them down.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the people who have the most at stake in this debate really are those American families earning less than $50,000. They

already pay above 82 percent of the overall tax burden, and they constitute 91 percent of incomes.

When we talk about providing tax relief, trying to ease the burden on these very individuals, it will be the Democrats on the other side of the aisle that will come up here to these podiums and try to suggest that we are trying to reduce taxes on only the wealthy. Well, it is not the wealthy. It is 91 percent of all income taxes and 82 percent of the total burden being paid by those who earned $50,000 or less.

I received a letter from a woman in Fort Collins who understands this full well. She says in one paragraph in this letter that she sent me, a woman from Fort Collins, Colorado, she says, ''Although my family is not wealthy, it makes sense to me to give the extra money back to the people who paid it.''

I think that she accurately sums up the sentiment of most Americans if we ask, where should this tax relief go? Where should this overpayment and cash revenues go? It should go back to those who overpaid.

Eighty-two percent of the taxpayers in America are those earning $50,000 or less, and those are the ones that we think deserve their money back.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman's time is about to expire, so I will just close with this, that, again, under the leadership of Speaker Hastert, we are working on what we call the Best agenda. Again, the B is for the best, strongest military. E is for excellence in education. S is for saving Social Security. And T is for reducing taxes.

We are making a lot of progress. This year, for the first year in many years, the appropriations bills will be passed out of the House ahead of the cycle, ahead of the calendar, and we are making a lot of progress.

I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado allowing me to share some of his time tonight, and I look forward to working with him in the balance of the year.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia in joining this special order. America is good, not so much because of the Congress or our laws or things here in Washington. America is a great country because of the people and because of the philosophy of life that we have here in the United States. It is that philosophy and those people that we in order to honor more by not talking so much about growing Washington, but by shrinking the power of the Federal Government and encouraging and strengthen the lot of the American people.

TO MODIFY DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) offers duty-free treatment to specified products that are imported from designated beneficiary developing countries. The GSP is authorized by title V of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

I have determined, based on a consideration of the eligibility criteria in title V, that Gabon and Mongolia should be added to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the GSP.

I have also determined that the suspension of preferential treatment for Mauritania as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP, as reported in my letters to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of June 25, 1993, should be ended. I had determined to suspend Mauritania from the GSP because Mauritania had not taken or was not taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights. I have determined that circumstances in Mauritania have changed and that, based on a consideration of the eligibility criteria in title V, preferential treatment under the GSP for Mauritania as a least-developed beneficiary developing country should be restored.

This message is submitted in accordance with the requirements of title V of the Trade Act of 1974.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1999.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1018

AFTER RECESS

The recess have expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 775, THE Y2K ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–213) on the resolution (H. Res. 234) waiving certain points of order against the conference report on the bill (H.R. 775) to establish certain procedures for civil actions brought for damages relating to the failure of any device or system to process or otherwise deal with the transition from the year 1999 to the year 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–214) on the resolution (H. Res. 235) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE AND SENATE FOR INDEPENDENCE DAY WORK PERIOD

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–215) on the resolution (H. Res. 236) providing for consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 1, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2799. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 99–21), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2800. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report concerning defense articles that were licensed for export under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act during Fiscal Year 1998; to the Committee on International Relations.

2801. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates—received May 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2802. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–51–AD; Amendment 39–11185; AD 99–11–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2803. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Credit Assistance for Surface Transportation Projects [OST Docket No. OST–99–5728] (RIN: 2125–AE49) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2804. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–400 Series Airplanes Powered by Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Engines [Docket No. 97–NM–89–AD; Amendment 39–11183; AD 99–11–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2805. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Aircraft Engines CF34 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–19–AD; Amendment 39–11179; AD 99–11–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2806. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–223–AD; Amendment 39–11186; AD 99–11–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2807. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Model 402C Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–21–AD; Amendment 39–11184; AD 99–11–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2808. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Lake Champlain, NY & VT [CGD01–98–032] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2809. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Chelsea Street Bridge Fender System Repair, Chelsea River, Chelsea, MA [CGD1–99–053] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2810. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Falgout Canal, LA [CGD08–99–035] received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2811. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Massalina Bayou, Florida [CGD08–99–033] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2812. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Muskingum River, Ohio [CGD08–99–020] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2813. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Harvey Canal, LA [CGD08–99–029] received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2814. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Mandatory Ship Reporting Systems [USCG–1999–5525] (RIN: 2115–AF82) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2815. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Anchorage Ground; Safety Zone; Speed Limit; Tongass Narrows and Ketchikan, AK [CGD17–99–002] (RIN: 2115–AF81) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2816. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; San Pedro Bay, CA [COTP Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA; 99–003] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 234. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 775) to establish certain procedures for civil actions brought for damages relating to the failure of any device or system to process or otherwise deal with the transition from the year 1999 to the year 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–213). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 235. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes. (Rept. 106–214). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 236. Resolution providing for consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period (Rept. 106–215). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BOYD, Ms. DUNN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2389. A bill to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KIND, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FORD, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 2390. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to create small, manageable, accountable classrooms with qualified teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. JACKSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WU, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FORD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr.

PASTOR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 2391. A bill to establish a National Center for Research on Domestic Health Disparities; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TALENT (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 2392. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to extend the authorization for the Small Business Innovation Research Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, 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. BAIRD:

H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide disaster relief for homeowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS:

H.R. 2394. A bill to provide wage parity for certain Department of Defense prevailing rate employees in Georgia; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. COMBEST (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. EWING, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. OSE, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to extend through fiscal year 2002 the authority for the advance payment, in full, of the payments required under production flexibility contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 2396. A bill to provide that the Davis-Bacon Act shall not apply to contracts for the construction and repair of schools and libraries; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OLVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FROST, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROTHman, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LEE, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. VENTO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MOORE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LARSON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WU, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 2397. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DELAY:

H.R. 2398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify certain existing limitations on private business use of facilities financed with tax-exempt bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 2399. A bill to establish a commission to recommend a strategy for the global eradication of disease; to the Committee on Commerce. to establish a commission to recommend a strategy for the global eradication of disease

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the low-income housing credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAZIO (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2401. A bill to amend the U.S. Holocaust Assets Commission Act of 1998 to extend the period by which the final report is due and to authorize additional funding; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. DUNN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. PAUL, and Mrs. NORTHUP):

H.R. 2402. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a 15-year recovery period for franchise property, to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain leasehold improvements, to allow capital gain treatment on the transfer of a franchise in connection with the transfer of an existing business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 2403. A bill to provide for payment in December 1999 of Social Security benefits otherwise payable in January 2000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.R. 2404. A bill to protect the privacy of individuals by ensuring the confidentiality of information contained in their medical records and health-care-related information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DIXON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of CALIFORNIA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote activities for the prevention of additional cases of infection with the virus commonly known as HIV; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 2406. A bill to reauthorize the Trade Adjustment Assistance program through fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. RIVERS:

H.R. 2407. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to establish certain requirements regarding the approval of facilities for the disposal of polychlorinated biphenyls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 2408. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to prescribe a rule that prohibits the importation for disposal of polychlorinated biphenyls at concentrations of 50 parts per million or greater; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROGAN (for himself, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 2410. A bill to amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994 to earmark not less than $150,000,000 for grants to reduce drug-related transactions and drug use in the one-mile areas surrounding elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2411. A bill to abolish the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Science, Government Reform, Rules, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOUDER:

H.R. 2412. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the ''E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 237. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with regard to fibromyalgia; to the Committee on Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

148. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14 memorializing the President of the United States and Missouri's Congressional delegation to recognize the effort and resources expended by Missouri to promote and protect its interest throughout the litigation and negotiation of claims against the tobacco industry; to the Committee on Commerce.

149. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1157 memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress to pass the important and far-reaching legislation that would help the elderly and, in turn, all Americans; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 8: Mr. COBURN, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 82: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 116: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 215: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 323: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 380: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 407: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 413: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 525: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. PASTOR, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 681: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 725: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 732: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 743: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 750: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 765: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 776: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 815: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 828: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 876: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 900: Mr. WEINER and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 925: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 997: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WISE, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 1006: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1081: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1082: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1105: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1106: Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 1127: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1130: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1163: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WU, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1168: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 1190: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1195: Mr. WATKINS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1332: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1358: Mr. KUYKENDALL and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1433: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1463: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 1478: Ms. WATERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1487: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1503: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1525: Mr. DIXON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 1531: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1592: Mr. QUINN, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 1598: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1620: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGAN, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1622: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1629: Mr. KLINK, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 1660: Mr. CLAY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LARSON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LEE, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1702: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1786: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1792: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1798: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1837: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. OSE, Mr. COOK, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 1842: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1848: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1849: Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COOK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1867: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1922: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1932: Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 1933: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1950 Mr. FROST and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1977: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1990: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1998: Mr. SABO and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 1999: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2015: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FROST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2028: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2060: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2088: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 2097: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. STUMP, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 2120: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DIXON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2121: Mr. HOLT, Mr. SAWYER, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2136: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 2156: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2159: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 2172: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 2221: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 2243: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 2260: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 2265: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2277: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DIXON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2283: Mr. WYNN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 2286: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 2301: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 2355: Mr. FOLEY.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ROGAN, and Mr. WATKINS.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. FILNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. TURNER.

H. Con. Res. 78: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. PORTER and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H. Con. Res. 118: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 128: Mr. SHAW, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Con. Res. 130: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 145: Mr. DIXON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 41: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H. Res. 146: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. SANDLIN.

H. Res. 187: Mr. HOLT and Mr. PORTER.

H. Res. 214: Mr. HALL of Texas.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

26. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Kirkwood Elementary School District, Tehama, CA, relative to Resolution No. 98/99–06 petitioning Congress, to continue statutory levels of state funding for special education and to permit increased federal funding for IDEA; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

27. Also, a petition of Dixon Unified School District, Dixon, California, relative to Resolution 99–1148 petitioning Congress to pay 40 percent of the costs of special education or remove federal mandates requiring the provision of these services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

28. Also, a petition of Municipal Council of the Borough of Ringwood, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 99–141 petitioning Congress to request federal assistance in committing Joanne Chesimard returned to jail in the United States, and support H. Con. Res 254; to the Committee on International Relations.

29. Also, a petition of the Municipal Council of the Township of Woodbridge, NJ, relative to House Resolution 1168 petitioning Congress to enact H.R. 1168; jointly to the Committees on Science and Transportation and Infrastructure.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1999 No. 95

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

The Psalmist gives us the secret of a truly great day:

Commit your way to the Lord and trust also in Him and He shall bring it to pass. I rest in the Lord and wait patiently for him.—Psalm 37:5,7.

Let us pray.

Blessed God, Your omniscience both comforts and alarms us. You know all about us: our strengths and weaknesses, our hopes and our hurts. So often, instead of waiting patiently for You, we try to forge ahead on our own strength. Here we are in the middle of another week. There is work to be done before the weekend. Help us to believe that what we commit to You will come to pass if You deem it best for us.

We need to experience that rest in mind and body which comes when we do what You guide us to do and then leave the results to You. Bless the Senators with the profound peace that comes from giving You their burdens and receiving Your resiliency and refreshment. May this be a great day because they, and all of us who work with them, decide to rest in Your presence and wait patiently for Your power to strengthen us. Through our Lord and Savior. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator ALLARD is now designated to lead the Senate in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD) 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will immediately begin consideration of the foreign operations appropriations bill. It is hoped that significant progress can be made in an effort to complete action on the bill today. I might interject that I think that is certainly possible, maybe by early afternoon.

During today's session, the Senate may also begin consideration of any other appropriations bills on the calendar. It is the intention of the majority leader to complete action on a number of appropriations bills prior to the Fourth of July recess. Therefore, Senators can expect votes throughout the remainder of the week.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1234, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 1234) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the committee was provided an allocation virtually identical to last year's bill of $12.6 billion. Although it is $1.8 billion below the request, I think it effectively manages our global responsibilities, and it does so within the budget caps.

For the past few years, the bill has emphasized funding in two areas—export promotion and growth in the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. This bill sustains that commitment—in fact, expands support for export promotion by $20 million for a total of $785 million to the Export-Import Bank.

This year, we have added recovery and reconstruction in Southeast Europe to our priority list.

While I expect the Europeans to bear the lion's share of responsibility for reconstruction, we have concrete trade interests in regional economic recovery and security interests in promoting stability and democracy.

With funds straight lined, this becomes a zero sum game. We have to reach consensus on tradeoffs and priorities.

There is no question that this will mean reductions in other accounts—but it's time to recognize priorities. There are obvious and easy cuts that the administration can make. Just as one example, the administration has asked for another $70 million for Haiti after spending billions in Haiti, with little to show for it. In fact, recent press accounts report an increase in drug trafficking through Haiti, and we have failed at every turn to restore a legitimate government.

This is just one example where I think the administration could cut back in order to serve more urgent priorities.

There are others. The request from the administration is redundant in the area of peacekeeping. They have asked for funds for a global peace keeping initiative, a regional Africa peacekeeping account and the Africa Crisis Response Initiative which trains peacekeepers.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

I think we can and should shift priorities. We have just waged a war in Europe, and we need to build the foundation for sustaining the peace in the aftermath of that war.

The Balkans Initiative in this bill does three things to serve what I see as our long term interests: It rids the region of Milosevic by declaring Serbia a terrorist state; we increase funding for stability and recovery; and we condition funds to Russia on total cooperation with NATO in Kosovo.

Let me elaborate.

In section 525, the bill establishes Serbia's status as a terrorist nation. With this terrorist designation, the administration cannot provide bilateral or support multilateral aid, and Belgrade is stripped of protections under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

This in turn, will allow Kosovars to take Milosevic to court for damages rendered during his brutal war of ethnic annihilation.

The administration has complained that this designation is inflexible and unreasonable, that Serbia is not the same as the other countries on the terrorism list because they don't sponsor groups such as Hezbollah.

Frankly, I am hard pressed to understand the difference between thugs blowing up a village with a car bomb or thugs shelling and burning a village to the ground.

The intent and the impact are the same. In both instances, innocent civilians are the targets and the victims.

The second important change in the bill affects funding. We have increased and changed the funding mix to fulfill two goals. We have tried to promote refugee confidence to return home, and relieve the pressure on the front-line states.

The administration requested $393 million for Eastern and Central Europe which included $55 million for Serbia and $175 million for Bosnia.

I have taken out Serbia's funds, cut back on Bosnia and added $142 million for a total of $535 million.

Of the total the bill earmarks $150 million for Kosovo, $85 million for Albania, $60 million for Romania, $55 million for Macedonia, $45 million for Bulgaria, and $35 million for Montenegro, leaving $105 million unallocated for other regional uses.

We have also earmarked funds within the Kosovo account to promote internal stability and confidence including the provision of $20 million to train and equip a Kosovo security force. Again, the administration had complained bitterly about this provision on the grounds that it arms the KLA at a time when the agreement is seeking to dismantle their capabilities.

There is nothing in the bill which calls for arming or supporting the KLA. In fact, the administration has plans to train and equip a police force and has estimated that this will cost $25 million. The bill is not consistent with the planning underway. It simply earmarks funds for a security force which I view as essential to any Kosovar having confidence the past will not be repeated.

Members of the KLA may very well be included in a security force, but that is not a decision for us to make. A Kosovo civilian government should make all decisions regarding recruitment standards, organization and supervision of internal security. Autonomy can not be preserved without security—that is just what this $20 million will launch.

In addition, to strengthen democracy, we have provided $20 million to support the development of local government institutions. This support should help the Kosovars rebuild independent judicial, legislative, and executive branches of self-government, as well as help at the local municipal level.

The United States made a commitment at Rambouillet to support a three year period of autonomy which would be followed by some kind of final decision on political status. Specifically, the Secretary of State pledged to support a referendum on independence if that is the course Kosovars chose.

I think we all hope that a change of government in Belgrade might produce conditions which would allow Kosovo to maintain some kind of tie with a democratic federation. In the interim, however, Kosovo must develop the capabilities and institutions to govern themselves, which I believe these funds will support.

Finally, the bill conditions future Russian aid on total cooperation with NATO on peacekeeping. The administration seemed caught by surprise when Russian troops marched into and took up positions at the Pristina airport. Frankly, I was surprised that they did not take up positions along the Belgrade-Pristina road. This move was calculated and inevitable—notwithstanding senior officials' attempts to explain it was just a few rogue troops.

If stability is to be restored in Kosovo, the Russian's cannot be allowed to maintain a client relationship with Serbia which may lead to de facto partition of the country.

To prevent this outcome, we link Russian aid to the Secretary of State certifying that the Russians have not established a separate zone of operational control, and that their forces are completely integrated under NATO command and control.

In the last few days, the Secretary of Defense seems to have worked out an arrangement that may secure these objectives. We all certainly hope so. But, just as the administration was surprised by the dash to control the Pristina airport, they could be surprised by difficulties in implementing the agreement. We must maintain some leverage to assure there is full compliance with the current expectations.

And, lest anyone doubt the relevance of this leverage, I suggest a review of the vote to condition aid to Russia on a withdrawal timetable from the Baltics. This was a few years back. Every leader in the region called me after the 89–11 Senate vote to congratulate the Senate for securing immediate negotiations which produced the desired result.

In other words, what we did in the early nineties was to condition Russian aid on withdrawal of troops from the Baltic countries. Shortly after we had that vote in the Senate, the Russian troops were out of the Baltic countries.

Beyond, the Balkans, this bill maintains United States interests in the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union and sustains our financial commitment to crucial allies ranging from Israel to Indonesia.

I also want to mention the increase in this bill's funding levels for the surveillance and treatment of infectious diseases. A recent process report noted that children and vulnerable populations are dying at a staggering rate of treatable and often preventable diseases. Thanks to Senator LEAHY's commitment, we are now in our third year of a multi-year strategy to significantly increase the U.S. commitment to control and prevent infectious diseases.

Finally, let me say that there is no question we could have spent more on foreign operations program. Senators LEAHY and I have both expressed strong support for increasing foreign assistance initiatives. However, working together, we have produced a bill which lives within the budget caps. It is very similar to the bill we passed in the Senate just 1 year ago with an overwhelming bipartisan majority vote of 90–3. Senator LEAHY and I certainly hope that will be the result again this year.

Before passing the baton over to my friend and colleague from Vermont, I thank him, at the beginning of what we think will be a rather short debate, for his leadership and cooperation in producing a bipartisan bill that went through the Appropriations Committee without dissent and we think has widely accommodated the interests of Members who take a particular interest in this bill every year.

We anticipate very few amendments. I will say in advance what I hope to do is, sometime before noon, seek consent that all amendments be in by a reasonable time today—probably by noon —within an hour from now. What I hope we can do is ask for a consent agreement to have all amendments filed before noon. There is every reason to believe this bill should be handled very quickly, and we hope we will have maximum cooperation from other Members of the Senate to do that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Kentucky for his comments, and as always, when working on this piece of legislation with

him, it has been a pleasure, notwithstanding the lack of allocations we had.

I concur with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky that we should try to wrap this up at a time certain. I will join with him at the appropriate time in a unanimous consent request that all amendments be filed by noon today. The reason I mention that now is so that, on this side of the aisle, people are alerted we will be making a request of that nature. I think it can be done.

With the agreement entered into last night by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Democratic leader, there is an effort to move some of these bills forward so we can get on to the question of the Patients' Bill of Rights when we come back after the July 4 recess. I urge Senators who have amendments to come to the Chamber and offer them.

This bill was reported by the Appropriations Committee with actually no debate and no amendments. One of the reasons, unfortunately, for the lack of any debate is the amount of funds in this bill is so far below what is needed to adequately fund our foreign policy priorities that there is little point in debating it.

Even if Members want to make changes in the bill, there is no way to pay for it. Everything in it is already underfunded. The bill is $800 million below the 1999 level. It is $1.9 billion below the President's request. No one can accuse the President of failing to try to protect this country's global interests. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the Congress. Devoting less than 1 percent of the Federal budget to our foreign policy is not responsible.

What this means is we are unable to meet our commitments—our solemn commitments—to the international financial institutions. We did not provide any funds for the President's expanded threat reduction initiative, to dismantle Russian nuclear weapons, to protect fissile material, and pay for other nonproliferation and security programs. We spent hundreds of billions of dollars—literally trillions of dollars—to defend against the threat of the then-Soviet Union.

We are unwilling to spend a tiny, tiny, tiny fraction of 1 percent of that same money now to dismantle some of those nuclear weapons and protect the material from them—material that can fall into the hands of people who do not have the kind of controls that were imposed at the time we were spending hundreds of billions of dollars to protect ourselves. It goes beyond penny-wise and pound-foolish; it goes into irresponsibility, especially in a nuclear age. I, frankly, cannot understand how we have gotten to this point.

We had to cut funding for many of the programs of special interest to Senators, i.e., the Peace Corps. Is there any foreign policy program in this country that we can point to with more pride than the Peace Corps? Yet we cut that.

With additional funds, we could do a great deal more to promote American exports in extremely competitive foreign markets. Other countries that do not begin to have the ability to export as we do are spending more money in trying to build up their foreign markets because they know that will create jobs, good-paying jobs, in their country. We step back and say we do not want to do this.

We can improve global health at a time when infectious diseases are our greatest threat after nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. There is no major infectious disease that is more than one or two plane rides away from our shores. And this isn't a case where we are showing some great humanitarian gesture to try to stop infectious disease in other continents; it protects us. Not only does it protect the people there, but ebola plague, a resistant strain of tuberculosis, and any other number of things can begin in one country and within hours be in a major airport in our country and then in our population. When it gets here, we will spend fortunes trying to get rid of it. We will not spend pennies in trying to stop it in the first place.

We should be doing more to protect the Earth's natural resources. They are under siege on every continent. Our health and our economy depend on a clean environment. Yet we spend a pittance as we see the environment continue to degrade, almost as though we think as Americans we can look at the borders of our great country and assume that we determine the environment for our people just within those borders.

The environment is determined by the rain forests of the world, by the ''desertization'' of large parts of the world, by chemical and other dumping in our oceans in other parts of the world. If we want to protect us—a quarter of a billion Americans—we ought to be concerned about what happens in other parts of the world.

Half the world is asking for help in building new democratic societies, but we have little to offer. For decades, again, we spent hundreds of billions of dollars—trillions of dollars—saying we were going to stand up for democracy, we were going to stand up against communism; we wanted democracy in the world.

Well, the Berlin Wall has come down. The Iron Curtain has rusted through. These countries are saying: Thank God America is there; they can help us form our democracy. And we say: When we thought you would be Communists, we could spend billions and billions and billions of dollars to contain you, but now that you want to be democratic, we don't really have even a tiny fraction of that amount to help you become democratic, to help you develop courts and a free press and a civil system, and on and on.

We should double or triple our support for international peacekeeping, especially in places such as Sierra Leone where NATO cannot intervene but the atrocities are far worse. Daily we see it in Kosovo. We almost have this thought that if we do not turn on CNN and see atrocities, they are not occurring. I suggest that Senators read the Intelligence Digest, read the free press, when they do report them and think of these atrocities that we could help stop.

If we do not do anything in these areas, all the areas I have talked about, because we save some pennies today by not doing anything in these areas, we are saddling future generations of Americans with far greater costs, and as we go into the next century, we saddle future Americans with a more dangerous and unstable world, a world that is increasingly polarized between the very rich and the extraordinarily poor.

I have little doubt that the President would veto a foreign operations bill at this level.

Having said all that, Senator MCCONNELL and I did the best we could with the allocation we received. We have tried to allocate the funds we had in the most responsible way possible.

I thank the senior Senator from Kentucky for the bipartisan way he worked with me to put this bill together. It has become a tradition of the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Vermont to work together on these issues. I am grateful to him. I think what he has done serves the Senate well. I think it serves the American people well.

Obviously, if I were in Senator MCCONNELL's position, I might have done some things differently, just as he would look at some of the things I have asked to be put in this bill and are included and do them differently. But on the whole, we have worked together to write a balanced piece of legislation. In fact, the funds are so tight, the balance is so delicate, I cannot imagine how I might accept any amendments, Democrat or Republican, to cut or add funds in this bill. This is a Rubik's cube, a small Rubik's cube but a Rubik's cube nonetheless, we have tried to put together.

I think we Senators should thank the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee, the senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and the senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, who did their best to give us a fair allocation within the limits they had to work with.

But if I might, before I yield the floor, mention a couple issues I am especially concerned about. One is the Global Environment Facility. It is one of the world's leading international environmental organizations. It funds projects to protect biodiversity, to prevent ocean pollution, to protect the ozone, and to prevent climate change.

Take a poll of the American people. Ask them how many are in favor of just those items. A resounding majority of the American people would be in

favor of protecting biodiversity, preventing ocean pollution, protecting the ozone, preventing climate change. For this endeavor, the administration requested $143 million for fiscal year 2000. That includes $35 million we owe already in prior year arrears. This bill contains just $25 million for arrears, and that is not acceptable.

Ask the American people if they have a justifiable concern about terrorism, and they will say yes. Those of us, the chairman and myself, who have access to the most current intelligence of our intelligence agencies know that the fear of terrorism is justifiable. The President requested $33 million for antiterrorism training programs. Under our allocation, we could only provide him $20 million. The request also included $10 million for a new antiterrorism program to help developing countries strengthen their border control systems—again, because the terrorism that may show up in those developing countries is a plane ride away from our shores. Even though the President's antiterrorism initiative is a good one, we cannot include any funds for it. Not that we don't want to fund these programs; the money is not there to do it.

There are a lot of other programs I could mention that need additional funds. Hopefully, before this session is over, we may get a revised allocation that will allow us to go into some of these areas. But right now I think we should act on the bill to move the process forward.

Again, I salute the chairman and ranking member of the full committee, the distinguished Senators from Alaska and West Virginia, for pushing so hard to go forward. The fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky and I have the working relationship we do, I think, helped us move forward with this. We should go forward with the process. Hopefully the other body will start moving on theirs. I think we could complete action on this bill in a very few hours. Senators who have amendments should not delay to offer them.

As I said earlier, to preserve the delicate balance of this bill, I expect to be opposing amendments that do not have suitable offsets.

With that, I yield the floor. The Senator from Kentucky and I are now the humble servants of the Senate, ready to start the sausage grinder forward. Hopefully, we can end up with a product very quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank my good friend from Vermont for his cooperation in developing this bill on a bipartisan basis. I agree with him that without the allocation that Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD provided for us, we couldn't have even done this well. I do think that even with this, some would argue inadequate allocation, we can meet our responsibilities around the globe. I believe we have done that in this bill.

Now the Senator from Kansas is here and has an important amendment to be offered.

Let me just mention to all Members of the Senate, Senator LEAHY and I, at about 10:30, are going to propound a unanimous consent request asking that all amendments to this bill be submitted by noon, which we think will help the Senate dispose of this measure in a timely fashion.

Mr. President, seeing the Senator from Kansas here, who has an amendment to offer, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 1118

(Purpose: To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to target assistance to support the economic and political independence of the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Vermont, for allowing me to bring forward this amendment. At this time, I rise to offer an amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, and I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 1118.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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. 1119 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1118

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration, on behalf of myself and Senator ABRAHAM of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL], for himself and Mr. ABRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 1119 to amendment No. 1118.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On Page 9, line 3, strike all after ''(c) Restriction through line 12 States.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to address the underlying second-degree amendment and to talk about the overall amendment itself and the area of the world with which we are dealing.

This amendment is an issue that has been heard in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee, both this Congress and last, and has passed this time by a voice vote of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It passed by a majority vote in the last Congress. It deals with an important region of the world, and it deals with a difficult policy issue for the Senate and for our Government to consider.

The underlying bill itself is called the Silk Roads Strategy Act. It deals with eight countries, and it provides an overarching policy towards these countries in the south Caucasus and central Asia. Specifically the countries are Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

I realize those are not common names of countries that people across the United States perhaps banter around, but I think they do know and recall with some knowledge the Silk Road, the old Silk Road made legendary many years ago, discovered and traversed by Marco Polo and many others who traveled throughout the region of central Asia.

It was really at that point in time the bridge; the Eurasian bridge was developed and brought commerce from Asia to Europe and from Europe to Asia. We are seeking to reinitiate this Silk Road, a new Silk Road that would have an economic corridor along with a freedom corridor in central Asia and the south Caucasus.

You can see this region of the world. I wish this map were a little clearer. I hope Members can see where this region of the world is caught. These are all countries in the former Soviet Union. They are in the south of the former Soviet Union; they are recently independent nations. They had some independence before, but these are just recently coming out from underneath the rubble of the fall of the Soviet empire.

They are caught between world global forces that seek to have them under their control. The Russians continue the desire to have an unusual influence, would be the best way to put it. The Iranians sit right here and seek to have a greater influence in the region. They seek to dominate most of these nations that have a Muslim-based population. They seek, the Iranians, to radicalize and put governments in place that are militant fundamentalist governments. China then, off to this side of the region—what we are seeking to do is to create an area of democracy, an area of free enterprise, an area of independence free from these world powers that seek to dominate them, in a group of nations that seek to be united with the West, again, in a Eurasian corridor of commerce and freedom. That is the new Silk Road Strategy Act. That is what this bill is about.

Lest we forget and just look at it as a geographic area, as important as this region is, I hope we will look at the people in this region. We are talking about nearly 72 million people involved in these countries of the Silk Road. You can look at them: the Armenian

population of 3.4 million; the Azeri population of 7.8 million; on down, Uzbekistan being the biggest with over 23 million people yearning to be free, yearning to be associated with the West, yearning not to go back under Russian dominance or to be put under Iranian dominance or Chinese dominance, but yearning to be free and associated with the West. That is what this bill is about.

This is a sanctions lifting bill. It lifts a particular sanction, sanction section 907 that has a set of provisions limiting any sort of assistance, any sort of work of the United States with Azerbaijan, which is also a key country for this corridor, and it doesn't lift the sanctions. It merely provides a national interest waiver. So this doesn't lift it. The President still has to say it is in the national interest of the United States to waive this sanction, and then he has the authority.

So it simply provides that authority to the administration, which is in line with the Freedom Support Act, which we originally passed to support these newly independent countries that came about from the Soviet empire falling. This act authorizes assistance for all these countries, specific economic assistance, development of infrastructure assistance, border control assistance, as well as assistance in strengthening democracy, tolerance in the development of civil society.

Authority in this bill to provide assistance for these countries of the south Caucasus and central Asia is in addition to the authority to provide such assistance under the Freedom Support Act, but it does not provide any new resources. It simply allows us to offer these resources and assistance to these countries bilaterally and multilaterally. We can provide assistance programs to the entire region, working it in a package and saying to these countries: You are better off if you will work together and bond together to be able to stand before the forces that are seeking to dominate you once again.

Mr. President, I think the window of opportunity for the United States to effect positive change in this region will only be open for a short period of time. I think that is the very critical part of this bill and why we need to have this debate and pass this issue now.

The window is short. I want to show you some of the activity that is taking place in this region. I mentioned the militant fundamentalists' efforts taking place to seek domination of most of these countries that have a Muslim-based population.

This is a chart of Iranian worldwide export of terrorism and fundamentalism that we are putting up here. I want to highlight this region that we are talking about. Of the eight countries we are talking about, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan have Iranians operating in this region. Afghanistan is operating here, seeking to put these countries under militant fundamentalist control. They are doing this today.

As recently as 2 months ago, the President of Uzbekistan had an assassination attempt that was put forward by militant fundamentalists who seek to have him removed. He provides mostly a secular Muslim government. They said we want him out and we want a militant fundamentalist government in here, and we are going to do what we can, including trying to assassinate him. They are trying to destabilize the Fergana Valley in this area. My point is, look at this map. It looks similar to the map I just put up here, the countries of the Silk Road. The Iranians are funding this effort. They are going into the camps here and funding the populations in this area. They are doing this today. Members can check this. This is happening.

If we want to let these countries slip off and go into the militant fundamentalist camps so we have more places to fight terrorism and more countries we have to fight against that are willing to spawn hatred against the West, let's fail this bill, and with all due respect to the Senator from Kentucky, let's pass his amendment. We have a disagreement about this particular amendment, section 907. I think it is critical and important that we pass and eliminate this bilateral sanction that we have against Azerbaijan, which is much of the gateway for the flow of democracy and freedom throughout this region. Time is of the essence.

In my view, the single best way to consolidate our goals in the region is to promote regional cooperation and policies that will strengthen the sovereignty of each nation. Each of these countries has its own individual needs. However, many of the problems in the region overlap and are shared, and a number of common solutions and approaches can apply. That is why we have put together this overarching Silk Road strategy. This region has generally taken a back seat to U.S. foreign policy. We have generally deferred to Russia and to Iranian policy and said we are going to let these drift along. The problem with the drift is that people are going to feel the power vacuum. It is being fueled by the Iranians and pushed by the Russians and other outside influences that don't seek for them to have their freedom.

We have eight countries, as I noted earlier, most of which have secular Muslim governments, that are fighting to stave off the Iranian-style Islamic extremism, which are looking westward, and at great risk to themselves, they have considerable economic ties with the West—and I want to note as well, with Israel.

Many of these countries in this region have historic and ancient Jewish populations existing there as well; living, surviving, thriving, but if you put in these anti-Western militant fundamentalist, those populations, Jewish populations are going to be run out and these countries are not going to be having good relationships with Israel.

These countries are recovering from 70 years of Soviet domination. They need our help in all spheres, including human rights. No one is suggesting that these are Jeffersonian democracies yet. There is a lot of pessimistic talk about the prospects for democracy in this region. All of these countries have human rights violations.

At any given point in time, some of the human rights violations may seem worse than others. Here is our choice. Do we engage and try to make what difference we can? Or do we ignore and let the region drift without us, becoming either violently anti-Western, anti-American, or become, once again, an extension of Russia, China, or Iran? It is a pretty clear, simple choice. They seek our support.

Now, on the point of human rights—because I think a lot of people will say there are human rights violations in this region and we really ought to watch out for that and we should not support these areas. Again, I point out that this is a waiver authority to the President. He still has to certify and it will have the same standards as other human rights issues. Recently, we had the Israeli Minister for Trade and Industry, Natan Sharansky, a well-known international figure on human rights, here in Washington, together with the Foreign Minister of Uzbekistan. Mr. Sharansky's reason for being here was to make one point, which I thank him for making.

He said:

> Look at the human rights situation and weigh this against the importance of the threat that is facing us. It is very important to engage and continue to encourage a positive process and the way to do this is to strengthen the role we are playing in the region.

He supported and endorsed this Silk Road Strategy Act in the region.

I want to look particularly at the second-degree amendment that my colleague from Kentucky put forward. I have immense respect for the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. He did excellent work on the overall bill, but we have a difference of opinion on section 907. I want to go specifically at this issue.

My overall amendment would provide a Silk Road Strategy Act for the entire region, providing a waiver authority in section 907. The second-degree amendment leaves the rest of the language but does not provide the national interest waiver on section 907. That is a key part of this bill, and that is why I oppose the second-degree amendment of my good colleague from Kentucky and my colleague from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, as well. We have a dispute on this. I want to go right at that issue of section 907.

With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Congress, in the fall of 1992, adopted the Freedom Support Act. This was designed to provide financial and technical assistance to the newly independent states, those of the former Soviet Union. I want to put that map

back up here, if we could, so people can have that in mind. It was to aid them on a path toward democratic and market reforms. Because of the then ongoing conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia over the enclave Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenian supporters were successful in including language in section 907 singling out Azerbaijan—the only former Soviet republic so treated—for sanctions. I will put up here a map of that region so you can see specifically what this area looks like. This is the Armenia and Azerbaijan area and the Nagorno-Karabakh region, which was in dispute, and this was in 1992, mid-1993, and late 1993.

In 1992, at that point in time, we passed the Freedom Support Act and Armenian supporters got narrow, bilateral sanctions against Azerbaijan put in place, saying we think Azerbaijan is treating Armenia wrong, blockading it. Therefore, we want section 907, which removes the United States from providing any assistance to Azerbaijan. Bilateral sanctions, some of which have been lifted—the chairman of the committee has lifted portions of these, but not all have been lifted. We provide waiver authority for the lifting of these bilateral sanctions. That was 1992. The only former Soviet republic so treated was Azerbaijan. The 907 sanction prohibited the ability of the U.S. Government to provide direct bilateral assistance to Azerbaijan until the President determined that demonstrable steps had been taken in ceasing hostilities and lifting the embargo against Armenia. A cease-fire has been in place for the past 7 years since that time period.

Peace negotiations under the auspices of the OSCE group are ongoing.

To me, it makes no sense whatsoever to continue these 907 sanctions. Proponents of retaining 907 argue that the restrictions should remain in place until the Azerbaijan embargo against Armenia is lifted. In point of fact, however, it is Armenia's ongoing occupation of Nagorno-Karabakh and the surrounding territory. Armenia currently occupies about 20 percent of Azerbaijan in violation of international law. Both the OSCE and the U.N. have condemned this occupation.

This is the region on the map they are occupying against the OSCE and U.N. ruling. They both have said this is an international law violation, that Armenia is occupying 20 percent of Azerbaijan. This functionally prevents the opening of the borders between the two countries.

In an attempt to end the stalemate, the OSCE advanced a proposal calling for Armenia to withdraw from the occupied land in exchange for the reciprocal opening of rail and pipeline facilities by Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan has accepted the proposal. Armenia has rejected it. This would be pulling back from a 20 percent of lands, and then opening up the rail and pipe corridors. Azerbaijan accepted it. Armenia has not.

The imposition of 907, I think, was a bad idea in 1993. It was adopted over the strong objections of the Bush administration, and its repeal is strongly supported by the Clinton administration.

For the United States to continue unilateral imposition of sanctions against Azerbaijan—that is what we have—does not make sense from either a geostrategic-political point of view or an economic point of view.

This is much of the corridor for the Eurasian bridge that is going through Azerbaijan.

The energy potential of the Caspian is one facet of Azerbaijan's strategic significance to the West. The broader issue of the timing and development of the Iranian transit corridor and the sovereignty of the individual republics of the South Caucasus is also at stake.

This provision—I might note, as well, the Silk Road strategy—is strongly supported by all the countries in the region outside of the Armenians. I think it would be a great benefit to Armenia as well.

Continuing 907 is an impediment to the improved truce between the United States and Azerbaijan and the entire region. It undermines the ability of American companies to secure their substantial investments in the region, and prevents the U.S. Government from being a truly honest broker in the peace negotiations.

Repealing of section 907 would allow for commercial and technical assistance to aid in the development of infrastructure, trade, pipeline projects, and to further development of democracy so they don't fall into the hands of the Iranians or the Russians.

Further, with the ongoing political turmoil in Moscow, removal of 907 would allow Azerbaijan to participate in a partnership for peace and broader security programs, as well as market reform and democracy-building initiatives necessary to promote political stability in this potentially volatile region.

Some may suggest this is not the time to do this on 907. I don't know of a better time other than 907 having not been put on in the first place. It doesn't lift the sanction. It provides a waiver authority for the President to do it.

Some may say, well, this is at a particularly susceptible time in the peace process. I don't think that is accurate. The last real peace initiative was in 1997, calling for Armenia's withdrawal from the occupied territories in exchange for normalization of trade with Azerbaijan. This was rejected by Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Unlike other provisions of the Freedom Assistant Act, I want to point out that section 907 does not provide for a national interest waiver. What we are doing here is making section 907 be in line with the rest of the Freedom Assistance Act in providing a national interest waiver.

The final point I want to make before yielding the floor for a discussion is, again, I point out my deep respect for my colleagues from Kentucky and Michigan who are opposed to the overall national interest waiver on section 907. We just have a differing point of view on this.

But the issue is, we are talking about a region of the world—a Eurasian corridor—that has had historical roots in the old Silk Road. They know how to relate with one another, and they are in a tough neighborhood. They have the Russians bearing down on them with undue economic and other influence, and the President of Georgia has had several assassination attempts where the assassin fled to Russia.

Georgia wants this bill very much. They have undue influence from the Iranians, who are providing aid to many of these terrorist groups operating in the region and fomenting discontent because they know they are inherently weak at this time. The Chinese have a certain amount of influence, but it is really between the Russians and the Iranians. And they seek to be connected with us.

If you pull 907 out of this and its interest waiver, and you say, OK, we are going to do everything but 907, as the amendment provides, you block this part of the key corridor of providing economic trade, developmental assistance, and, through much of the region, its commerce and its activity will flow through Baku and Azerbaijan. This is a critical part of it. That is why, with all due respect, I oppose the second-degree amendment, ask my colleagues to vote against that and to support the underlying amendment without amendment, and pass this critical issue that we really need for U.S. foreign policy.

I thank my colleague.

I thank the President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

FILING OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

I ask unanimous consent that all first-degree amendments to be offered to the pending appropriations bill must be filed at the desk by 1 p.m. today, and, of course, other than the managers' amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to commend my friend and colleague from Kansas, first of all, for taking an interest in a part of the world that very few Members of Congress probably can find on a map. I share his view that this is an extraordinarily important part of the world.

As the Senator from Kansas pointed out, all of these countries are part of what used to be the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union very early on, in the wake of the end of the cold war, said: This is our ''near abroad,'' sort of their version of the Monroe Doctrine, their

territory, and we were not thereby expected by them to be in that area. Nevertheless, the Russians don't make foreign policy for the United States. And we are in the process of trying to develop our own strong bilateral relations with each of those countries.

The Senator from Kansas has been in the forefront of advocating the importance of the United States having its own bilateral relations with each of those countries. I commend him for it because he has been very farsighted in understanding the significance of this part of the world to the United States.

I think all other aspects of the Silk Road proposal are good. Where we differ, as the Senator from Kansas indicated, is on that portion of the Silk Road called the ''repeal of section 907.''

Reasonable people can look at this and reach different conclusions. What the Senator from Kansas would like to see—I am perfectly confident in what I would like to see—is a settlement of this dispute between Azerbaijan and Armenia.

For our colleagues who have not paid a whole lot of attention to this part of the world, Nagorno-Karabakh is an almost entirely Armenian enclave, as the Senator from Kansas pointed out, within the territory of Azerbaijan connected by an area called the Lachin corridor. It is this area which is in dispute.

As the Senator from Kansas pointed out, Armenia won the conflict that occurred with the breakup of the Soviet Union, and it occupies not only Nagorno-Karabakh but the other territory adjacent thereto, which is Azeri.

The sad aftermath of that war is large refugee camps, which I visited, and the Senator from Kansas visited as well, of displaced people stuck in these refugee camps now for some 6 years, with the hopelessness and despair that develops in that atmosphere, reminiscent of an entire generation of Palestinians who have grown up in these camps in the Middle East. It breeds a fanaticism, a terrorism, that is an enormous unsettling aspect of life in that part of the world. Nothing could be better for that area than getting that dispute settled. I am sure the Senator from Kansas and I agree on that.

The question is, How do you best get there? The Senator from Kansas mentioned the Minsk Group. I am not very optimistic that the Minsk Group is going to bring about a settlement. The Minsk Group, in addition to including Azerbaijan and Armenia, includes Russia, France, and the United States. I think the Senator from Kansas and I probably agree that the Russians like things the way they are around there. There are Russian troops in all of those republics still, with the exception of Azerbaijan. Some are there by invitation, some are not by invitation. I think the Russians enjoy keeping the Caucasus destabilized, with all due respect to our occasional friends, the Russians. The French, who most of the time are our allies, I think frequently are difficult in these negotiating situations.

These are the players: The French, the Russians, the Americans, the Armenians, and Azeris. Nothing has happened, and I am not optimistic something will happen until the United States thinks this is important.

Think of the money, time, and effort we have spent in the Balkans over the last 3 or 4 years. I happen to be in the minority in our party who think we have a national interest in the Balkans. I wish we had the interest in the Caucasus that we had in the Balkans, because we might have settled the dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan. We have not had that, and nothing has happened.

The question before the Senate is, What kind of condition makes peace more or less likely to occur? Reasonable people can look at the same set of facts and reach a different conclusion.

The Senator from Michigan, Mr. ABRAHAM, and I have offered this second-degree amendment because we believe that section 907 —even though it has been constantly stripped down—is important to give the Azeris some incentive for ultimate settlement. It is the view of the Senator from Kentucky that the lifting of 907 ought to be part of the final settlement between Armenia and Azerbaijan. To give it away in advance of final settlement makes final settlement less likely.

I completely respect the observations of the Senator from Kansas. As I said, reasonable people can differ about this. I think removing the last element of leverage in advance of the final settlement is not a step in the right direction.

We will have at some point today—although no time agreement can be entered at this point—a decision on this. I hope my colleagues will consider whether or not lifting this sanction in advance of a final settlement of the dispute is helpful in achieving a final settlement of the dispute.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I lend my support to this amendment. I realize the chairman and ranking member have a number of other issues they want to discuss. I am not sure at what point we will reconvene on this second-degree amendment.

I clearly associate myself with the Senator from Kentucky, both as a cosponsor of the amendment as well as with his comments today. I share his view that the appropriate role for the United States at this point is not to decide this matter by taking this action—which I think would be premature; I think there still remain serious issues in play that would argue against changing the status of section 907 at this point. My view is that we should move forward with the balance of this amendment.

I, too, applaud the Senator from Kansas, who I think has done great work in this area. I fully support his efforts as well as the contribution he makes by raising the section 907 issue. Hopefully, it puts all of our policymakers in the United States more in focus on the issues.

If we are to include the Silk Road Act or a major portion of it in this legislation, it should be included without inclusion of section 907. I am willing to speak on this at a later point if we extend the debate.

I appreciate the efforts of the Senator from Kentucky, and I look forward to working with him, as well as the Senator from Kansas, in hopefully resolving this.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I hope we can get a time agreement so we know when we will actually vote on this particular issue.

Reasonable people may differ, and will differ, on what the U.S. policy should be. Azerbaijan—section 907—is the only country from the former Soviet Union that we have unilateral sanctions against.

We are not lifting those sanctions by this amendment. We are allowing a national interest waiver to the President which is the same as the rest of the Freedom Support Act. In that sense, we will put Azerbaijan—which is at the gateway to much of the Eurasian platform as far as connecting the countries together—on an equal footing with all of the countries that came from the rubble of the former Soviet Union.

We seek peace in this region. It is important that we have a settlement in this region. This particular set of unilateral sanctions on Azerbaijan has been the United States policy since 1992. It has not led to peace since 1992.

We are seeking to create an abundance of activity, on a multilateral basis, of all the countries in the region, causing them to work together, to lift each other up economically, democratically, and regarding human rights, as an area, an entire region, that is developing on those principles of a free democracy—free, independent status, and human rights.

To pull this one out—it is a key corridor—the concept of the countries working together falls apart. It will not happen. It will not happen if we do that. That has been the U.S. policy since 1992. It has not led to peace yet between Armenia and Azerbaijan. I don't think it will now. If we get these countries to work together, to say, together we can support each other, we can grow economically in other ways, I think we create the atmosphere for peace to take place. Everybody has an interest in peace occurring.

We are talking about a large set of resources in this area. They do have the economic wherewithal to be able to grow and grow together. But we have to have them all. You can't pull one of them out and say it will not happen.

I think the proposal I put forward leads to peace and peaceful opportunities in the region. That is why I support it. I am happy to talk further

about this at a later date if we get a time agreement. With all due respect, I disagree with my colleagues from Kentucky and Michigan. I think we have the national interest waiver on section 907.

At the proper time, I will want a recorded vote on this so we can have a determination by this body of U.S. policy here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Anne Alexander, a fellow in the office of Senator FEINGOLD, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 1233.

I further ask unanimous consent Natalia Feduschak, an American Political Science Federation fellow in the office of Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG, be granted such floor privilege during debate and votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, again I remind Senators we have a unanimous consent agreement entered into by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to have all amendments in by 1 o'clock today. I urge him to do that. I had hoped we could wrap this bill up at a relatively early time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky, what is his desire at this time on this particular amendment?

Mr. McCONNELL. I say to my friend from Kansas, we are unable to get a time agreement on this amendment at this time. It is my intention to lay it aside and deal with some other matters. We will keep working on it during the course of the day.

Mr. BROWNBACK. That is certainly acceptable to me. I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky, the manager of the bill, I have a second amendment dealing with the Sudan I am hopeful we can get worked out at some point in time, rather than calling it up. But if we cannot, I will seek recognition on that as well later on.

Mr. McCONNELL. I say to my friend from Kansas, I am familiar with his other amendment. It is acceptable to me. If he will keep working on that, I think we should be able to get it cleared in the course of the day.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. 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. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, while we are waiting for other Senators to come up with amendments, I want to draw attention to an amendment I intend to offer if it is not accepted overall. It is an amendment entitled ''Humanitarian Assistance for the Sudanese Opposition Groups.''

This is a very simple amendment that would allow us to give food aid to the southern Sudanese resistance and also the northern Sudanese resistance efforts, food aid only. This is not other forms of aid. It is certainly not military aid. But it is food aid to the Sudanese resistance movement.

The language says, and I will provide the amendment:

> The President is authorized to provide humanitarian assistance, including food, to the National Democratic Alliance [That is an overall alliance of the groups in opposition to the government in Khartoum] and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement, operating outside of the Operation Lifeline Sudan structure.

That is the simple amendment we put forward.

I recently led a congressional delegation. Congressman DON PAYNE from New Jersey, Congressman TOM TANCREDO from Colorado, and I went to Sudan and traveled to southern Sudan and met with the embattled groups that have been fighting against the Khartoum government, which is a government that was not freely elected. They stood for election in 1988. They were defeated, got about 18 percent of the vote, and then took over the government in a coup in 1989 and have since then been operating a terrorist regime in Sudan. It is terrorist internally in Sudan and terrorist externally from Sudan.

They have killed, according to the IS Committee on Refugees, internally in Sudan, in the last 10 years, 1.9 million people in a genocide and ethnic cleansing the likes of which the world has not seen in recent times. This is the worst humanitarian situation in the world. That is according to the director of USAID, Mr. Atwood, who testified on the issue, on the Sudan—the worst in the world—nearly 2 million killed, over 4 million internally displaced. That is the internal terrorism of this government.

This is a government—and this is incredible—that actually allows slavery to exist. That is documented. The Baltimore Sun did a series of articles documenting this. Christian Solidarity International has bought back the freedom of over 6,000 slaves of northern people empowered by the Government to go south, kill the men in the village, take the women and children hostages, and make them slaves.

This is a picture taken by one of my staff members at Christmas this past year when she was in Sudan. This little boy is probably 11 or 12 years old. He is holding his arm out in this picture. It actually has on it his slave brand—branded slave.

What the Government in Khartoum does is, they allow people from the north to go down as raiders into these communities, and part of what they get paid for is the slaves they can take. This is a closer picture of the little boy's arm showing the brand mark. They are taken and made to be herders, they are taken into sexual concubinage. The slave trade exists in the world today at the hands of the Government in Khartoum. It is absolutely unfathomable that this continues to occur. That is on top of the genocide and the ethnic cleansing that is taking place.

This is a picture of the civilian bombing that takes place within the country all the time. I was in Yei. The hospital in Yei has been bombed three times in the last year. They are taking old Soviet cargo planes, Antonovs, and they roll bombs out the back. They are indiscriminate. They are not militarily significant, but it kills a lot of people. It terrifies the people on the ground.

This is a picture of the hospital that has been bombed.

This photograph is, again, a civilian target. It has a big red X on the top of it, and that is part of the bombing that takes place.

This picture shows people who are watching for the bombers.

I put up a quick chart of the atrocities of the Government in the north. Remember, this amendment we are going to offer simply allows humanitarian aid to the resistance movement. It does not provide arms of any nature, but it does provide food aid to the resistance movement in Sudan.

This is what the Government in Khartoum has done. If people are going back and forth saying we are taking sides if we provide humanitarian aid to the resistance, I point out, the Government in Sudan is a terrorist regime as determined by the United States State Department. It is state-sponsored terrorism. They have housed Osama bin Laden since 1997. He stayed in Khartoum.

Most of the terrorist groups operating in the world have a base of operation in Khartoum. The Government in Sudan is supporting terrorist movements in three adjacent countries—Congo, Eritrea, and Uganda. They are seeking to expand this militant fundamentalism.

I pointed this out earlier:

Dead, 1.9 million people. It is the worst humanitarian situation in the world.

An internally displaced population of 4.3 million.

Last year, they let famine alone kill 100,000 people. Mr. President, this is the most incredible thing. Food sat in the country, and the Government in Khartoum would not let us fly relief planes into the area where they needed it, and the people died. They died at the hands of the Khartoum Government because they would not let our planes deliver the food aid.

Enslavement takes place, civilian bombings, forced religious conversions, terrorist threats throughout the region. This is the Government in Khartoum. This is the Government of

Sudan. If Members are hesitant to support food aid to the resistance movement, this is against whom they are fighting. This is arguably one of the, if not the worst regimes in the world for the treatment of its own people and attempts to export a militant fundamentalism and spread it throughout Africa. They housed the terrorist who tried to kill President Mubarak of Egypt. I mentioned the Government in Sudan housed Osama bin Laden.

This is a simple amendment. Rather than calling it up at the present time, I am making my colleagues aware, if it is not agreed to, I will be calling this amendment up and asking for a vote on this amendment. It is food aid to the opposition groups. It is not military aid. It is against the Government that supports the institutions of slavery, and it has the worst humanitarian situation in the world. Mr. President, 100,000 were killed last year. This is the least we can do.

I see other Members in the Chamber. I do not want to take additional time for this. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Robin Goodman and Howard Kushlan, who are interns in my office this summer, and John Bradshaw, who is a fellow, be granted the privilege of the floor during the debate on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside. I say to my colleague from Kentucky, I will speak on an amendment I am going to offer just to save us time so we can move along today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 1123

(Purpose: To combat the crime of international trafficking and to protect the rights of victims)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today I will discuss one of the most horrendous human rights violations of our time—the trafficking of human beings, which is particularly prevalent among women and children, for the purposes of sexual exploitation and forced slavery.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill, the International Trafficking of Women and Children Victim Protection Act of 1999, which addresses this issue. This legislation was cosponsored by Senators FEINSTEIN, BOXER, SNOWE, MURRAY, HARKIN, and TORRICELLI.

Today I am going to offer an amendment, which I will send to the desk shortly, to the foreign ops bill, which is basically this piece of legislation. If adopted, this amendment will put the Senate on record as opposing trafficking for forced prostitution and domestic servitude and acting to check it before the lives of more women and more girls are shattered.

Trafficking in human beings is one of the fastest growing international trafficking businesses. Women and girls seeking a better life, a good marriage, a lucrative job abroad, unexpectedly find themselves forced to work as prostitutes or in sweat shops. Seeking this better life, they are lured by local advertisements for good jobs in foreign countries at wages they could never imagine at home.

Every year, the trafficking of human beings for the sex trade affects hundreds of thousands of women throughout the world. That is hard to believe. Every year the trafficking of women and girls for sex trade affects hundreds of thousands of women or, for that matter, girls throughout the world.

The U.S. Government estimates that 1 million to 2 million women and girls are trafficked annually around the world. According to experts, between 50 and 100,000 women are trafficked each year into the United States alone. They come from Thailand, Russia, the Ukraine, and other countries in Asia and in the former Soviet Union.

Although trafficking has been a problem in some Asian countries, it was not until the breakup of the Soviet Union that a sex trade in that region began to flourish. This appalling trade has grown by leaps and bounds over the last decade. Trafficking is induced by poverty, lack of economic opportunities for women, the horrendous low status of women in many cultures, and the rapid growth of sophisticated and ruthless international crime operations.

Trafficking rings exploit and abuse poor, vulnerable women in the devastated economies of Russia, the Ukraine, and other countries in Central Europe, where women are unable to find jobs to sustain themselves and their families.

As many of you know, I am deeply concerned about what has taken place in Russia today. I am deeply concerned about it because I believe what happens in Russia, for better or for worse—and I hope it will be for better—will crucially affect the quality, or lack of quality, of our lives, our children's lives, and our grandchildren's lives. I suppose I am also concerned because my father was a Jewish immigrant who fled Russia.

In that country, we know that some 6.5 million women are unemployed, and 2.5 million children are not in school but they are in the streets. These women and children are vulnerable to international organized crime that preys on the jobless, the destitute, the desperate, and the naive.

Upon arrival in countries far from their homes, these women from Russia and the Ukraine, and many other countries, are often stripped of their passports, held against their will in slave-like conditions, and sexually abused. It is just unbelievable that this is exactly what is happening. Rape and intimidation and violence are commonly employed by the traffickers to control their victims and to prevent them from seeking help.

Through physical isolation and psychological trauma, traffickers and brothel owners imprison women in a world of economic and sexual exploitation that imposes a constant threat of fear and deportation, as well as violent reprisals by the traffickers themselves to whom the women must pay ever growing debts.

Many brothel owners actually prefer foreign women—women who are far from help and home who do not speak the language—precisely because it is so easy to control them. Most of these women never imagined the life of hell they would encounter, having traveled abroad to find better jobs or to see the world.

Many, in their naivete, believed that nothing bad could happen to them in rich and comfortable countries such as Switzerland, Germany, or the United States. Others who were less naive but desperate for money and opportunity are no less hurt by the traffickers' brutal grip.

Last year, First Lady Hillary Clinton spoke powerfully of this human tragedy. She said:

> I have spoken to young girls in northern Thailand whose parents were persuaded to sell them as prostitutes, and they received a great deal of money by their standards. You could often tell the homes of where the girls had been sold because they might even have a satellite dish or an addition built on their house. But I met girls who would come home after they had been used up, after they had contracted HIV or AIDS. If you've ever held the hand of a 13-year-old girl dying of AIDS, you can understand how critical it is that we take every step possible to prevent this happening to any other girl anywhere in the world. I also, in the Ukraine, heard—

The Ukraine actually was where my father was born—

> of women who told me with tears running down their faces that young women in their communities were disappearing. They answered ads that promised [them] a much better future in another place and they were never heard from again.

We have had women from the Ukraine in our office, in face-to-face meetings, talking about the awful problem of women and young girls being exploited, leaving the Ukraine, coming to countries such as ours, and then finding themselves in this kind of situation.

These events are occurring not just in far off lands but in the United States as well. Earlier this spring, 6 men admitted, in a Florida court, to forcing 17

women and girls, some as young as 14, into a prostitution slavery ring. The victims were smuggled into the United States from Mexico with the promise of steady work, but, instead, they were forced into prostitution. The ring was discovered when two 15-year-old girls escaped and went to the Mexican consulate in Miami.

According to recent reports by the Justice Department, teenage Mexican girls were also held in slavery in the Carolinas and forced to submit to prostitution. In addition, Russian and Latvian women were forced to work in night clubs in Chicago. According to charges filed against the traffickers, the traffickers picked up the women upon their arrival at the airport, seized their documents and return tickets, locked them in hotels, and beat them. This is in our country. The women were told that if they refused to dance nude in various nightclubs, the Russian mafia would kill their families.

Further, over 3 years, hundreds of women from the Czech Republic who answered advertisements in Czech newspapers for modeling were ensnared in an illegal prostitution ring.

Because the victims of international trafficking are frequently unfamiliar with the laws, cultures, and languages of the countries to which they have been trafficked, these victims often find it difficult or impossible to report the crimes that have been committed against them or to assist in the investigation and the prosecution of such crimes. Further, victims do not have legal immigration status in the countries into which they are trafficked, so the victims are often punished more harshly than the traffickers themselves.

Trafficking in women and girls is a human rights problem. This is a human rights amendment that requires a human rights response. Trafficking is condemned by human rights treaties as a violation of basic human rights and as a slavery-like practice. Women who are trafficked are subject to other abuses—to rape, to beatings, to physical confinement—which are squarely prohibited by human rights law but are happening all around the world. The human abuses continue in the workplace in the forms of physical and sexual abuse, debt bondage and illegal confinement, and all are prohibited. But the practices go on.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the right to be free from slavery and involuntary servitude, arbitrary detention, degrading or inhuman treatment, as well as the right to protection by law against these abuses.

The United Nations General Assembly has passed three resolutions during the last 3 years recognizing that international traffic in women and girls is an issue of pressing international concern involving numerous violations of fundamental human rights. The United Nations General Assembly is calling upon all governments to criminalize trafficking, to punish its offenders, while not penalizing its victims.

Fortunately, the global trade in women and children is receiving far greater attention by governments and nongovernment organizations following the U.N. World Conference on Women in Beijing. The President's Interagency Council on Women is working hard to mobilize a response to this problem. Churches and synagogues, and nongovernment organizations are fighting the battle daily, but much, much, much more must be done.

This amendment provides a human rights response to the problem. It has a comprehensive and integrated approach focused on prevention, protection, and assistance for the victims and prosecution of the traffickers.

I am going to highlight a few of the provisions in the amendment.

One, it sets an international standard for governments to meet in their efforts to fight trafficking and assist victims of this human rights abuse. It calls on the State Department and Justice Department to investigate and take action against international trafficking. In addition, it creates an Interagency Task Force in the Office of the Secretary of State to Monitor and Combat Trafficking and directs the Secretary to submit an annual report to the Congress on international trafficking.

The annual report would, among other things, identify states engaged in trafficking, the effort of those states to combat trafficking, and whether their government officials are complicit in the practice.

Corrupt government or law enforcement officials sometimes directly participate and benefit in the trade of women and girls. Corruption also prevents prosecution of the traffickers.

On a national level, as I look to this amendment, it ensures that our immigration laws do not encourage rapid deportation of trafficked women, a practice which effectively insulates traffickers from ever being prosecuted for their crimes. Trafficking victims are eligible for nonimmigrant status valid for 3 months. If the victim pursues criminal or civil actions against a trafficker or if she pursues an asylum claim, she is provided with an extension of time. Furthermore, it provides that trafficked women should not be detained but instead receive the needed services, the safe shelter, and the opportunity to seek justice against her abuser.

Finally, this amendment provides much-needed resources to programs assisting trafficking victims here at home and abroad. We must commit ourselves to ending the trafficking of women and girls and to building a world in which women and children are no longer subjected to horrendous abuses.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I have worked on this bill for a long time with a lot of groups and organizations. I believe this will have strong bipartisan support. I have tried to respond to a variety of different concerns. I say to my colleague from Vermont, as long as he doesn't think this is in the spirit of buttering him up, I view him as a champion in human rights work. I really believe this is consistent with his work. I think we ought to have this kind of response. I thought, in order to save time, I would speak on this amendment. I know there are other amendments that are on the floor.

I wonder whether I might send this amendment to the desk so that we will have it for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 1123.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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.'')

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I see my colleague from Illinois. I have another amendment that I could introduce, but for now, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have several Senators on the floor seeking recognition. The Senator from Minnesota, of course, had the floor. We are going to take a look at his amendment, which would not be in order for a vote right now. I listened to very much of what he had to say.

I am wondering if we could have an agreement that the Senator from New Jersey be recognized, the Senator from Oregon be recognized, and the Senator from Illinois be recognized next in that order.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator from Vermont add the Senator from California?

Mr. LEAHY. And then the Senator from California. I see the distinguished chairman is now on the floor. I am wondering if this might kind of expedite things. I do not think any of these Senators wish to speak for any great length of time.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey be recognized for 5 minutes, the Senator from Oregon be recognized for 5 minutes, the Senator from Illinois be recognized for 5 minutes, and the Senator from California be recognized for 5 minutes —

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder whether or not before colleagues speak, I could just send this amendment, the second amendment, to the desk so it is filed.

Mr. LEAHY. And then before this begins, that the Senator from Minnesota be recognized to send an amendment to the desk for appropriate filing purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1124

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is filed.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I apologize to my friend, Senator LEAHY. I just walked onto the floor. Are the speakers here in relation to the Brownback amendment and the second-degree by myself and Senator ABRAHAM?

Mrs. BOXER. We are.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous consent, the Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, yesterday the citizens of South Florida watched in horror as live television cameras revealed an extraordinary spectacle. The hopes of freedom and the great traditions of America collided on the open seas with the harsh reality of the Clinton administration's arrangements with Castro's government in controlling immigration to the United States.

Six Cuban refugees who fought across the Florida straits came to within yards of the coast of the United States of America. Only a few feet from their destination, they leaped from the boat and attempted to swim to the shores of our country. They did so for the reasons that all of our ancestors and hundreds of thousands of other Cuban Americans came to the United States—with the belief that they could find freedom and security.

It was with horror, I am certain, on their part, but also by other Americans who watched this spectacle unfold as Coast Guard boats intercepted the swimmers. Men attempted to swim for their lives and were never given lifejackets. Surrounded by Coast Guard boats that generated large wakes, imperiling the lives of those who would swim to shore, Coast Guard crewmen used pepper spray against some of the swimmers. They were then taken into custody in handcuffs. Welcome to America.

It is essential that the Coast Guard, the Department of the Treasury, begin an immediate inquiry to revise these procedures to find out how this incident could have happened. Handcuffing refugees, using pepper spray, not helping those who were endangered on the high seas, subjecting them to the wake of large boats, allowing them to stay in the ocean for 15, 20 and, 30 minutes without assistance, no matter how you feel about Castro's government or immigration, no matter how you approach this issue, is not the role of the U.S. Coast Guard. It is not the policy of the U.S. Government. This is not how we treat refugees or people who are coming to our shores for freedom.

It reminds us that the problems of Castro's government are not yet addressed. This crisis is not yet over. In the last 6 months, Amnesty International has reported that the total number of political prisoners in Cuba is now 350. In the last 6 months, there has been the arrest of four human rights dissidents petitioning their own government to recognize basic human rights. In just the last 6 months, the Cuban government has now passed laws making it a felony, punishable by 20 years in jail, to cooperate with the U.S. Government or any of its agencies. Things are not getting better in Castro's Cuba. They are getting worse.

As people flee that island for freedom, they deserve more and the people of the United States expect more than to have the agencies of this government used to continue an oppression, not at the hands of Castro but to threaten the lives of these refugees at the hands of our own agencies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous consent, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1119

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I will be brief. I rise to oppose the McCONNELL second-degree to the Silk Road amendment. I rise as a cosponsor of the bill.

We are constantly called upon in this country to pick sides among parties with ancient feuds. The area of the Silk Road, as defined in this bill, is an area that has long been beset with communism, Islamic fundamentalism, and other interests which, frankly, are inimical to U.S. interests.

Section 907 picks a side. I think it is founded on the best of motives but with the worst of results. At the end of the day, if we want to be honest brokers in this fight, it does not help us to be sanctioning one party at the table.

This isn't about oil; this isn't about some of the interests of the oil companies that want to develop in the Caspian; this is about being evenhanded; this is about getting beyond the status quo, which simply is not working.

In my view, it is appropriate to give the President the discretion to make a recommendation as to whether or not this sanction should continue. If he determines that it is working, fine, leave it in place. If not, I fear we will forever be caught up in picking sides on the Senate floor in conflicts we cannot ultimately end. I believe the U.S. posture in this very sensitive and important region of the world should be fair to both sides.

There are atrocities, human rights violations, on both sides. I wish there were just good guys and bad guys; unfortunately, there are plenty of both on both sides. In the end, I ask us to take a more evenhanded approach, support the Brownback bill and, ultimately, I believe, be more effective in this very sensitive negotiation in trying to foster peace, trying to foster development, trying to foster democracy in a part of the world that has known little of any of that.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California, who has asked for 5 minutes, go before me and that I then be recognized for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the McConnell amendment. I thank the Senator for offering his amendment because, frankly, without it, a number of us will have problems supporting the underlying amendment by Senator BROWNBACK.

The Brownback amendment addresses a very important issue of revitalizing trade in that area of the world, and the problem with it is that it gives the President the authority to waive section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. The McConnell amendment strikes that portion from the Brownback amendment and, therefore, makes it a fine amendment. But without the McConnell amendment, I am afraid we are doing some very great harm and damage to human rights and to common decency.

Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act was enacted to place restrictions on United States government-to-government assistance to Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockades of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

I have very strong concerns about ending section 907, which is essentially what we are doing, because we know the administration's position on that. Doing that would reward the Azeri Government for taking no steps in lifting their blockade.

The blockade they have put on has prevented the transportation of basic human necessities, such as food and medicine, from reaching the suffering people of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. I don't believe the United States should stand by and allow the Armenian people to live with a devastated economy, without a real commitment from Azerbaijan that they are taking steps to end the blockade.

Let me be clear about section 907 and what it does not do. It is not a sanction. In fact, the United States has normal trade relations with Azerbaijan. Section 907 does not prevent humanitarian aid from reaching Azerbaijan. It doesn't prevent the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, and the Trade Development Agency from functioning in Azerbaijan.

The only thing section 907 requires—and that is why I don't understand why Senator BROWNBACK wants to, in effect, repeal it—is that the Azeri Government ''take demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.'' That is not a high hurdle to clear. If the Azeri Government cannot even take steps—small

steps—to end this blockade, I believe it has no right to the assistance that will be provided in the underlying Brownback amendment.

I understand Mr. BROWNBACK's amendment is well intentioned, and I enjoy working with him on many issues that affect the world. But because it would repeal section 907, I think if he were to accept Senator MCCONNELL's amendment, we would have a good underlying bill.

In closing, I wanted to read into the RECORD a brief comment made by Senator PAUL SARBANES in his minority views that he put into the RECORD. I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee, and I know Senator SARBANES believes strongly in this.

This is what he said:

> Under current law, all Azerbaijan must do in order for section 907 to be lifted is to ''take demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.'' This is an entirely reasonable expectation, especially given the basic purpose of this bill, which is to promote trade and economic cooperation between the countries of the region.

He points out:

> For nearly a decade, the government of Azerbaijan has prevented the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and other vital commodities to Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, causing immense suffering.

So I ask the question of my friend, Senator BROWNBACK—in a rhetorical way, since he is not here—why would he want to do something that would only increase the suffering? Under the McConnell amendment, we cure this problem from his bill.

Senator SARBANES says:

> During winters, much of the Armenian population has had to live without heat, electricity, or water. Schools and hospitals have been unable to function, and most Armenian industries have been forced to close down, crippling the economy and producing widespread unemployment and poverty.

We all want to see progress in the world. We want to see trade and jobs created. But we don't want to see more human suffering. I think if we go along with the Brownback amendment, without the McConnell amendment, we will be doing a disservice to the world.

I know I have a little time left. I have no further comment, and I yield the rest of my time to Senator MCCONNELL.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from California. I think she has it exactly right. The issue is whether, in the absence of a peace agreement between Azerbaijan and Armenia, the United States will have completely normal relations with Azerbaijan. I would like to see normal relations between our country and Azerbaijan. I would also like to see normal relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan. If all the leverage is removed in advance of an agreement, it seems to most of us that it makes the agreement less likely.

So I commend the Senator from California. She is absolutely correct on the merits. We hope the second-degree amendment will prevail.

Mr. DURBIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, with my colleagues' indulgence, I ask unanimous consent that I may follow the Senator for no more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a request on this side of the aisle for 10 minutes at that point, and then right after that would be acceptable to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that I agree with Senators MCCONNELL and BOXER. Senator BROWNBACK calls for normalizing relations with Azerbaijan. Certainly that makes sense. We want to move toward the day when we have those normal relations. But we cannot overlook the fact that, for over 10 years, Azerbaijan has in fact imposed the blockade on Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, at great suffering to the people of that region.

It has stopped the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and other vital commodities to Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Our foreign policy is basically premised on the belief that if we are going to have normal relations with Azerbaijan, they have to have normal relations with Armenia.

As Senator MCCONNELL said, Senator BROWNBACK has a vision for the future that we may share someday, but first we must address the concerns that Senator MCCONNELL addresses in his amendment. I support him. I think it is a very sensible approach. To waive section 907 in the absence of any progress toward lifting the blockade would reward the Government of Azerbaijan for failing to remove it.

Keep in mind that even though we have this section 907 restriction, we provide humanitarian and democracy-building assistance to Azerbaijan, and in fact the businesses of the United States do business there involving a lot of international agencies. But before we really normalize relations, let us demand a normalization of relations when it comes to the treatment of the Armenian people.

I don't need to remind anyone in this Chamber of the long and sad history of the Armenian people and the genocide which they endured. They have asked us to stand by them until they can resolve this peacefully. I think the United States is right to do so.

I object to the approach used by Senator BROWNBACK and fully endorse the efforts by Senator MCCONNELL.

FUNDING TO SEND LATIN AMERICAN STUDENTS TO THE U.S. ARMY SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. President, while the budget caps did not allow adequate funding for this bill, I want to complement Senator MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY on the bill they have produced within the constraints they faced. I am particularly pleased that the bill includes funding for microcredit programs, with the expectation that the Agency for International Development will spend more for microcredit programs than last year. I am pleased that funding for the United Nations Population Fund is included in the bill. I am delighted that Foreign Military Financing funds for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been increased. These additional funds will help the Baltic countries meet their Membership Action Plans as they aspire to join NATO.

This bill contains International Military Education and Training (IMET) funds that are used for Latin American students to attend the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The school is the Army's Spanish-language training facility for Latin American military personnel, located at Fort Benning, GA. The school is a relic of the cold war with a horrendous legacy of teaching torture and assassination. It deserves to be closed for what it has taught in the past, what it stands for in Latin American democracies today, and what its counter-insurgency training at such a tainted institution may lead to in the future.

I had planned to offer an amendment to delete IMET funding for the school. However, I felt that my colleagues here in the Senate had not heard enough about the school, so I will not offer my amendment today. I introduced a bill, S. 873, to close the school. Our colleagues in the House have also introduced such a bill, H.R. 732, which now has 137 cosponsors.

Let me tell you why I think this school should be closed. I think you need only to look at the yearbook of the School of the Americas. Let me tell you what you will find. It is not surprising that among the graduates of the School of the Americas is the top of the list of the worst human rights abusers in Latin American current history. Listen as I read some of the graduates from the School of the Americas at Fort Benning, GA, an institution supported by U.S. taxpayers. These were people trained at the expense of the United States to return to Central America and lead. Listen to the people included:

19 Salvadoran soliders linked to the murder of 6 Jesuit priests, their housekeeper and her daughter in El Salvador in 1989;

48 of 69 Salvadoran military members cited in the U.N. Truth Commission's report on El Salvador for involvement in human rights violations;

Former Panamanian dictator and convicted drug dealer Manuel Noriega and nine other Latin American military dictators;

El Salvador death squad leader Roberto D'Aubuisson;

Two of the three killers of Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador;

Mexican General Juan Lopez Ortiz, whose troops committed the Ocosingo massacre in Chiapas in 1994;

Guatemalan Colonel Julio Alpirez, linked to the murder of U.S. citizen Michael Devine in 1990 and Efrain Bamaca (husband of Jennifer Harbury) in 1992;

124 of 247—50 percent—of Colombian military officials accused of human rights violations in the 1992 work ''State Terrorism in Colombia'', compiled by a large coalition of European and Colombian non-governmental organizations;

Two of the three officers prosecuted by Guatemala for masterminding the killing of anthropologist Myrna Mack in 1992, as well as several leaders of the notorious Guatemalan military intelligence unit D–2;

Argentinian dictator Leopoldo Galtieri, a leader of the so-called ''dirty war,'' during which some 30,000 civilians were killed or ''disappeared'';

Haitian Colonel Gambetta Hyppolite, who ordered his soldiers to fire on a provincial electoral bureau in 1987;

Several Peruvian military officers linked to the July 1992 killings of nine students and a professor from La Cantuta University;

Several Honduran officers linked to a clandestine military force known as Battalion 316 responsible for disappearances in the 1980's;

10 of the 12 officers responsible for the murder of 900 civilians in the El Salvadoran village of El Mozote; and

Three of the five officers involved in the 1980 rape and murder of four United States churchwomen in El Salvador.

This school is not the victim of a few isolated incidents of wrongdoing by its graduates. This list shows that human rights violations are endemic among its graduates, with far in excess of 200 murderers and other human rights violators on its past rolls.

Yet last week, when the commandant of the school, Col. Glenn R. Weidner, came to brief Senate staff on the school, he said ''it doesn't take much to get on this list,'' that has been read in the Senate. I would say to the colonel what it takes is murder, rape, and torture. And the list is long and convincing.

I would also say to him that these 225 graduates have been confirmed by the Congressional Research Service. I did not include in my bill the other allegations of the School of the Americas graduates that could be independently confirmed. Can the school claim innocence in the actions of its graduates? Many do not think that is possible. For example, just a few months ago the Guatemalan Truth Commission report faulted the school's counterinsurgency training as having ''had a significant impact on human rights violations during the armed conflict,'' a conflict that killed 200,000 people.

How, in the name of democracy, can we keep this school open?

I am not proposing that we hold U.S. foreign military training programs accountable for all of the actions of these graduates. We know from experience that people can be brutal with or without training. But why in God's name do we continue this?

Colonel Weidner also said that those wanting to close the school were isolationists, opposed to engaging in Latin America. Nothing could be further from my point of view. The question is how we engage.

Let me also say to those who suggest that these comments somehow are a reflection of criticism of the military of the United States that this school should close. The Army should support its closing. I think the men and women in uniform who serve this country do a wonderful job. But this school has not produced the kind of graduates for which we can take credit and pride. I believe it is an insult to American Army officers to have their own country's reputation sullied by an institution that has been associated with horrible crimes and human rights abuses committed by its graduates.

We should remove the albatross of their association from them and from our country by closing the School of the Americas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, is there an amendment pending? I believe there is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment pending by Senator WELLSTONE.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wellstone amendment be temporarily laid aside so we may dispose of some managers' amendments that have been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1127 THROUGH 1145, EN BLOC

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send the managers' amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) proposes the managers' amendments numbered 1127 through 1145, en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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. 1127

On page 11, line 12 strike everything after the word ''loans'' and through the word ''provision'' on line 22.

On page 18, line 21, after the colon insert the following:

''*Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds appropriated under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be made available for political, economic, humanitarian, and associated support activities for Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraqi Liberation Act (Public Law 105–338); Provided further, That not less than 15 days prior to the obligation of these funds, the Secretary shall inform the Committees on Appropriations of the purpose and amount of the proposed obligation of funds under this provision:''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1128

On page 7, line 13 strike the language beginning with ''but shall be'' through line 16 ''Appropriations''.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I fully support this amendment that is included in the manager's package to strike language from S. 1234, the foreign operations appropriations bill, which would have suspended the availability of fiscal year 2000 funding for the Inter-American Foundation until the General Accounting Office completes an investigation of alleged civil and criminal wrongdoing by employees at the Foundation. I want to thank the managers of the bill and the chairman of the committee for their willingness to remove this language.

I think it is important to explain for the record why this language was included in the committee-reported bill and what led to the amendment to strike.

Several months ago, the GAO contacted the Appropriations Committee asking permission to investigate information provided to their fraud hotline regarding allegations of contract and hiring regulatory abuses at the Foundation. GAO forwarded a report on these issues to the committee on May 20, 1999. During the course of that investigation, additional anonymous allegations were made to GAO investigators by employees of the Foundation, and the GAO requested permission from the committee to brief the Board of the Foundation on those allegations. However, the committee initially decided that the GAO should investigate these additional allegations, and included language in the bill to restrict the Foundation's funding until the investigation was completed.

When apprised of the language included in the bill and the committee's intention to direct GAO to investigate these additional allegations, I raised the issue with Chairman STEVENS and asked him to reconsider this approach. After discussing the matter, we agreed that additional information on the nature of the allegations should be sought in order to determine the appropriate course of action.

Last week, members of my staff and the Appropriations Committee staff met with representatives of the General Accounting Office to discuss their findings regarding the administrative investigation which was completed on May 20, as well as the additional allegations. Based on the information received at that briefing and GAO's characterization of the additional allegations as administrative in nature, we determined that the more appropriate way to proceed would be to accede to the GAO's request to brief the Board of the Foundation on these matters and allow the Board members to determine what further action, if any, should be taken.

Chairman STEVENS and Chairman MCCONNELL advised me that, by referring the matter to the Board, the committee would view this investigation as

complete, and GAO would not be requested to conduct any further investigations of these matters. This amendment, therefore, removes any restrictions on IAF funding as well as any language that contemplates further GAO involvement in this matter, aside from advising the Board of their findings and the existence of additional allegations.

Mr. President, I fully support the decision to permit the General Accounting Office to brief the Board of the Foundation about allegations of misconduct at the Foundation. I believe that this is the appropriate and normal course of action in this type of matter, and I thank Senators STEVENS and MCCONNELL for agreeing to refer this matter to the Foundation's Board.

As my colleagues know, allegations of this sort are generally referred to an agency's inspector general for investigation and action, if necessary. Since the Foundation does not have an inspector general at this time, advising the Board or perhaps the Audit Committee of the Board (which functions as the Foundation's Inspector General) is the appropriate course of action, instead of pursuing a congressionally directed GAO investigation.

In addition, I sponsored and the Senate earlier adopted an amendment to S. 886, the foreign relations authorization bill, which requires the inspector general of the Agency for International Development to function in that capacity for the IAF, as well as the African Development Foundation. Hopefully, this will provide IAF with the oversight and investigatory authority to discover and deal with issues of this sort in the future, if necessary.

When our staff members were briefed by the GAO, they were advised of the specific nature of these so-called ''criminal'' allegations. The GAO characterized the allegations as administrative in nature, stating that, even if substantiated, these types of activities would very rarely draw criminal penalties and would instead be dealt with by a request for reimbursement or a reprimand, at most. In addition, it is important to know that most, if not all, of these allegations have already been reviewed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and their investigation found all of them to be unsubstantiated—a conclusion which the FBI addressed in a letter to the Foundation's Board Chair earlier this year.

Mr. President, I would never attempt to thwart any legitimate effort to uncover and eliminate fraud, unethical activities, or any type of misconduct in government or government-affiliated agencies. In this instance, however, I an concerned that these allegations about an individual at the Inter-American Foundation were designed to accomplish one end—the removal of that individual from effective employment at the Foundation because of his very successful efforts over the past several yeas to bring accountability, order, and legitimacy to an agency whose programs had been fraught with waste and abuse.

The individual involved discovered serious deficiencies and improprieties regarding the Foundation's grant-making program and the lack of oversight exercised by the Foundation program offers charged with overseeing Foundation grant organizations and contractors overseas. For example, this individual found that the Foundation had made grants to organizations in Ecuador involved in the kidnapping of U.S. citizens. This individual also took decisive action when it was discovered that the Foundation provided financial support to an organization in Argentina that engaged in acts of serious civil disobedience, including the seizure of public buildings and the blockage of roadways.

This individual also exposed fraudulent activities of overseas contractors of the Foundation, including the extortion of funds from Foundation grantee organizations. Finally, he established personnel time and attendance policies at the Foundation to correct rampant absenteeism and non-performance of duties.

This individual's successful efforts to make the Foundation's employees and Board accountable for their actions and decisions involving U.S. taxpayer dollars have caused some of these people to engage in a vendetta to remove him from his position at the Foundation, or at least minimize his effectiveness in that post.

Mr. President, regardless of the outcome of the Board's review of these latest retaliatory allegations against this individual, I believe there should be a thorough investigation of the Board and employees of the Foundation to ensure that the above-mentioned activities are no longer occurring. I also believe it would be prudent to determine whether improper hiring or personnel practices, misuse of government funds or equipment, theft or loss of government funds or property, conflicts of interest, or other improprieties or mismanagement—allegations similar to those falsely made against the individual involved in this matter—exist anywhere in the organization. These are matter that should be reviewed at the earliest opportunity by the AID inspector general, who will soon be serving as the inspector general for the Foundation.

Let me serve notice that I will continue to monitor activities at the Foundation with respect to the handling of this matter, and I will do everything in my power to ensure that the matter is resolved fairly and in a manner consistent with the handling of similar allegations in any other agency of government.

Again, I thank my colleagues for concluding the committee's involvement in this issue and referring the matter to the Foundation for appropriate administrative review.

AMENDMENT NO. 1129

On page 7, line 22, after the colon, insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That funds made available to grantees may be invested pending expenditure for project purposes when authorized by the President of the Foundation: *Provided further*, That interest earned shall be used only for the purposes for which the grant was made: *Provided further*, That this authority applies to interest earned both prior to and following enactment of this provision: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 505(a)(2) of the African Development Foundation Act, in exceptional circumstances the board of directors of the Foundation may waive the $250,000 limitation contained in that section with respect to a project: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall provide a report of the Committees on Appropriations before each time such waiver authority is exercised:''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1130

(Purpose: To provide up to $5,500,000 to establish an International Health Care Center at Morehouse School of Medicine)

On page 8, line 6, after the word ''AIDS'' insert the following: ''and including up to $5,500,000 which may be made available to establish an International Health Center at Morehouse School of Medicine''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1131

On page 22, line 5, before the word ''Ukraine'' insert the words ''Government of''.

On page 22, line 6, after ''1999'', insert the following: '', including taking effective measures to end corruption by government officials''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1132

On page 22, line 15, before the period, insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds made available for Ukraine, $3,500,000 shall be made available for the destruction of stockpiles of anti-personnel landmines in Ukraine''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1133

On page 10, line 10, after the colon, insert the following:

''*Provided further*, That the proportion of funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for biodiversity activities should be at least the same as the proportion of funds that were made available for such activities from funds appropriated by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1995 (P.L. 103–306) to carry out sections 103 through 106 and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961:''.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to reaffirm that protecting biodiversity is a key goal of our foreign policy. It is also to clarify language on page 23 of the Appropriations Committee report—Report 106–81, which incorrectly refers to fiscal year 1994. The year should have been 1995.

The United States, the birthplace of the global environmental movement, has led the way in supporting efforts to protect the incredible variety of plants and animals around the world. Yet because of shrinking budgets and changing priorities in Congress and at AID, our efforts to preserve the Earth's biodiversity have diminished. The consequences of this are profound, for ourselves and even more so for future generations. We cannot afford to neglect an area of environmental protection that so directly affects the lives of

American families and American industries.

AID's biodiversity activities include efforts to save species and ecosystems from extinction or degredation. Only 1.5 million of the estimated 10–50 million species have even been named and classified. Far fewer have been studied for their potential uses to humanity. Yet the destruction of natural habitats is leading to 100 extinctions every single day. AID also promotes genetic diversity. Genes that could have been lost to environmental destruction now improve and protect crops all over the world, and especially here in the United States.

In the United States, we reap the benefits of the world's biological diversity every day. Atmospheric pollution is reduced by tropical rainforests. Our cattle and crops are crossbred to improve their genetic traits. The pharmaceutical benefits alone are amazing. Diseases common in this country are cured with medicines that come from plants from around the world. The worldwide market for drugs derived from plants is $40 billion. Who knows what new species will be discovered, leading to medicines that will benefit tomorrow's sick? No one does, which is why we cannot let a newly discovered species containing a possible cure for cancer, or AIDS, or even the common cold, go the way of the dinosaurs.

AID has led the way worldwide in supporting biodiversity, by working effectively with U.S. and foreign nongovernmental organizations, and foreign governments. For example, the Philippines, with its coral reefs and tropical forests, is one of the most biodiverse places in the world. It is also one of the most threatened. But through effective management, AID has helped place over 1.2 million acres of forest land under community stewardship and away from harm. AID has implemented similar projects elsewhere, working with governments to protect their own valuable resources.

Despite successes such as these, our biodiversity efforts are threatened. Since 1995, AID expenditures for biodiversity have decreased by nearly $50 million, a nearly 50 percent reduction in just four years. Much of this decline is due to the steady reduction in our foreign aid budget. But even from this shrinking pie, biodiversity gets a thinner and thinner slice every year. In 1995, biodiversity spending was 5.1% of development assistance expenditures. By 1996 it was down to 4%. Then in 1998, expenditures were reduced to only 3.3%.

These disproportionate cuts have devastating consequences. The Philippines project I just mentioned will completely run out of funding next year. In Madagascar, a country that AID made one of its top biodiversity priorities over a decade ago, AID cut its biodiversity funding by $900,000. In some ways Madagascar was lucky, because AID had originally planned to cut $1.5 million dollars. And this is a country that AID says is ''Africa's most important biodiversity priority.''

Obviously, we have many other development assistance priorities—in public health, in education, in family planning, in justice reform, to name a few. But we need a more balanced approach. I have spoken out more times than I can count in support of more funding for foreign aid. Foreign aid not only helps promote American interests abroad, but also provides direct benefits here at home. But even given the shrinking funds we devote to foreign aid, we must ensure that funding to protect biodiversity does not continue to suffer disproportionate cuts. We should resume the proportion of development assistance funding for biodiversity to the proportion it received in 1995. That is what my amendment would do.

I also want to be very clear about what we mean by ''biodiversity.'' We mean ''activities designed to support the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity—biomasses, ecosystems, species, or genetic diverity—by identifying needs, by designing, implementing and monitoring conservation and management actions; through research and training; or through institutional strengthening, policy interventions and program development.'' This is consistent with AID's definition of these activities.

Finally, we need to ensure that AID's Office of Environment and Natural Resources receives strong support. This office performs a vital function in the design, implementation and evaluation of conservation activities. Yet funding for it has been cut steadily since 1995, from $25.6 million to $6.9 million in 1999. That it totally unacceptable, and it seriously undercuts AID's capacity to exert leadership in this area.

Mr. President, I want to commend AID for its leadership in this area. I also want to ensure that it continue's to exert that leadership. That requires adequate resources, and I intend to work with AID to balance the many competing development assistance programs to achieve that goal.

AMENDMENT NO. 1134

On page 32, line 12, delete everything beginning with ''For'' through ''expended'' on page 33, line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

''For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying direct or indirect loans and loan guarantees, as the President may determine, for which funds have been appropriated or otherwise made available for programs within the International Affairs Budget Function 150, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts owed to the United States as a result of concessional loans made to eligible countries, pursuant to parts IV and V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including necessary expenses for the administration of activities carried out under these parts), and of modifying concessional credit agreements with least developed countries, as authorized under section 411 of the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 as amended; and concessional loans, guarantees and credit agreements with any country in sub-Saharan Africa, as authorized under section 572 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Act, 1989 (Public Law 100–461); $43,000,000, to remain available until expended; provided that any limitation of subsection (e) of Section 411 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to the extent that limitation applies to sub-Saharan African countries shall not apply to funds appropriated hereunder or previously appropriated''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1135

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding which office in the Department of State is appropriate for managing United States interests in Ukraine)

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MANAGEMENT OF UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN UKRAINE

SEC. 580. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Ukraine is a major European nation as it has the second largest territory and sixth largest population of all the States of Europe.

(2) Ukraine has important geopolitical and economic roles to play within Central and Eastern Europe.

(3) A strong, stable, and secure Ukraine serves the interests of peace and stability in all of Europe, which are important national security interests of the United States.

(4) Ukraine is a member State of the Council of Europe, the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Central European Initiative, and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Conference, is a participant in the Partnership for Peace program of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and has entered into a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with the European Union.

(5) The Government of Ukraine has clearly articulated its country's aspirations to become fully integrated into European and transatlantic institutions, and, in pursuit of the attainment of that aspiration, the government of Ukraine has requested associate membership in the European Union with the intent of eventually becoming a full member of the European Union.

(6) It is the policy of the United States to support the aspiration of Ukraine to assume its rightful place among the European and transatlantic community of democratic States and in European and transatlantic institutions.

(7) In the United States Government, the responsibility for management of United States interests in Ukraine would be most effectively performed by the officials who perform the responsibility for management of United States interests in Europe, and a designation of those officials to do so would strongly underscore and most effectively support attainment of the United States objective to build a Europe whole and free.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should designate the Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs to perform, through the Bureau of European Affairs of the Department of State, the responsibilities of the Department of State for the management of United States interests in Ukraine.

AMENDMENT NO. 1136

(Purpose: To reduce the amount appropriated for contribution to the International Development Association)

On page 38, line 10, strike ''$785,000,000'' and insert ''$776,600,000''.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, many people, including myself, were deeply

disappointed by the World Bank's June 24th decision to approve a $160,000,000 loan to fund the controversial Western Poverty Reduction Project.

We recognize the strong views about this issue and I have agreed to accept this amendment, but with some reluctance.

The Western Poverty Reduction Project has drawn criticism from Members of Congress, the Clinton administration, other governments and international human rights and non-governmental organizations. A $40,000,000 component of this project which would fund the resettlement of some 58,000 poor Chinese farmers into an historically and culturally distinct Tibetan and Mongolian area is the primary source of concern.

The $9 million cut in IDA funds which would result from the Helms amendment is the United States contribution to this portion of the project.

I share Senator HELMS' concern that the project may put additional pressure on Tibetans and other ethnic minorities in the region who are already struggling to overcome economic and cultural marginalization under Chinese rule.

There are also serious questions about the project's impact on the environment. It is my understanding that the Bank did not follow its own procedures in considering the environmental impact of this loan.

The United States Executive Director at the Bank voted against the loan and I supported that vote.

While many of us are not happy with the June 24th decision, the fact is we voted on this loan just as we have on countless other loans over the years. We participated in the Board's democratic voting process, as established by the Bank's charter and agreed to by its shareholders, just as we always have. The United States was instrumental in establishing the Bank's voting rules.

What made this vote different, however, is that we lost.

With some 18 percent of the voting power on the Board, the overwhelming majority of the time the view of the United States prevails on the World Bank's Board and at other international financial institutions. We have become accustomed to getting our way.

However, in the rare instances when we do not, dismissing the process, reneging on our financial obligations and walking away from our responsibilities is not an appropriate response. This is what this amendment does.

By cutting our contribution to IDA, which provides critical assistance to the world's poorest countries, this amendment compromises the democratic procedures at the Bank and damages United States credibility. It also invites other shareholders to cut their contributions to the Bank whenever they do not get their way. Taken to its logical conclusion, the damage to the Bank's ability to carry out its mission would be immense.

We have see how we can influence this project by simply staying involved. United States intervention and persistent international pressure has already changed the way the Bank will proceed with this loan.

Under World Bank President James Wolfensohn's leadership, the Board made the highly unusual and commendable decision to delay disbursement of the $40,000,000 until the Bank's independent inspection panel conducts a thorough review and determines whether the project meets the Bank's environmental and resettlement standards.

In addition, the Chinese Government has pledged its support for the review and stated that the press and government officials will have access to the region. Concerns about whether the project area will be open to experts unaffiliated with the Bank or the Chinese Government still need to be addressed.

It is expected that the Western Poverty Reduction project will be completed in 2005. By approving this amendment today and reducing our contribution to IDA we forfeit our leverage to influence the project and ensure that the Bank's environmental and resettlement standards are met over the next six years.

Mr. President, the plight of the Tibetan people is a clear example of what occurs when the principles of democracy are consistently and blatantly violated. In an effort to support their struggle, this amendment also compromises those same principles. It will weaken the United States' ability to ensure that the rights of Tibetans and other ethnic minorities are protected as the Bank moves forward with the project.

AMENDMENT NO. 1137

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO ACQUISITION OF USAID FACILITIES.

(a) Funds appropriated under the heading ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development'' may be made available for acquisition of office space exceeding $5,000,000 of the United States Agency for International Development only if the appropriate congressional committees are notified at least 15 days in advance in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394–1).

(b) As used in this section, the term ''acquisition'' shall have the same meaning as in the Foreign Service Building Act of 1926.

AMENDMENT NO. 1138

(Purpose: Regarding assistance for Haiti)

Beginning on page 92 delete Section 560 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

ASSISTANCE FOR HAITI

SEC. 560. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in providing assistance to Haiti, the President should place a priority on the following areas:

(1) aggressive action to support the institution of the Haitian National Police, including support for efforts by the leadership and the Inspector General to purge corrupt and politicized elements from the Haitian National Police;

(2) steps to ensure that any elections undertaken in Haiti with United States assistance are full, free, fair, transparent, and democratic;

(3) a program designed to develop the indigenous human rights monitoring capacity;

(4) steps to facilitate the continued privatization of state-owned enterprises; and

(5) a sustained agricultural development program.

(b) REPORT.—Beginning six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and six months thereafter, the President shall submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives with regard to—

(1) the status of each of the governmental institutions envisioned in the 1987 Haitian Constitution, including an assessment of whether or not these institutions and officials hold positions on the basis of a regular, constitutional process;

(2) the status of the privatization (or placement under long-term private management or concession) of the major public entities, including a detailed assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti has completed all required incorporating documents, the transfer of assets, and the eviction of unauthorized occupants of the land or facility;

(3) the status of efforts to re-sign and implement the lapsed bilateral Repatriation Agreement and an assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti has been cooperating with the United States in halting illegal emigration from Haiti;

(4) the status of the Government of Haiti's efforts to conduct thorough investigations of extrajudicial and political killings and—

(A) an assessment of whether or not substantial progress has been made in bringing to justice the persons responsible for these extrajudicial or political killings in Haiti, and

(B) an assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti is cooperating with United States authorities and with United States-funded technical advisors to the Haitian National Police in such investigations;

(5) an assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti has taken action to remove and maintain the separation from the Haitian National Police, national palace and residential guard, ministerial guard, and any other public security entity or unit of Haiti those individuals who are credibly alleged to have engaged in or conspired to conceal gross violations of internationally recognized human rights;

(6) the status of steps being taken to secure the ratification of the maritime counter-narcotics agreements signed in October 1997;

(7) an assessment of the degree to which domestic capacity to conduct free, fair, democratic, and administratively sound elections has been developed in Haiti; and

(8) an assessment of whether or not Haiti's Minister of Justice has demonstrated a commitment to the professionalism of judicial personnel by consistently placing students graduated by the Judicial School in appropriate judicial positions and has made a commitment to share program costs associated with the Judicial School, and is achieving progress in making the judicial branch in Haiti independent from the executive branch.

AMENDMENT NO. 1139

On page 24, line 18, strike all after ''(h)'' through the period on page 25, line 2, and insert the following:

Of the funds appropriated under this heading that are allocated for assistance for the

Central Government of Russia, 50 percent shall be withheld from obligation until the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that The Government of Russia has terminated implementation of arrangements to provide Iran with technical expertise, training, technology, or equipment necessary to develop a nuclear reactor, related nuclear research facilities or programs, or ballistic missile capability.

AMENDMENT NO. 1140

On page 22, line 24, after the word ''Armenia'' and before the period insert the following: '': *Provided*, That of the funds made available for Armenia, $15,000,000 shall be available for earthquake rehabilitation and reconstruction''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1141

(Purpose: To earmark Foreign Military Financing funds for the Philippines)

On page 37, line 11, before the period insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be available only for the Philippines''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1142

On page 12, line 6, insert a new section:

LEBANON

Of the funds appropriated under the headings ''Development Assistance'' and ''Economic Support Fund,'' not less than $15,000,000 shall be made available for Lebanon to be used, among other programs, for scholarships and direct support of the American educational institutions in Lebanon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1143

On page 13, line 5, after the word ''Appropriations'' insert the following words: '', the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House,''; and

On page 98, line 16, after the word ''Appropriations'', insert the following words: '', the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1144

(Purpose: To earmark funds for the independent states of the former Soviet Union for the REAP International School Linkage Program)

On page 21, line 22, before the period insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $200,000 shall be available only for the REAP International School Linkage Program''.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, REAP International operates a school linkage program between North Dakota and the Russian Republic of Buryatia. In the past, this program has resulted not only in the establishment of close personal relationships, but also provided community based assistance and sustainable development to this important region of the Russian Far East. REAP International's school linkage program between North Dakota and Buryatia is all the more critical when one considers the setbacks that the U.S.-Russia relationship has suffered in the wake of NATO's actions against Serbia. In addition, the failure of the Russian economy has left many Russians disillusioned, and there are those in the Russian leadership who would take advantage of that disillusionment in order to reverse the free market reforms already underway in Russia. We must not let that happen. One way to prevent it is to help Russian youth to understand and reap the benefits of a stable, free market economy through student exchange programs.

Student exchange programs often promote long-lasting relationships between institutions and communities. Does the Senator agree that these programs also play an important role in strengthening ties between countries?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. REAP International's school linkage program with Buryatia, Russia focuses on economic development activities, vocational and entrepreneurial training, and the enhancement of civic institutions. These types of activities are important in stabilizing communities in the Russian Far East. Is this type of stability not vital if Russia is to move ahead with economic reforms?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I concur in the Senator's assessment that stability is a necessary prerequisite for the transition to a market economy, something we all hope Russia is able to achieve.

Mr. DORGAN. And would the Senator also agree that the development of the Russian Far East is vital to the overall future development of Russia's market economy, and therefore it is critical that we support efforts to foster sustainable development and stability in this important region?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I certainly agree with that.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the Chairman for his comments and support.

AMENDMENT NO. 1145

(Purpose: To restrict United States assistance for reconstruction efforts in the Balkans to United States-produced articles and services)

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

RESTRICTION ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS IN THE BALKANS REGION.

SEC. . (a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for United States assistance for reconstruction efforts in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or any contiguous country may be used for the procurement of any article produced outside the United States, the recipient country, or least developed countries, or any service provided by a foreign person.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if—

(1) the provision of such assistance requires articles of a type that are produced in and services that are available for purchase in the United States, the recipient country, or least developed countries, or if the cost of articles and services produced in or available from the United States and such other countries is significantly more expensive, including the cost of transportation, than the cost from other sources; or

(2) the President determines that the application of subsection (a) will impair the ability of the United States to maximize the use of United States articles and services in such reconstruction efforts of other donor countries, or if the President otherwise determines that subsection (a) will impair United States foreign assistance objectives.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ARTICLE.—The term ''article'' means any agricultural commodity, steel, communications equipment, farm machinery, or petrochemical refinery equipment.

(2) FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA.—The term ''Federal Republic of Yugoslavia'' means the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and includes Kosovo.

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person'' means any foreign national exclusive of any national of the recipient country or least developed countries including any foreign corporation, partnership, other legal entity, organization, or association that is beneficially owned by foreign persons controlled in fact by foreign persons.

(4) PRODUCED.—The term ''produced'', with respect to an item, includes any item mined, manufactured, made, assembled, grown, or extracted.

(5) SERVICE.—The term ''service'' means any engineering, construction or telecommunications.

(6) STEEL.—The term ''steel'' includes the following categories of steel products: semi-finished, plates, sheets and strips, wire rods, wire and wire products, rail type products, bars, structural shapes and units, pipes and tubes, iron ore, and coke products.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I intend to support the Manager's amendments package to the Fiscal Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000, which includes a modified version of a bill I introduced on June 10th, S.1212, the Kosovo Reconstruction Investment Act of 1999. I am pleased to have Senators RICK SANTORUM and ROBERT BYRD join me as original cosponsors of this amendment.

I also want to thank the Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, Senator MCCONNELL, and the Subcommittee's Ranking Member, Senator LEAHY, for their assistance and support of this amendment.

While this amendment's language is a compromise, and is not as strong as S. 1212 which I introduced earlier this month, it is an important first step in the right direction. I will continue to work with my colleagues in the coming months to help promote American taxpayers, workers and key industries as the U.S. begins to spend billions of dollars to rebuild Kosovo and, as expected in the future, the rest of Yugoslavia.

This amendment will help American workers and companies get the first best shot at those Kosovo reconstruction opportunities that are being paid for with U.S. foreign aid funds. As a result, a large portion of the American taxpayer's dollars destined for the Kosovo reconstruction effort will be invested in the purchase of American made goods and services whenever possible.

This legislation will benefit both the people of Kosovo and American workers. The people of Kosovo will have reconstructed homes, hospitals, factories, bridges, powerplants and telecommunication systems. The American people will benefit as a significant portion of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars come back to the U.S. in the form

of new orders for American made goods and services. New jobs will be created. With this legislation we can make the best out of a looming, costly, and long term burden on our nation's budget.

This will be especially important for some of our key industries, such as agriculture and steel, that are facing hard times here at home. Other hard working Americans from industries like manufacturing, engineering, construction, high tech and telecommunications will also enjoy new opportunities to produce goods and services destined for export overseas.

For example, our ranchers and farmers, many of whom are being severely harmed by a combination of tough competition at home, cheap imports and closed markets overseas will benefit. This bill will help provide them with the opportunity to strengthen their share in Europe's Southeastern markets.

Our steel workers, many of whom are also in a tough situation, will benefit as U.S. made steel is used to reconstruct, homes, hospitals, factories, bridges and other necessary infrastructure. American steel would also be used as American made construction equipment and tractors are delivered to the Balkans. American engineers, contractors and other service providers will play a key role in rebuilding telecommunications and other necessary infrastructure projects.

The American taxpayers have already borne the lion's share of waging the war in Kosovo. Our pilots flew the vast majority of the combat sorties. In addition, the Foreign Operations Supplemental Appropriations bill that passed last month provided $819 million for humanitarian and refugee aid for Kosovo and surrounding countries. It has been estimated that peace keeping operations will cost an additional $3 billion in the first year alone. This is just the beginning. In the future, American taxpayers will be spending tens of billions of dollars more as we participate in what apparently is an open-ended peacekeeping effort.

Without this legislation those countries who largely sat on the sidelines while we fought will be allowed to sweep in and clean up. The American taxpayers' dollars should not be used to profit Western European conglomerates. The American people deserve better. This Kosovo Reconstruction Investment Amendment will help remedy this situation.

Yet another problem this bill would help alleviate is our exploding trade deficit which is on track to an all time high of approximately $250 billion by the end of this year. In March of this year alone, the U.S. posted a record one month trade deficit of $19.7 billion.

Furthermore, many of the other industrialized countries that regularly distribute foreign aid do not do so with no strings attached. For many years now, countries like Japan have also required that the foreign aid funds they distribute be used to buy products produced by their domestic companies.

The degree to which the Japanese government uses ''tied aid'' to the benefit of Japanese companies and boost their exports was underscored by a recent quote that can be found in the June, 1999, issue of the ''Look Japan'' magazine. When referring to Japanese efforts to help neighbor countries recover from the Asian economic crisis, Oshima Kenzo, the Director of the Economic Cooperation Bureau at Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated:

> This enormous machine of Japanese aid has barely begun to move. Aid to Asian countries in crisis is something that must be done on an ''all-Japan'' basis . . . The purpose of aid to Asia is primarily to provide relief to Asian countries, but it has a secondary aspect of reenergizing the Japanese economy too, so there are many domestic hopes riding on this as well.

While my original Kosovo reconstruction language in S. 1212 included tougher ''Buy America'' provisions, this amendment's compromise language will allow U.S. foreign aid funds to be used to purchase goods and services produced in ''least-developed countries.'' This is something we can do while still serving the purpose of this amendment. For example, U.S. steel workers will still have the first shot at producing steel for the Kosovo reconstruction effort since countries such as Japan, South Korea and Brazil, all of whom have been taking a heavy toll on the U.S. steel industry here at home, most definitely are not ''least developed countries.'' American telecommunications, heavy equipment manufacturers and a wide variety of other U.S. industries will also benefit.

If America's Airmen, Sailors, Marines and Soldiers are good enough to wage a war, then America's hard working taxpayers, including steel and manufacturing workers, engineers and contractors are good enough to help rebuild shattered countries. If we are called on to put the Balkans back together, we should do it with a fair share of goods and services made in America.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. McCONNELL. As I said, this is a list of managers' amendments that has been cleared on both sides of the aisle:

McConnell-Leahy amendment to move the Iraqi provision;

McCain amendment to strike Inter-American Foundation language with a statement;

Leahy-McConnell amendment on African Development Foundation provision;

Stevens-Coverdell amendment on AIDS;

McConnell-Leahy on Ukaine corruption;

Leahy-McConnell amendment on Ukraine demining;

Leahy amendment on biodiversity;

Leahy amendment on debt restructuring;

Roth amendment on Ukraine;

Helms amendment on IDA-China;

Helms amendment on USAID construction notification;

Helms-DeWine amendment on Haiti;

Leahy-McConnell amendment on Russia-Iran;

McConnell amendment on Armenia;

Helms amendment on the Philippines;

Abraham amendment on Lebanon;

Thomas amendment on technical correctional reports;

Dorgan amendment on Russia exchanges; and

A Campbell amendment on Buy America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1127 through 1145), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator LAUTENBERG be shown as a cosponsor of the Roth amendment on the Ukraine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I understand the Senator from Illinois will be recognized. Then the Senator from Minnesota is going to be recognized. I ask unanimous consent I then be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I will speak for a few moments today about an issue of great concern to me and many other Members. In the last few days in Washington, there has been literally a euphoria over the notion we in Washington are running large budgetary surpluses on an annual basis. The uncorking of champagne bottles all around town has taken place on the notion that, because we are running surpluses, we are somehow paying down the national debt.

Yesterday, the New York Times had an article on page 14 entitled, ''Clinton Sees the Possibility of Zero U.S. Debt by 2015.''

As I will show, this article is dead wrong. The article stated that the entire national debt, which now stands at over $5.6 trillion, will be paid down by the year 2015. It went on to state that the debt clock in New York, which is a daily tally of the Federal national debt, would be down to zero by the year 2015.

It turns out that is dead, flat wrong. In fact, the national debt is now rising. It is going to continue to rise every year of the President's 15-year projections. The total national debt by the year 2015, as listed on that debt clock in New York, will stand at more than $7 trillion.

How can this be? We have heard from Washington that we are running large

annual budget surpluses. The President, 2 days ago, said this year we will have a $98 billion surplus, and those surpluses are going to rise each year to the point that in the year 2004 we will have a $253 billion surplus.

Looking at the fine print on the President's midyear report, we find our total gross Federal debt is still going up. It stood at $5.4 trillion at the end of the last fiscal year. This year, it will rise to $5.6 trillion. By the year 2004, the total gross Federal debt will have risen to over $6 trillion.

How can our national debt still be going up if we are running surpluses in Washington? The answer to that question is, we really do not have surpluses in Washington. They have a definition of surpluses in Washington which is far different from the average perception of what the word surplus would mean to American families or businesses. One would think when you have surpluses, you would be paying down your debt, not increasing it. However, in Washington, the debt is still going up, even as they say they have surpluses.

We know our President chooses his words very carefully. I read his press statements the other day. He was careful not to say we are paying down the total Federal debt. He talked instead about one of the components of the Federal debt. It turns out there are two parts to the Federal debt. There is debt owed to Government accounts and there is debt held to the public. Both of those debts have to be paid off. At some point, we have to come up with the cash to pay down those debts.

What President Clinton chose to do in his statements the other day was ignore this part of the Federal debt and decide he would only focus on debt held by the public. It is true he is actually going to start trying to pay down the debt held by the public. Debt held by the public stood at $3.7 trillion at the end of last year. By the year 2004, the President will have paid it down about $700 billion to $2.9 trillion. It is true by the year 2015 he will have paid this portion of the national debt down to zero.

How is he going to pay that portion of the debt down to zero? He is going to borrow more from the Government accounts. He is going to borrow more from Government accounts. It turns out he will increase the Government accounts section of the national debt. Not only will he increase it, he is going to quadruple debt held by these Government accounts. It will rise from $1.7 trillion at the end of last year to $3 trillion by the year 2004. Guess what. By the year 2015, when the New York Times said we would have no national debt, it turns out the debt in this column will be more than $7.5 trillion.

I have to say, if the ordinary family were to pay down their mortgage by running up their credit card and then realize what they were doing, I think they probably wouldn't feel it was cause for celebration that they had just shifted the composition of their debt. Similarly, I don't think there is cause yet in Washington to uncork the champagne bottles and pat ourselves on the back that we are paying down a portion of the Federal debt while we are increasing the other portion and are increasing the overall debt.

Right now, the average family in America is responsible for $55,000 of that total national debt. Each family's share of the national debt is going to be going up in each and every year of the President's 15-year projections. At the end of the 15 years, the total national debt will be even higher than it is now, and each family's share of that national debt will be even higher.

This chart shows the direction our national debt is going: It is continuing to rise. We are digging the hole deeper.

All this talk about surpluses in Washington should be taken with a grain of salt. The surpluses they are talking about are fictitious surpluses; they are accounting gimmicks. If any private business man or woman used the same kind of accounting they use in Washington, they could potentially wind up behind bars in a Federal penitentiary. We need to change the accounting system in Washington so the public and the media cannot be so easily misled.

I am hopeful the press throughout this Nation will point out that the earlier reports were flatout wrong, that the debt clock in New York will not stand at zero by the year 2015, even under the President's projections. Under the President's own projections of our national debt, it will be higher in the year 2015 than it is now.

I think it is a shame Washington is misleading the American public about our true financial condition. Is it not high time we end the hocus-pocus bookkeeping in Washington and speak the plain truth?

I ask unanimous consent to print the New York Times article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 29, 1999]

CLINTON SEES THE POSSIBILITY OF ZERO U.S. DEBT BY 2015

(By David E. Sanger)

WASHINGTON, June 28.—President Clinton today raised the mind-bending possibility that the giant national debt clock in midtown Manhattan would soon start running in reverse—and that by 2015, the Government would owe no money to investors around the world.

There is little question that Mr. Clinton described the general direction of the clock correctly. Barring a stock market disaster or a Japan-like recession, the Federal Government's $4.5 trillion debt, the figure on the clock, will begin diminishing in the next few months. That number includes debt that the Government owes to itself, mostly to the Social Security system.

The more important figure—debt that the Government owes individual investors, companies and governments around the world—has actually been in decline for two years. How much it can be reduced in 15 years is far more problematic, dependent on a huge range of economic assumptions—chiefly the growth rate of the national economy—that, given the inexact nature of such things, are most likely subject to major revision.

But even if the United States could pay off all its debt in the next 15 years, many economists and some Government officials say that might not be as great as it sounds. Although huge debts in the 1980's and early 1990's when the Government ran up huge annual deficits, were a tremendous drag on the economy, a bit of national debt may be a good thing.

''It's almost hard to imagine what this country would be like debt-free,'' said Alan Sinai, the chief economist of Primark Decision Systems, an economic consulting group. ''But while no politician would want to admit it, the optimal debt for the United States is probably not zero. What that optimal level should be, though—now that's a subject for a real national debate.''

Without question, reducing the debt creates a host of advantages for the United States. As the Treasury tames its appetite for borrowed money, it no longer competes with homeowners looking for mortgages, for example, or companies seeking to raise money. As a result, interest rates have more room to fall.

And as the debt declines—Mr. Clinton's projections show that it will fall below $3 trillion in 2005, and below $2 trillion in 2009—the amount of interest the Government pays each year goes down substantially, freeing up even more cash, while raising the national savings rate. That, in turn, helps to compensate for the free-spending ways of American consumers, who in these boom times are barely saving.

''That may be the biggest single advantage,'' one of Mr. Clinton's senior economic advisers said toady.

But a debt-free United States might create a more complex, and some say riskier, financial landscape worldwide.

For international investors, there is no safer place to put money than United States Treasury bonds. When the Asian economic crisis hit in 1997, and accelerated last year after the collapse of the Russian economy, investors around the world put their assets into United States Treasuries. These investments help make the dollar the world's most popular ''reserve currency,'' the money other governments hold for economic security in their central banks. And they give the United States subtle but significant economic clout around the world.

If the Government stops long/term borrowing, the money that becomes available may stay in the United States, invested, say, in mortgages or corporate debt. But if investors do not have the security of investing in United States Treasuries, they may be less interested in holding their cash in dollars, and that could affect the dollar's value on world markets.

Investors could put their money in another country's treasury bonds—say those issued by the new European Central Bank or the Bank of Japan. But that requires taking a bet on the future of European and Japanese currencies, adding a significant risk to the investment.

Whether any of this happens depends on a series of assumptions. The chief one is the future of the American economy. Mr. Clinton's projections, released today, assume that the American economy will grow between 2.1 percent and 2.6 percent a year for the next 15 years. The Administration made similar bets for the past seven years, and it was wrong every time. But the surprise was pleasant: the economy expanded far faster, and for far longer, than even the most optimistic Government projections.

The risk is that future errors could be in the opposite direction. That is what happened to Japan, which assumed that the successes of the 1980's would extend into the

1990's. It was the blunder of the decade, and Japan is mounting a huge debt as it tries to spend its way out of seven-year recession.

''These are difficult projections to make for even the next year or two,'' Mr. Sinai said today, ''And even more difficult for beyond that.'' and the risk is accentuated because most of the paydown of the debt is to occur between 2010 and 2015, allowing plenty of time for economic and political miscalculation or happenstance.

On the other hand, the Government is closer to paying off the debts that really matter than even Mr. Clinton indicated today. While the debt clock reads $5.6 trillion, the figure that kicks around the United States Treasury is less than half that: $2.77 trillion, when the amount of debt held by the Federal and state governments and the Federal Reserve is subtracted. Under the President's projections, that debt will be paid off around 2011.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 1123, AS MODIFIED

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will shortly send a modified amendment to the desk. In the time I have, let me speak on a topic I think is related to this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield? I have been advised by Senator MCCONNELL's staff this has been cleared, the modification has been cleared. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to send it to the desk we can have it accepted.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I send my modified amendment No. 1123 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified.

The amendment (No. 1123), as modified, is as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new title:

TITLE—INTERNATIONAL TRAFFICKING OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN VICTIM PROTECTION

SEC. ___01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''International Trafficking of Women and Children Victim Reporting Act of 1999''.

SEC. ___02. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The worldwide trafficking of persons has a disproportionate impact on women and girls and has been and continues to be condemned by the international community as a violation of fundamental human rights.

(2) The fastest growing international trafficking business is the trade in women, whereby women and girls seeking a better life, a good marriage, or a lucrative job abroad, unexpectedly find themselves in situations of forced prostitution, sweatshop labor, exploitative domestic servitude, or battering and extreme cruelty.

(3) Trafficked women and children, girls and boys, are often subjected to rape and other forms of sexual abuse by their traffickers and often held as virtual prisoners by their exploiters, made to work in slavery-like conditions, in debt bondage without pay and against their will.

(4) The President, the First Lady, the Secretary of State, the President's Interagency Council on Women, and the Agency for International Development have all identified trafficking in women as a significant problem.

(5) The Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing Conference) called on all governments to take measures, including legislative measures, to provide better protection of the rights of women and girls in trafficking, to address the root factors that put women and girls at risk to traffickers, and to take measures to dismantle the national, regional, and international networks on trafficking.

(6) The United Nations General Assembly, noting its concern about the increasing number of women and girls who are being victimized by traffickers, passed a resolution in 1998 calling upon all governments to criminalize trafficking in women and girls in all its forms and to penalize all those offenders involved, while ensuring that the victims of these practices are not penalized.

(7) Numerous treaties to which the United States is a party address government obligations to combat trafficking, including such treaties as the 1956 Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, which calls for the complete abolition of debt bondage and servile forms of marriage, and the 1957 Abolition of Forced Labor Convention, which undertakes to suppress and requires signatories not to make use of any forced or compulsory labor.

SEC. ___03. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are to condemn and combat the international crime of trafficking in women and children and to assist the victims of this crime by authorizing an annual report of its findings to include the identification of foreign governments that tolerate or participate in trafficking and fail to cooperate with international efforts to prosecute perpetrators;

SEC. ___04. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) TRAFFICKING.—The term ''trafficking'' means the use of deception, coercion, debt bondage, the threat of force, or the abuse of authority to recruit, transport within or across borders, purchase, sell, transfer, receive, or harbor a person for the purpose of placing or holding such person, whether for pay or not, in involuntary servitude, or slavery or slavery-like conditions, or in forced, bonded, or coerced labor.

(2) VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term ''victim of trafficking'' means any person subjected to the treatment described in paragraph (2).

SEC. ___05. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to Congress describing the status of international trafficking, including—

(1) a list of foreign states where trafficking originates, passes through, or is a destination; and

(2) an assessment of the efforts by the governments described in paragraph (1) to combat trafficking. Such an assessment shall address—

(A) whether governmental authorities tolerate or are involved in trafficking activities;

(B) which governmental authorities are involved in anti-trafficking activities;

(C) what steps the government has taken toward ending the participation of its officials in trafficking;

(D) what steps the government has taken to prosecute and investigate those officials found to be involved in trafficking;

(E) what steps the government has taken to prohibit other individuals from participating in trafficking, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of individuals involved in trafficking, the criminal and civil penalties for trafficking, and the efficacy of those penalties on reducing or ending trafficking;

(F) what steps the government has taken to assist trafficking victims, including efforts to prevent victims from being further victimized by police, traffickers, or others, grants of stays of deportation, and provision of humanitarian relief, including provision of mental and physical health care and shelter;

(G) whether the government is cooperating with governments of other countries to extradite traffickers when requested;

(H) whether the government is assisting in international investigations of transnational trafficking networks; and

(I) whether the government—

(i) refrains from prosecuting trafficking victims or refrains from other discriminatory treatment towards trafficking victims due to such victims having been trafficked, or the nature of their work, or their having left the country illegally; and

(ii) recognizes the rights of victims and ensures their access to justice.

(c) REPORTING STANDARDS AND INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State shall ensure that United States missions abroad maintain a consistent reporting standard and thoroughly investigate reports of trafficking.

(2) CONTACTS WITH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In compiling data and assessing trafficking for the Human Rights Report and the Annual Report, United States mission personnel shall seek out and maintain contacts with human rights and other nongovernmental organizations, including receiving reports and updates from such organizations, and, when appropriate, investigating such reports.

SEC. ___06. PROTECTION OF TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1123), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent it be in order the Senator from Rhode Island be recognized for the 5 minutes prior to my recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1118

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his graciousness in allowing me to speak. I rise today to express my opposition to the Brownback amendment which would implement the Silk Road Strategy Act of 1999. I urge my colleagues to support the second-degree amendment offered by Senators MCCONNELL, ABRAHAM, and SARBANES. I am also a cosponsor of the second-degree amendment.

The purpose of Senator BROWNBACK's amendment is appropriate, in the sense

he wants to provide assistance to integrate the Caucasus, provide more cooperation and collaboration between these countries. But what we have seen over the last several decades, really, has been the resistance, particularly by the Government of Azerbaijan and the Government of Turkey, to a cooperative and collaborative relationship with the Government of Armenia. That is a polite way of saying they have been blockading Armenia for many years.

In response to that blockade, we have passed, I think wisely, legislation in this Congress and preceding Congresses to prevent our cooperation with these countries unless they lift the blockade. It has been the only real way we have been able to put leverage upon the governments of Turkey and Azerbaijan to recognize that a dialog, cooperation, collaboration, and regional harmony is necessary.

The interesting and ironic point at this juncture is that our strategy seems to be working because for the first time, in the context of the NATO meetings here in Washington just a few weeks ago, the President of Armenia and the President of Azerbaijan had face-to-face meetings.

Up until that time, the Azeris refused to even recognize, really, the Government of Yerevan to have a constructive dialog. Now at the point where we are making progress, where we have a dialog initiated by the Azeris and the Armenians, we are attempting to undercut that progress with this amendment which will essentially take all the pressure off both the Azeris and the Turks in terms of their relationship with Armenia and, in particular, the region of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Nagorno-Karabakh has been for generations an area of concentrated Armenian population but under the control of Azerbaijan. In 1988, Nagorno-Karabakh seceded from Azerbaijan. There was warfare. Mercifully, the warfare has ceased, but this is still a festering point among the three countries—Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenia, and Azerbaijan.

Again, if we are to make progress on this very critical issue, the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh, the issue of the general relationship among Armenia and its neighbors, Azerbaijan and Turkey, now is not the time to take off the one piece of leverage, section 907, which is giving the Azeris an incentive to go to the table, sit down, and talk and collaborate.

I have had the privilege and the opportunity to travel to Armenia and to Nagorno-Karabakh. There is a sincere willingness to seek an understanding, to seek a cooperative arrangement with the Azeris, with the Turks. But that cannot happen unless there is a dialog.

The dialog has started, but my fear is that if we adopt this measure, proposed with every good intention by the Senator from Kansas, we will undercut the progress we have made. We will send a strong message to the Azeris that they do not have to do anything, they do not have to talk to the Armenians, they do not have to do anything, because they now are unrestricted in terms of their type of diplomatic initiatives.

It will be terribly unfortunate, and it will essentially undercut the motivation which I believe is compelling and moving this underlying amendment of the Senator from Kansas forward: the notion of regional dialog, regional cooperation, regional collaboration.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky, because that is the only way we are going to keep both the Azeris and the Armenians at the table. We know from a long sweep of history, if two nations are talking, then there is hope. Once the dialog is over—and it will end if section 907 is repealed—we are going to see a much more hostile and threatening environment in the Caucasus, one which will not only impact our relationship but also will be a threat to the stability of that region.

I thank and commend the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, Senator ABRAHAM from Michigan, and those who are standing up and saying, now that we are making progress, now that we finally have a dialog between the President of Azerbaijan and the President of Armenia, do not take away the motivation for that dialog; let's continue to talk; let's continue to work for peace in this area.

I yield back any time to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his comments. We appreciate his support on this most important amendment. We certainly hope the Senate will approve the second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 1123, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senator from Minnesota to further modify his amendment, which was adopted just a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I send the modification to the desk. I thank both Senator LEAHY and Senator MCCONNELL for their support. This is the first time we are going to have such a report. It is going to be very important to the human rights community and the law enforcement community. It will have a stigmatizing effect on countries involved in this, and it is going to make a huge difference from the point of human rights.

The amendment (No. 1123), as further modified, is as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new title:

TITLE—INTERNATIONAL TRAFFICKING OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN VICTIM PROTECTION

SEC. ___01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''International Trafficking of Women and Children Victim Reporting Act of 1999''.

SEC. ___02. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are to condemn and combat the international crime of trafficking in women and children and to assist the victims of this crime by requiring an annual report including the identification of foreign governments that tolerate or participate in trafficking and fail to cooperate with international efforts to prosecute perpetrators.

SEC. ___03. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) TRAFFICKING.—The term ''trafficking'' means the use of deception, coercion, debt bondage, the threat of force, or the abuse of authority to recruit, transport within or across borders, purchase, sell, transfer, receive, or harbor a person for the purpose of placing or holding such person, whether for pay or not, in involuntary servitude, or slavery or slavery-like conditions, or in forced, bonded, or coerced labor.

(2) VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term ''victim of trafficking'' means any person subjected to the treatment described in paragraph (2).

SEC. ___04. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to Congress describing the status of international trafficking, including—

(1) a list of foreign states where trafficking originates, passes through, or is a destination; and

(2) an assessment of the efforts by the governments described in paragraph (1) to combat trafficking. Such an assessment shall address—

(A) whether governmental authorities tolerate or are involved in trafficking activities;

(B) which governmental authorities are involved in anti-trafficking activities;

(C) what steps the government has taken toward ending the participation of its officials in trafficking;

(D) what steps the government has taken to prosecute and investigate those officials found to be involved in trafficking;

(E) what steps the government has taken to prohibit other individuals from participating in trafficking, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of individuals involved in trafficking, the criminal and civil penalties for trafficking, and the efficacy of those penalties on reducing or ending trafficking;

(F) what steps the government has taken to assist trafficking victims, including efforts to prevent victims from being further victimized by police, traffickers, or others, grants of stays of deportation, and provision of humanitarian relief, including provision of mental and physical health care and shelter;

(G) whether the government is cooperating with governments of other countries to extradite traffickers when requested;

(H) whether the government is assisting in international investigations of transnational trafficking networks; and

(I) whether the government—

(i) refrains from prosecuting trafficking victims or refrains from other discriminatory treatment towards trafficking victims due to such victims having been trafficked, or the nature of their work, or their having left the country illegally; and

(ii) recognizes the rights of victims and ensures their access to justice.

(b) CONTACTS WITH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In compiling data and assessing trafficking for the State Departments Annual Human Rights Report and the report referred to in subsection (a), United States mission personnel shall consult with human rights and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations, including receiving reports and updates from such organizations, and, when appropriate, investigating such reports.

SEC. ___06. PROTECTION OF TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

JUVENILE JUSTICE BILL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have an adage: Where there is a will, there is a way. Often that seems to embody how legislation is passed by this Congress. Of course the question always is what is the will, and what is the way? We should look no further than the priority being put on two separate pieces of legislation: S. 254, the juvenile justice bill, and H.R. 775, the Y2K bill. If one looks at that, one sees how the will and the way work around here.

The Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill, S. 254, passed the Senate after 2 weeks of open debate, after a number of votes, and after significant improvements on May 20. The Senate passed it by a strong bipartisan vote of 73–25.

On June 17, the other body passed its version of this legislation but chose not to take up the Senate bill and insert its language, which is the standard practice. Nor has the Republican leadership in the House made any effort to seek a House-Senate conference or appoint conferees.

When there are differences in legislation passed by each House, the normal order is for House and Senate conferees to work these differences out in conference, but we cannot do that unless they appoint conferees.

The majority in the other body is taking a break even before our July 4 recess. They are taking no steps to proceed to conference on the juvenile justice bill or toward the appointment of conferees. Indeed, despite statements by the Speaker of the House earlier this week, the House majority leader is now reported to be planning to delay the completion of this bill for months. This delay is costing us valuable time in getting this juvenile justice legislation enacted before school resumes this fall. This is just plain wrong.

Every parent in this country is concerned this summer about school violence over the last two years and worried about the situation they will confront this fall. Each one of us wants to do something to stop this violence. 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. But we have an opportunity before us to do our part. It is unfortunate that the majority is not moving full speed ahead to seize this opportunity to act on balanced, effective juvenile justice legislation.

We should not repeat the delays that happened in the last Congress on the juvenile justice legislation. In the 105th Congress, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported juvenile justice legislation in July 1997, but it was then left to languish for over a year until the very end of that Congress. In fact, serious efforts to make improvements to this bill did not even occur until the last weeks of that Congress, when it was too late and we ran out of time.

The experience of the last Congress causes me to be wary of this delay in action on the juvenile justice legislation this year. I want to be assured that a House-Senate conference on this legislation is fair, full, and productive.

At the end of the last Congress, the majority staged what appeared to be a procedural ambush to move a one-sided bill forward in a way that precluded full and open debate and amendment. I certainly hope that the current delay in action on this year's juvenile crime bill is not an attempt to concoct another procedure ambush.

We have worked hard in the Senate for a strong bipartisan juvenile justice bill. I will be vigilant in working to maintain this bipartisanship and to press for action on this important legislation. We know if we have the will, there is a way.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. I yield without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee. I could not agree more with his remarks. We worked hard on this bill. We deserve for it to be heard. We do not deserve—the American people do not deserve—for it to be shoved under a carpet to pop out sometime unknown perhaps when it cannot be debated.

I ask the Senator this question: Does it seem unreasonable, given his years of experience in the Senate—and I know we worked on criminal justice matters when I was in the House—does it seem unreasonable for us to have a goal, for the American people to sort of set the goal, or agree with us in the goal, that the juvenile justice bill, including provisions such as closing the gun show loophole, which this body passed, be on the President's desk by the day school resumes, by Labor Day of next September? Does that seem to be a reasonable timetable and a reasonable request for people who are interested in debating the issues and seeing that we do something to close the gun show loophole?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I say to my friend from New York, it is reasonable to move forward on it. These are issues the American people care about. They do care about the gun show loopholes on gun sales, certainly after the tragedy of Columbine. They do care about a number of the issues that are in the juvenile justice bill. The Senate reflected that by passing it 73–25. This is a 3-to-1 vote in the Senate.

I say to my friend from New York, when he served in the other body, he and I were on a number of conference committees together. We knew we would have major criminal justice bills come in one distinct form from the Senate and one distinct form from the House, but we moved quickly in the conferences, sometimes going all night long. In fact, I can remember a couple that went all night long, 2 or 3 nights in a row, to complete our work because we knew we were dealing with criminal justice matters, matters about which the American people have great concern. But we did it.

So I say to my friend from New York, in answer to his question, that this is wrong. This is wrong that we are not moving forward to immediately conference the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator from New York for his concern and his leadership on these matters. He was one of the leaders—in fact, oftentimes on the floor he was the leader—on these issues, including closing gun loopholes. I was looking forward to, and am looking forward to, his expertise and his work when we do get to conference. He and I are ready to go to conference. I am prepared to have him in there to help me in that conference, because these are major issues.

But at some time or another the American people expect us to vote one way or the other. Some Senators will vote against our position. Some House Members will vote against our position. Some will vote for it. I do not ascribe motives to them, but I say, that you either vote for or against something. You do not vote maybe. And the Congress is being forced to vote maybe.

This is a sharp contrast to the pace of action on the Y2K bill. The Y2K bill provides special legal protections to businesses. After earlier action in the House on H.R. 775, the Y2K liability limitations bill passed the Senate on June 15, 1999. That was about 1 month after the Senate passed the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill.

On June 16, the day after Senate action on the Y2K bill, the Senate asked for a House-Senate conference and appointed conferees. In fact, I am one of them. The House responded by agreeing to the conference and appointed its conferees a few days later, on June 24. Then we immediately went to conference. The conference met that same day, the same day the House appointed its conferees.

After a weekend break for extensive negotiations with the White House, the conference report on the Y2K liability limitations bill was filed yesterday, June 29. I expect the House and Senate will be taking up the conference report almost immediately, and the Y2K liability limitations bill will probably see final passage this week.

It is interesting that this is a business-lobbied-for issue and that thing zips through here; it zips through here at warp speed. I can almost see the legislative clerk saying: We want warp 5,

Scottie. And, by golly, we are going to have it.

I should also note, this Y2K liability limitations bill is industry's second bite at the apple to gain protections against liability to customers and consumers. If all goes as expected, in less than a year's time, big business will have successfully lobbied for the passage of two major pieces of legislation to protect themselves against any accountability for actions or losses their products may cause to consumers.

Last year, I joined with Senator HATCH to introduce and pass into law a consensus bill known as the Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act. This legislation passed both the House and the Senate by unanimous consent on October 8, 1998. When we took this action, requested last year, we acted in good faith, we acted in recognition of the fears of industry, but we did it in a balanced way that continued to protect consumers and the rights of all Americans. The House and Senate accepted that unanimously, and the White House signed it.

Notwithstanding that bipartisan piece of legislation, notwithstanding the unanimity we sought, we see this year where business fears are being reconstituted for the basis of greater and greater demands for special legal protections for potential Y2K defendants. Special business interests have come back to Congress with new demands, and there has been swift action.

But by contrast to this swift action to help business by limiting their potential liability in the Y2K bill at the expense of American consumers, in contrast to jumping immediately to do whatever the business lobby wanted, we find now that those who should be appointing conferees in the House are not doing that, they are dragging their feet on moving to appoint conferees on the juvenile justice bill.

The juvenile justice bill is not designed as a protection to businesses that may have made mistakes in the computers they sell to people. No. The juvenile justice bill is intended to make a difference in the lives of our children and our families. I guess children and families do not have the power and the lobbying clout that some of these major businesses do. I guess they do not have PACs. They do not give major contributions. They do not go to the big fundraisers. All they are, are families trying to raise their children and send them to school safely; so the House majority is not going to move rapidly on a juvenile justice bill.

As Senators, as House Members, as human beings, that should have been our No. 1 priority. We should have brought this to conference. We should have concluded it by now so that the new programs and protections for schoolchildren could be in place when school resumes this fall. At the rate we are going, we guarantee that children will be going back to school without the protections that three-quarters of the Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, voted for; we guarantee that the promise we held out here in the Senate to protect the children who have to go to school, to protect their families, to protect this country, the promise we held out to them is a hollow promise, because the House of Representatives, and their leadership, the Speaker and the majority leader, are saying: We're not going to get to this bill; we're not going to have conferees.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes, for a question, or I will lose my right to the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have listened carefully to what the Senator has said. I must say, I am in total agreement with the Senator.

As I understand the parliamentary situation, rather than follow the usual procedure, where we have legislation that has passed the House and the Senate, and then we go to the conference, and then the conference comes back and we have an opportunity to evaluate what was in the conference, but then we have at least some resolution to the issue, this process and this parliamentary gymnastics, which the leadership on both sides, evidently, were a part of, effectively, as I understand what the Senator is saying, if I understand the parliamentary situation, basically undermines in a very significant and important way the work that was done here in the Senate in terms of trying to help families deal with the problems of violence in their communities, violence in their schools, and also to deal with the law enforcement issue in terms of the gun show loophole.

I believe I am correct, am I not, in understanding what the Senator has represented here this afternoon? Am I correct?

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Massachusetts is absolutely right. The Senator from Massachusetts, of course, is one of those who was on the floor day after day, hour after hour, helping us craft this bill and getting it through. A former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he has been a leader on juvenile justice issues for the better part of four decades. We greatly appreciate all that he contributes each day and all that he contributed again this year to the Senate juvenile justice bill that we were able to pass with such a strong bipartisan majority.

The Senator from Massachusetts, from his experience—longer experience than I have had in this body—is aware that when we have had these major pieces of criminal justice or juvenile justice legislation or any major justice legislation, we have gone to conference and we have worked out the differences. He also knows, as I do, if we refuse to do that, it, in effect, kills legislation—legislation that passed here in a bipartisan fashion. I share the concerns that the Senator from Massachusetts has.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am just wondering if the Senator could give us some insight. It took us 9 days to work out an agreement with the Republican leadership in order to permit the Senate to consider what we know as the Patients' Bill of Rights when we return from the Fourth of July recess, to dispose of that. What we saw during that time was every type of parliamentary maneuver in order to deny the will of the Senate on that particular issue.

Now we have, as a result of the leadership, both the majority and minority leadership, an opportunity to address those issues when we return.

It seems to me we are seeing a similar effort by the leadership to deny the Senate the ability to express itself on an issue that is affecting children, an issue affecting violence in our schools and our local communities. Effectively, the rules of the Senate are being used in order to deny the Senate the reasonable chance to express itself.

Is that basically the bottom line, when all is said and done; we are seeing a parliamentary maneuver to try and effectively undermine what has been the considered judgment of this body? We are being put back, effectively, to ground zero in terms of this issue?

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Massachusetts is absolutely right. Unlike the Y2K bill and other things, where there is a rush to complete congressional action on it, this is something where it appears, especially in the other body, that the parents and the children of this country do not have a voice. No matter what other legislative issues are going on, the conference could have been meeting if the House had just proceeded to take the normal steps needed and appointed conferees.

The majority leader of the House of Representatives has said they are not going to appoint conferees, certainly not any time in the near future. We have been ready to go forward at any time, the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. But if there are not going to be conferees, this bill is in limbo.

So you had the hopes of the parents of this country, the hopes that the schoolchildren had following the passage by the Senate of a good juvenile justice bill, that maybe we are coming to grips on at least some aspects of juvenile violence. Those hopes are dashed because when the matter is finally taken up by the other body, they say: Wait a minute, we don't have to have any votes on this.

I am privileged to participate in legislative action on the floor of the Senate. We Senators ought to run the Senate, not a powerful lobby. I say the same to the other body. They ought to stand up and speak for their constituents and not become mouthpieces for a powerful lobby, but that is what has happened.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator. I see on the floor our friend and colleague from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, who made a gallant fight on

the floor of the Senate in terms of reducing the availability and the accessibility of guns to children in this country and also to those of the criminal element. It was a hard-fought battle. The Senate expressed its will. That is the way this body should act.

Now, with a parliamentary maneuver, the leadership that was strongly opposed to those provisions has been basically able, at least for the time being, to undermine what has been debated, discussed, and acted on here in the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for bringing this matter to our attention. I thank, again, the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from California, both of whom I am sure share our frustration with this parliamentary maneuver.

I think at some time in the Senate, a body that has a very proud tradition of permitting people to express their judgment and to make a determination to deal with public business, at some time we are going to learn the lesson that you can't constantly undermine what is the regular order, which is the reason why this body was established; that is, for Senators to be able to express their will. I think we are seeing another way and means of corrupting the purpose that the Founding Fathers intended. I think it is enormously regrettable.

I assure the Senator from Vermont, we will work very closely with him to try to remedy this situation in any way that we can. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I totally concur with what the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts has said. He was a leader who worked with us to design the Senate-passed bill.

All of us, whether we are parents or grandparents or teachers or policymakers, we are puzzling over the causes of children turning violent in this country. We know that the root causes are likely multifaceted. We know there is no one cause. There is no one magic solution.

I believe the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill is a firm and significant step in the right direction. The passage of that bill showed that when Senators roll up their sleeves and get to work, we can make significant progress. And we did. Senators were on the floor, they were in conferences in the cloakroom and off the floor. We worked extremely hard to come together. We had some false steps at the beginning, but we finally came together when we passed a piece of legislation 73 to 25.

That took a lot of work. We had conservatives and liberals and moderates holding hands on a number of issues to make it work because we cared about the children of this country. That progress does not do any good if the House and Senate do not come together in a conference.

I yield for a question to my friend from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his leadership on the juvenile justice bill, all parts of it. I see the Senator from New Jersey has come to engage also in some conversation.

I ask the Senator from Vermont, because when you read a book that says how a bill becomes a law, it seems very simple in many ways. It says a bill passes the Senate or the House. Then it goes to the second House. If it started in the House, it goes to the Senate. Then there is a conference where the differences are ironed out. Then the bill goes over to the President.

When we passed this bill—and my friend pointed out the overwhelming margin with which it was passed—the country really celebrated because for the first time in a long time we passed some sensible laws.

The question that I have for my friend is as follows: After the Senate walked hand in hand, people on both sides of the aisle, to an overwhelming vote, with three-quarters of the Senate voting to pass this juvenile justice bill, which included the Lautenberg amendment that closed the gun show loopholes—we remember that it was very close; the Vice President cast the tying vote—the people of this country were very relieved. At least they certainly were in California. They said: Thank goodness you are doing something relevant. They assumed we were making progress.

Then the bill goes over to the House, and as I remember it—and I would like the Senator from Vermont to tell me if I am correct on this—no sensible gun control was passed at all. Everything was killed. What remained was just the part that dealt with juvenile justice, not the part that talked about sensible gun laws because they separated those out.

If we are to have any closing of the gun show loophole that Senator LAUTENBERG fought so hard for, that the Vice President came over here to cast the tie-breaking vote for, which says, yes, we will do background checks to make sure that felons don't get guns and people with mental illness don't get guns and children don't get guns, we want that, the only hope, is it not so, lies in a conference where the Senate bill will be presented side by side with the House bill and the conversation will proceed and we will come up with a bill?

By not appointing conferees, is my friend implying that at the moment it means zero progress on this whole issue of juvenile justice and sensible gun laws and, perhaps, if it continues long enough, when the kids go back to school they will have no benefit from this fine bill? Is that what my friend is saying—that this is another way to at least temporarily kill this bill?

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from California is correct. She has described the bill very well, as she always does, and where we are in the legislative process. She has had both a distinguished career in the other body and here. She understands what has happened.

It was not an easy thing passing the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill here in the Senate. We had a very difficult time. It evolved. But interestingly enough—and I have been here 25 years—I have rarely seen an occasion where the American public became involved and more fully aware of what was happening.

I must say, initially, much of the news media did not even cover it. The American people became aware through C-SPAN and through all the discussions on the Internet and through the radio. And then, more and more, they realized what was happening and what was at stake.

I do not know how many people are aware of this discussion we are having right now. I will guarantee you that it will be on web sites and on the Internet, though, because the American public is concerned about this.

The Senator from California, the Senator from New Jersey, and others, will remember that as calls started coming into Senators' offices, the debate started shifting. This was one of those all too rare occasions where the American public went beyond having the debate interpreted for them and started watching what was actually happening in the debate and contributing and participating themselves.

The Hatch-Leahy legislation passed because the American people were paying attention and because they were concerned, and votes started changing, positions started changing. That is why this body came together by a 3-to-1 vote and passed the Hatch-Leahy legislation, a good piece of juvenile justice legislation, because the American people paid attention and knew something could be done.

Now it has been blocked in the other body. Why? Perhaps because that is the only way this legislation can be stopped—it won't be stopped by a vote in the Senate. Senators have said how they will vote. The only way it can be stopped is if the other body refuses to bring it up, and the way they refuse to bring it up is by refusing to appoint conferees.

(Mr. BUNNING assumed the Chair.)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. Certainly.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I know that the Senator from Vermont very much shares this view, despite the fact that gun ownership is a popular thing in the State of Vermont where a lot of people hunt and a lot of people collect guns. But I believe it is fair to say, is it not, that in the State of Vermont, despite the abundant number of guns you have there, violent crime is a relatively small factor? Is that the case?

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from New Jersey is right.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Therefore, does Vermont have laws that require review of applications to buy guns and require people to get permits to buy guns?

Mr. LEAHY. No, other than the Federal law, the Brady law.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Federal law. So they are in adherence, obviously, to the Federal law?

Mr. LEAHY. That is right.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that we had a long struggle, which the Senator from Vermont and I participated in, to get the Brady law into place and to try to retain the review of applicants to buy guns, to be continued under the national instant check system. I wonder if the Senator has seen the pieces recently about the fact that the FBI, even with a 3-day business period available to them, does not have enough time to control every one of the decisions that is made to enable someone to buy a gun.

Mr. LEAHY. I have seen that, and I have seen the results in some places where those who should not get guns have gotten them because there has not been enough time to make the checks.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I know the Senator keeps abreast of things, especially affecting justice, especially affecting juveniles. I inquire of the Senator as to whether or not he knows that where more than 1,700 guns, gun purchases, were denied to prohibited buyers, unstable felons and criminals have been allowed to buy guns because they were unable to thoroughly check the backgrounds before the guns were sold. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. LEAHY. No. But I am aware of the fact that the Senator from New Jersey is one of the experts on this issue. He has studied it as much or more than any other person in this body. If he says those are the numbers, I am willing to accept them.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I appreciate that. I don't know whether the Senator is further aware that since the Brady bill was put into place in March of 1994, over 400,000 illegal gun sales have been blocked—over 400,000 illegal gun sales have been blocked as a result of the Brady bill being in place.

Mr. LEAHY. I was aware of that number. It is a very significant number.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Senator is aware, I am sure, that I had the privilege of authoring the domestic violence prohibition for guns to be available to those who had been convicted of misdemeanors, in marital and home disputes. Over 13,000 gun permits have been denied under the law that I authored at the end of 1996, which kept those people from being able to buy guns. I don't know if the Senator is aware of the extent of that number, but it is 13,000.

The fact of the matter is that, in conjunction with that, we know that roughly 150,000 times a year a gun is put to a woman's head in front of her children, or in the privacy of a discussion between the two of them, and the threat is made: I will blow your head off.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that there are forces at play here that refuse to permit us to have sensible gun violence control? I didn't say gun control; I said gun violence control.

Mr. LEAHY. I say to the Senator from New Jersey, apparently those forces, at least at this point, have succeeded in the other body, and that is why we are not having conferees appointed and proceeding to a prompt conference, because they know if there were a conference and if the public responds as it did during the debate on the Hatch-Leahy bill originally, that conference may pass out legislation that they might not like, especially as it relates to controlling gun violence. I think that is one of the reasons why we have not seen that.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I ask the Senator this question. The Senator from Vermont has had abundant experience as a prosecutor in the law since he was able to start his profession, the distinguished career in the Senate.

What will it take, in the Senator's mind, to finally say to the American public that we get your message? We understand that you want to protect your children. And while people have the right to bear arms, people have the right to bear children and send them to school hoping and believing that they are going to get home safely. When, I ask the Senator, does he think that message will get through these, I will call them ''hollow halls,'' so that people will believe that they can send their children or their loved ones to the workplace or to school or to the streets without being gunned down by someone who shouldn't have a gun?

Mr. LEAHY. It will only come, I say to my friend from New Jersey, when we realize that our children and our families are far more precious to us than votes or campaign contributions. The Senator from Vermont was long ago clear on that point. My wife, my children—my family—are far more important to me than any votes, any office, any lobbyist, any pressure, any favors, any campaign contributions, or anything else. I think most families in this country feel the same way—that the family is the most precious thing possible to them.

In this body we passed legislation that might protect those families. We see the response on the other side of the Capitol of symbolism instead of substance, of speeches or feel-good solutions. We cast the tough votes here. The Senator from New Jersey made sure that we did.

On this issue especially, can we not stand up and say our families are more important, our children are more important, our grandchildren are more important, and all of that is more important than a powerful lobby?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the distinguished senior Senator from Utah, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, a coauthor of the Hatch-Leahy-Biden-Sessions-Feinstein juvenile justice bill on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I have been very intrigued and interested in the remarks that have been made. I just want everybody to know that I want to go to conference on this bill.

The Hatch-Leahy-Biden-Sessions-Feinstein bill is a very important bill. We all know it. We all know it is important. We all know that we need to pass it this year.

Let me just say this: Leadership will, in my opinion, appoint conferees in July because I believe we have to do this.

I met just this week with leaders in both the House and the Senate—the majority leader in the Senate and the Speaker of the House. I know the intention is to appoint conferees and to have this matter resolved. My hope is that we will pass a conference report before the August recess.

No one wants this bill more than I do. It is an important bill.

To hear some of my colleagues speak, though, you would think that 99 percent of this bill is a gun control bill. I would say that a very small part of it involves guns, and the rest of it addresses in a serious way the very important issues we must confront regarding juvenile violence and juvenile justice. These are the truly critical parts of this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I agree with the point that the Senator from Utah has made. There are an awful lot of things in the Senate-passed bill besides guns. There are some very major changes in the handling of juvenile crimes, especially juvenile violent crimes, and matters relating to the relationship between the Federal Government and State governments. There are some very significant things that should not be overlooked and will be a part of the debate.

I was wondering if the Senator from Utah knows when the other body will appoint conferees and how quickly we might appoint conferees?

Mr. HATCH. My feeling is that they will appoint conferees in July—both leaders of the House and the Senate, the floor leaders—perhaps prior to the recess. My goal is to have this conference report voted on before we go out on the August recess; if not, then as soon as we can after we get back, but I hope before the August recess.

Mr. LEAHY. I also hope, I might add—and I will not interrupt the Senator again—that we are able to come to a conclusion and agreement on legislation that can be signed into law prior to the beginning of the school year.

Mr. HATCH. It would be great if we could do that. That is my goal.

I thank my colleague for being willing to stand up on that point with me.

I voted against the Lautenberg amendment. I voted against it twice. Neither of those votes on Lautenberg

won a majority of the Senate. But it finally passed with the tie-breaking vote of Vice President GORE.

Still, I voted for the final bill. I have repeatedly made clear my desire to pass this bill. This is not an empty exercise for me. This is an important bill. So there is no question about that.

Let me just say this: We have had a lot of crying, moaning, and groaning about background checks at gun shows.

Let's just stop and think about it. If we had not had Brady, which required a 5-day waiting period, if we had not had this new demand for a 3-day waiting period, we could have already had a responsible system in place. We spent so much time on 3- to 5-day waiting periods that we haven't gotten the instant check system in place throughout the country. In other words, we haven't concentrated enough efforts on implementing the one thing that will really help us to identify and weed out the felons and others who are disqualified to purchase guns in the first place.

Some would rather concentrate their efforts on this phony waiting period issue than address the real problem of identifying those who aren't allowed to own a firearm. The reason they would rather address the phony issue of a 3-day waiting period at gun shows is because gun shows only take place for 3 days. If you have a 3-day delay, it means basically there won't be any more gun shows.

What does that mean? This is pretty important stuff.

If you do not have the gun shows where legitimate, private sellers of guns can come and sell their weapons with appropriate background checks, which everybody in this body is willing to do—I have led the fight to do it—if you do not allow that to happen, then the private sellers of weapons are going to go into the streets, and those guns will all be sold on what will then be a much larger black market for guns.

We have that already in our society. We ought to minimize it. The best way to do it is to have legitimate gun shows. There are some 4,000 of them in this country—legitimate gun shows where we have legitimate background checks that are done within a 24-hour period. And that will never happen as long as we keep playing political games, and seeking the political advantage that some people think they get by talking about 1 day, 2 days, or 3 day waiting periods.

The key is to get an effective instant check system in place so we absolutely instantly can tell whether the purchaser of this weapon is somebody who is legitimately entitled to purchase the weapon.

Having said all of that, having made it very clear that we intend to have conferees on this matter and that we intend to put this matter to bed, hopefully before the August recess, a lot depends on cooperation from the other side.

As we know, we have lost a week and a half because of delays on the other side because they want their legislation considered on their terms, regardless of how important the appropriations bills are. We have had interference after interference on getting the work of the Senate done.

And as important as all of that is, I think it is important that the American people know that the juvenile justice bill is about a lot more than guns. That is a minuscule part of the bill. We are talking about prevention and enforcement and assistance to local and State governments.

S. 254, the Senate-passed bill, provides an infusion of funds to State and local authorities to combat juvenile crime.

S. 254 provides approximately $1.1 billion annually to fight juvenile crime and prevent juvenile delinquency.

We have $500 million for a juvenile accountability incentive block grant.

States can use this grant to implement graduated sentencing sanctions which intervene early with appropriate penalties, so that at the first signs of delinquent or antisocial behavior take firm steps to get these kids back on the right track. They can build detention facilities for juvenile offenders, test juvenile offenders for drugs upon arrest, and require juvenile offenders to complete school or vocational training, among other reforms.

S. 254 provides a 25-percent earmark of the juvenile accountability block grant for drug treatment, school counseling, and crime prevention. These are important, significant grants. They far supersede this almost feckless debate about guns.

The Hatch-Leahy amendment provides $50 million for the States for juvenile judges, public defenders, and probation officers to reduce the backlog of juvenile cases. That is important. The juvenile Brady provision, which prohibits juveniles who commit a violent crime or serious drug felony as a juvenile from ever being able to buy a gun thereafter, is something almost everybody agrees with. We had it in the bill to begin with. We didn't need those on the far left who hate guns and who want gun control to tell us what to do in these matters.

There is $75 million annually to help States upgrade juvenile felony records and provide school officials access to such juvenile felony records in appropriate circumstances. This may be the most important reform in the bill, because it gets these records to the police and prosecutors and judges who need the information to appropriately deal with repeat offenders.

There is $435 million annually to the States for programs to prevent kids from getting into crime. Some of these are specifically targeted towards gangs in school. This is far more important than all of this harping about guns.

There is $40 million to assess the effectiveness of youth crime and drug prevention efforts; a 3-year, $45 million demonstration project to provide alternative education to at-risk or problem juveniles; and an extension of the violent crime reduction trust fund through 2005, to ensure adequate funding for the administration of justice programs.

In S. 254, the Senate-passed bill takes action to empower parents, the entertainment industry, and the general public to limit the exposure of children to violence. Specifically, this bill includes important provisions for the enforcement of industry rating systems.

The Hatch-Brownback amendment—and I commend my distinguished colleague from Kansas for his leadership—to S. 254, which passed overwhelmingly, provides the entertainment industry with limited exemption from the antitrust laws. This provides the motion picture, recording, and video game industries the freedom to develop and enforce voluntary standards and enforcement mechanisms without fear of antitrust liability or government regulation. The Brownback-Hatch amendment allows the appropriate industries to enter into joint discussions, consideration, and agreement to ensure retail compliance with preexisting rating systems for both off-line and on-line content.

We have a provision regarding marketing violence to children. The Brownback-Hatch amendment to S. 254 directs the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission to jointly examine the marketing practices of the video game, music, and motion picture industries to determine the extent to which violent material is marketed to children. The FTC is directed to report their findings to Congress within 9 months of enactment. And while I am pleased that President Clinton belatedly endorsed this idea, I should note that the Senate passed this three weeks before the President said a word about it.

We have a National Institutes of Health study. The Brownback-Hatch amendment to S. 254 provides $2 million in funding to the National Institutes of Health to study the effects of violent entertainment on children. We know that is the cause of an awful lot of the problems.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I have listened carefully to the Senator's speech in support of the juvenile justice bill. The Senator makes such a compelling argument of how important this bill is, how we shouldn't waste any time to move forward.

I ask the Senator, if that is his feeling and the feeling shared by Members on his side of the aisle, why has the Republican leadership in the House refused to appoint conferees?

Mr. HATCH. I have assurance from the House leaders they will appoint conferees.

Mr. DURBIN. They announced they will not appoint conferees until after the Fourth of July.

Mr. HATCH. That is true. I know they have their hands full. I trust the

statement of the leaders. If they do it then, that will be fine. That is consistent with what we have done in the past. I don't have any problem with that.

Let me continue my remarks. The Hatch-Leahy amendment to S. 254, which passed overwhelmingly, encourages large Internet service providers to offer screening/filtering software to empower parents to limit access to material unsuitable for children. This amendment provides that within 12 months of enactment, large Internet service providers should provide the software either at no charge or at a fee not exceeding the cost to them. That is a very important part of this bill.

We have an antiviolence public service campaign in this bill. The Republican education amendment to S. 254 provides $25 million annually to the National Crime Prevention Council and community-based organizations for a national public service campaign to prevent violence.

We have a provision on Internet bombmaking. The Hatch-Feinstein amendment to S. 254 prohibits the teaching of bombmaking, including bombmaking instructions, on the Internet if there is reason to know the bomb will be used in violation of Federal law.

We also get tough on violent juveniles and other violent offenders. We ensure that violent juveniles will be held accountable. Among other reforms, S. 254, with Republican amendments, contains the following: Project Cuff. The Hatch-Craig amendment provides $50 million to hire additional Federal prosecutors to prosecute gun crimes in Federal court to take advantage of stiff Federal sentences.

We have full funding of the National Instant Check for background checks for firearm purposes. That is something that had to be done. We have not been concentrating on that as we should, because we keep playing games on guns instead of doing what should be done.

We have an extension of the prohibition against juvenile possession of a handgun in the Youth Handgun Safety Act to semiautomatic rifles.

The juvenile Brady provision, which I have already mentioned, prohibits firearm possession by juveniles who commit violent offenses.

We have a bipartisan provision that requires safety locks or secure gun storage devices to be sold with a handgun.

We have a minimum of 12 years in prison for those who discharge a firearm during the commission of a violent felony or drug trafficking crime.

We have a minimum of 15 years in prison for those who injure a person during the commission of a crime of violence or a drug trafficking crime.

We have a minimum of 3 years in prison for first-time offenders and a minimum of 5 years in prison for repeat offenders for those who distribute drugs to minors or sell drug in or near a school.

We have an increase in the maximum penalty for knowingly possessing, transporting, or transferring stolen firearms, to 15 years in prison.

We have an increase in the maximum penalty to 20 years for a juvenile who illegally brings a gun or ammunition to school with intent to carry or otherwise possess, discharge, or use the handgun or ammunition in the commission of a violent felony.

We have an increase in penalties for illegal purchase of a firearm.

We have an increase in penalty for committing crimes of violence while wearing body armor.

We have a safe-and-secure-schools provision.

These are very important. One would think that everything comes down to the Lautenberg amendment. That amendment didn't pass overwhelmingly. In fact, it didn't even have the support of a bare a majority in the Senate until the Vice President of the United States, as is his right, voted to break the tie.

SAFE AND SECURE SCHOOLS

S. 254, with Republican amendments, will promote safe and secure schools, free of undue disruption and violence, so that our teachers can teach and our children can learn. S. 254 includes the following:

Training for parents, teachers, and other interested members of the community for the identification of—and appropriate responses to—troubled and violent youth.

Innovative research-based delinquency and violence prevention and mentoring programs.

Assistance to state and local school districts for comprehensive school security assessments.

Assistance to state and local school districts to purchase school security equipment and technologies such as metal detectors, electronic locks, and surveillance cameras.

Collaborative efforts with community-based organizations (including faith-based organizations) and law-enforcement agencies to provide effective violence prevention and intervention programs.

Assistance to state and local school districts to establish and implement school uniform policies.

Assistnce to state and local school districts to hire school resource officers, including community police officers.

Incentives for States to detain juveniles found in possession of an illegal firearm for 24-hours to undergo evaluation.

Incentives for schools to make school discipline records available to all schools, whether private or public, when students transfer between schools.

Civil liability protection for teachers who discipline a violent student.

Resources to States and localities to create anonymous hotlines to report possible acts of violence.

I say in closing, I have been assured we will have conferees after we get back from this next recess. My goal, of course, if we can and if we get some cooperation from the other side on the floor, is to have that bill up before the August recess, so we can have this bill passed and hopefully signed by the President before school begins this year.

I want to see that happen. It isn't going to happen if we keep playing games on guns. There is no point kidding ourselves about it.

One side must not think they have a big advantage over the other on guns. We have to work in good faith to resolve these problems. And I believe we can. I have total confidence in my colleague, Senator LEAHY from Vermont, who has worked with me assiduously on this matter. He has played a significant role.

Senator BIDEN and Senator FEINSTEIN, also on the other side, have worked very hard to try to have this bill completed. I know my colleague from Vermont and I will work very hard to get this bill done in the best way we possibly can that will bring everybody together in both the House and Senate and hopefully get a bill signed by the President.

In any event, we intend to go forward. It is an important bill, probably in some respects the most important bill in this whole session of Congress, when one considers the needs of our nation's children. We need to address—as S. 254 does—ensuring safe schools, promoting ways to keep vile entertainment from our kids, preventing juvenile crime, and really addressing for the first time needed law enforcement with regard to violent juvenile crimes.

I think we have taken too much time on this. I know we have an important appropriations bill on the floor, so I yield the floor at this time.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I join the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, and my colleagues in urging the majority to appoint conferees and proceed to conference on the juvenile crime bill.

It has now been one month and four days since the Senate passed the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999, by an overwhelming margin of 73–25. It has been nearly two weeks since the House of Representatives passed its counterpart bill.

And yet, since that time, there has been no progress at all toward going to conference on these two bills. In fact, it appears that there are some on the other side of the aisle who deliberately want to forestall or even de-rail the conference that is necessary to pass this vitally-needed legislation.

When the House passed its counterpart bill, they did something that is very unusual: they did not take up the Senate bill, insert the text of their bill, and request a conference, as is routinely done. This is not the kind of thing that happens by accident. For a conference to take place, both Chambers of Congress must pass the same bill.

Because the House of Representatives did not do this, one of the two Chambers must take up the other one's bill, pass it, and ask for a conference. This presents numerous opportunities for procedural mischief and delay by those who would rather not see any bill pass than one containing modest gun safety provisions, such as the Senate bill.

Mr. President, I am very disturbed by this delay in taking the next step to pass this important legislation.

Our nation was rocked 2 months ago by the tragic shootings at Columbine High School in Colorado, coming as it did in the wake of earlier school shootings in Jonesboro, Arkansas; West Paducah, Kentucky; Springfield, Oregon; and elsewhere. We cannot tolerate or evade this shocking school violence. We should not let our children start a new school year without passing this important legislation to address youth violence.

The Senate bill is a wide, sweeping measure, which will help us to confront the problem of juvenile crime. It includes a number of provisions which I authored and which I have worked on for several years, including:

A ban on importing high capacity ammunition magazines;

A ban on juvenile possession of assault weapons and high capacity ammunition magazines;

A comprehensive package of measures to fight criminal gangs;

Limits on bombmaking information;

The James Guelff Body Armor Act, which contains reforms to take body armor out of the hands of criminals and put it into the hands of police; and

Crime prevention programs.

It also contains other modest reforms to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and children, including: Requiring the same background checks at gun shows which gun dealers have to preform; and requiring the sale of child safety locks with handguns.

The Senate bill also establishes a new $700 million juvenile justice block grant program for states and localities, representing a significant increase in federal aid to the states for juvenile crime control programs, including:

Additional law enforcement and juvenile court personnel;

Juvenile detention facilities; and

Prevention programs to keep juveniles out of trouble to begin with.

Our bill encourages increased accountability for juveniles, through the implementation of graduated sanctions to ensure that subsequent offenses are treated with increasing severity.

It reforms juvenile record systems, through improved record keeping and increased access to juvenile records by police, courts, and schools, so that a court or school dealing with a juvenile in California can know if he has committed violent offenses in Arizona; and extends federal sentences for juveniles who commit serious violent felonies.

Let us not delay further in enacting these important measures. I join my colleagues in urging the majority to proceed to conference and appoint conferees, so that we can enact this vital legislation.

I thank the Chair, and yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it has been 71 days—71 days —since the tragic shooting at Columbine High School. There are 69 days left before school children in Massachusetts and other states go back to school. It is time for Congress to finish the job we began last month and pass juvenile justice legislation. Communities across America are waiting for our answer.

We need to provide communities with the assistance they need to reduce youth violence.

We need to help parents struggling to raise their children from birth through adolescence.

We need to help teachers and school officials recognize the early warning signals and act before violence occurs.

We need to assist law enforcement officers in keeping guns away from children.

We need to close the gun show loophole.

We need to require the sale of safety locks with all firearms.

The Senate passed such legislation with overwhelming support last month. The House of Representatives passed its own version of this legislation earlier this month. It is time to appoint House and Senate conferees to write the final bill and send it to the President, so that effective legislation is in place as soon as possible.

Everyday we delay, this critical problem continues to fester. Children are under assault from violence and neglect—from the break-up of families—from the temptations of alcohol, tobacco, and drug abuse—from violence in the media. These are not new problems, but they have become increasingly serious problems, and Congress cannot look the other way and continue to ignore them.

We must support youth, parents, educators, law enforcement authorities, and communities. The public overwhelmingly supports more effective steps to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and juveniles. We cannot accept ''no'' for an answer from the National Rifle Association. It is long past time for Congress to face up to this challenge. The tragedy at Columbine High School is an urgent call to action to every member of Congress. Will we finally do what it takes to keep children safe, or will we continue to sleepwalk through this worsening crisis of gun violence in our schools and our society.

We have a national crisis, and common sense approaches are urgently needed. If we are serious about dealing with youth violence, the time to act is now. There is no reason why this Congress can not pass a comprehensive juvenile justice bill before the August recess. The citizens of this country deserve better than what Congress has given them so far.

The lack of action is appalling and inexcusable. We cannot continue to whistle past the graveyards of Littleton and the many other communities scarred by juvenile gun violence in recent years. Each new tragedy is a fresh indictment of our failure to act responsibly.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, all the amendments to this bill have now been filed. I, at this point, will consult with Senator LEAHY about how we proceed, but in all likelihood we should be able to finish this bill by mid to late afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 1119

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I wanted to address the body on several of the discussion points that were raised today regarding an amendment I filed. I inquire first of the President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is the McConnell amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Then I will not have to ask the pending business be set aside. We are still on that.

I wanted to address several of the issues my colleagues have raised, that the negotiations between Armenia and Azerbaijan that are taking place in the so-called Minsk Group are at a very delicate time period and the repeal of section 907, as addressed in the McConnell-Abraham amendment, would upset the delicate negotiations at this point in time.

Frankly, it is just not true that these negotiations are at a delicate point in time now and this amendment would do that. The present conflict has been going on since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and a cease-fire has been in effect since 1994. The U.S. Government is one of the peace group co-chairs, along with Russia and France, and they all—the U.S. Government, the Clinton administration—favor repeal or waiver of section 907.

The amendment I put forward prevents our Government from being an honest broker in the peace process. We have letters from Secretary Albright and the administration on this.

Russia is involved, and not in a helpful way. Their handiwork in retaining influences in the Caucasus is only slightly less obvious than their efforts to help out in Kosovo—in some situations where they were not helpful at all. Russian military troops are still based in Armenia and were providing military support and munitions supplies to Armenia during the war with Azerbaijan.

The argument in support of the status quo has nothing to do with the sensitivities of the ongoing peace talks. The last real peace initiative where there was a real push was in 1997, calling for Armenia's withdrawal from the occupied territories in exchange for normalization of trade with Azerbaijan. This was rejected by Armenia.

The continued status quo in Armenia's favor is nothing less than the Armenian Government's attempt to influence U.S. foreign policy and preserve an undue advantage. It really is that simple. Azerbaijan is the only country in the former Soviet Union that has unilateral sanctions from the United States. Again, we do not lift them; we just provide waiver authority for section 907.

So those arguments being raised by my colleagues are simply not accurate. Also, they talk about the issue of the blockade: Somehow Azerbaijan is blockading Armenia. I want to show a map on this point so people can get a look, again, at the region and what this so-called blockade is about.

Here is Azerbaijan. Here is Armenia. Here is the area in dispute. Armenia is occupying 20 percent of the landmass of Azerbaijan. The United Nations has condemned this action by Armenia. OSCE, the group much involved in negotiation, condemns the action by Armenia.

You can see Armenia has outlets they can use through Iran or through Georgia, which is up here. So there is not a blockade on Armenia. What the so-called blockade is, and has been for a long period of time, is a mutual border closing caused by Armenia's continued illegal occupation of Azerbaijan.

I hope my colleagues will look at the map, look at the situation, read the U.N. resolutions, the OSCE resolutions about Armenia occupying 20 percent of Azerbaijan, and quickly and clearly conclude that this blockade is really a mutual border closing caused by Armenia and its illegal occupation of Azerbaijan. That, plus the difficulties caused by Armenia's mining of some of the overland routes through the buffer zone surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh, are probably some of the most serious logistical obstacles in the blockade.

So I point these out to my colleagues, those who are saying this is a sensitive time. We had a cease-fire for 5 years. It is not that the government is involved in trying to negotiate a true peace and wants 907 to be repealed so the United States can be an honest broker in this peace process and not one-sided on it. The Clinton administration, and Bush administration prior to that, opposed section 907. And the blockade is really not a blockade at all.

Mr. President, I ask at this time to set aside the pending amendment, Senator MCCONNELL's amendment, so I can call up an amendment.

I will call up amendment No. 1170. This is an amendment I talked about previously on Sudan. I would like to have that considered. I ask unanimous consent that we set aside the pending amendment so I can call up amendment No. 1170.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1170

(Purpose: To make available international disaster assistance, humanitarian assistance, and development assistance in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 1170.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ___. INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds made available under chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international disaster assistance) for fiscal year 2000, up to $4,000,000 should be made available for rehabilitation and economic recovery in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan. Such funds are to be used to improve economic governance, primary education, agriculture, and other locally-determined priorities. Such funds are to be programmed and implemented jointly by the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture, and may be utilized for activities which can be implemented for a period of up to two years.

SEC. ___. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR SUDANESE INDIGENOUS GROUPS.

The President, acting through the appropriate Federal agencies, is authorized to provide humanitarian assistance, including food, directly to the National Democratic Alliance participants and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement operating outside of the Operation Lifeline Sudan structure.

SEC. ___. DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.

(a) INCREASE IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—The President, acting through the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to increase substantially the amount of development assistance for capacity building, democracy promotion, civil administration, judiciary, and infrastructure support in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORT.—The President shall submit a report on a quarterly basis to the Congress on progress made in carrying out subsection (a).

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, this is an amendment we have been negotiating back and forth. I indicated briefly that we wanted to bring it up if we could not get a negotiated agreement. We are proceeding later on in the day. I know the people in charge of the bill want to move this amendment, so I called this amendment up to get it as the pending business so people can discuss it.

I have discussed this earlier. I do not seek to take up an extraordinary amount of time to discuss it. It would make available international disaster assistance, humanitarian assistance, and development assistance in the opposition-controlled areas of the Sudan.

I recently led a congressional delegation to the region. The government in Khartoum is a terrorist regime. That is according to the U.S. State Department. They have in their country the worst humanitarian situation in the world. That is according to Brian Atwood, head of USAID—the worst in the world. There were nearly 2 million people killed in 10 years, over 4 million internally displaced. This is through forced, manmade famine and starvation. This is by bombing, indiscriminate civilian bombing by the government in Khartoum.

It is exporting terrorism. It has housed Osama bin Laden until 1997. They house a number of terrorist groups in Khartoum. They are supporting terrorism and spreading throughout the region a sort of militant terrorism—in the Congo, Eritrea, Uganda, and other places. They seem to seek to be the African edge of the militant terrorism. The people attempting to kill President Mubarak in Egypt were given housing and aid and abetting in Sudan by this government. This is a bad regime. This amendment simply seeks to provide humanitarian assistance to those opposition-controlled areas and the opposition groups.

Here, again, is the list of items the government in Khartoum, the Sudan Government, is doing today. I have talked about these. Most recently, last year, 100,000 people, according to the U.S. Committee on Refugees, were killed by a man-induced famine, induced by the Khartoum government. They would not let our disaster relief planes fly into the region. They said no.

It is time we allowed aid to go to the resistance groups that are fighting just for dignity and for their own lives. This is a simple amendment. It is a modification to the one we previously called up. I do not know of any objection to this, and as soon as the manager of the amendment can perhaps come to the floor, I would simply like to ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment and have us vote on it because I think it is a worthwhile amendment. While that is being taken care of, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HELMS be added as a cosponsor to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I have discussed this with Senator FRIST, who chairs the subcommittee, who also has traveled to Sudan and knows of the situation taking place in that region. That is why this is an important issue for us to take up now. This is the appropriate vehicle. It is

providing aid to the southern resistance movement. Actually now it is not just southern, it is all over the country.

We can move the vote to a later point, but I ask for the yeas and nays on amendment No. 1170.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second at this time.

Mr. BROWNBACK. At the appropriate time, when we can get a sufficient second, I will be asking for the yeas and nays on this amendment so we can have a vote on this amendment.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. 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. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. THOMAS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1305 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. THOMAS. 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.

Mr. BINGAMAN. 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. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Brownback amendment No. 1170.

AMENDMENT NO. 1165

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding assistance provided to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside and that amendment No. 1165 be called up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. CLELAND, proposes an amendment numbered 1165.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA.

It is the sense of the Senate that nothing in this Act, or Senate Report No. 106–81, relating to assistance provided to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the Foreign Military Financing Program, should be interpreted as expressing the will of the Senate to accelerate membership of those nations into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this sense-of-the-Senate amendment is being offered on behalf of myself, Senator ROBERTS, Senator BOB SMITH, and Senator MAX CLELAND as well.

It is, I believe, an important amendment. It is also an amendment that will be accepted. That is my expectation. We don't have a final decision on that, but we hope that is the result.

This year's foreign operations appropriations bill designates $20 million in foreign military financing grant assistance to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, the Baltic States. I am not concerned about the fact that we are designating funds for those states. I am concerned about the provision because of the intent that appears to lie behind the funding.

Let me quote from the committee report. It says in the committee report:

The assistance accelerates Baltic states integration into NATO and supports these democracies as they enhance military capabilities and adopt NATO standards.

This amendment I have offered, with the help of the three other Senators I mentioned, would state that nothing in this bill concerning the foreign military financing intended to support the legitimate security needs of the Baltic States should be interpreted as also expressing the intent of the Senate to accelerate the membership of those countries into NATO.

We recently observed the 50th anniversary of NATO, welcomed three new members into the alliance: the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary. I voted for the admission of those three into the alliance on this historic occasion. No other nations were admitted to the alliance, nor was there a commitment made to extend an invitation to any particular nation to join in the future.

The language contained in the Senate report accompanying the bill suggests that the military financing authorized in the bill would be for the express purpose of accelerating the integration of those states into NATO. I believe that language is premature. I believe it is ill-advised at this time. Let me try to give a few indications as to why.

Many of my colleagues share the concern, which we have heard on the floor, about the future of the NATO alliance. We, obviously, value NATO and its contributions to peace. We fervently intend that it continue to be a force for peace in the future.

Recent events within the alliance have raised some concern. Despite the recent military victory in Kosovo, there is some evidence that the alliance may not be totally healthy at this stage.

While the bombing campaign continued in Yugoslavia, for example, there were divisions among NATO members. Those were worked through.

In addition, there is a major debate now underway concerning the equity of the burdens that different members of NATO have, both financial burdens and military burdens.

I am not suggesting we debate the future of NATO today, although I do believe the Senate should soon review the Strategic Concept that is being proposed to guide future NATO potential military involvements.

I am suggesting, however, that legislative provisions, such as the one I have called attention to today in this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, could prematurely complicate the very difficult problems the alliance is facing. I don't believe anybody here would deny that a debate concerning the membership of the Baltic nations in NATO is likely to be a spirited one. This bill is not the appropriate venue for that debate to take place.

I have reviewed, by the way, the Baltic charter that was signed in January 1998 to determine if I missed something with respect to the membership of the Baltic nations in NATO. There are many affirming words in the charter about cooperation between NATO and the Baltic nations, and there are several encouraging references with respect to possible future membership of those countries in the alliance. But there are no words that commit NATO to offering membership or to accelerating their integration of those nations into the alliance.

The provision in the bill that would provide military assistance to the Baltic nations for that specific purpose is not grounded in a policy that I believe we should embrace at this time.

The sense-of-the-Senate amendment I offer would permit foreign military financing to meet the security needs of the Baltic nations, but it does not commit the Senate, as a result of that assistance, to commit itself to approval or acceleration of the membership of the Baltic nations into NATO.

I hope my colleagues will support the amendment. I believe it is in our national interest and in the security interests of Europe as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the bill before us includes increased Foreign Military Financing funding to help Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania improve their militaries. The Baltic countries need to improve their military posture whether or not they join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). But the fact is that they do aspire to join NATO, and all three countries will be working to meet goals in NATO's Membership Action Plans for each country.

My colleagues Senators BINGAMAN, ROBERTS, BOB SMITH, and CLELAND have offered an amendment that says that nothing in the bill ''should be interpreted as expressing the will of the Senate to accelerate membership of those nations into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).'' However, the Senate can do nothing to invite the Baltic countries or any other

aspiring country to join NATO. Only NATO can invite countries to join. When they are ready to join, and if they are invited to join, the Senate would have to vote to approve amending the NATO treaty to accept further NATO expansion.

The Foreign Military Financing funding can serve to accelerate the Baltic countries' efforts to meet NATO criteria, but the decision to invite them to join NATO remains a political one that will be made by NATO's nineteen member states. The Baltic states could do nothing to become NATO ready and be invited—or they could become modern-day Spartas and still not be asked to join NATO; that decision is up to NATO.

The Senate has already expressed its opinion in Section 2703 of the European Security Act of 1998 that was included in last year's Omnibus Appropriations bill that ''It is the sense of Congress that Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria . . . (C) upon complete satisfaction of all relevant criteria should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible date.'' In other words, the Senate and House of Representatives have already said that when the Baltic countries are ready to join NATO, they should be invited to join.

Thus I fail to see the usefulness of the amendment offered by my colleagues today. I particularly regret that the amendment has singled out Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia when in fact there are many NATO aspirants, including Romania, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Slovakia, Albania, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The Baltic countries have made enormous strides in transforming themselves into free market democracies. They have embraced civilian control of their militaries, have participated in international peacekeeping, and have demonstrated their ability to operate with the military forces of NATO countries under NATO standards, spending precious resources to do so. I believe we must follow through and do all we can to convince our NATO allies that the Baltic states should be invited.

The United States' position on further expansion is that NATO should have an open door policy and that geography should be no barrier to membership. Russia need not feel threatened by the NATO membership of the three tiny Baltic states—they can do nothing to threaten the enormous and powerful Russian Federation. And right now Russia has no hostile intent toward them. But should Russia turn away from democracy, and if an expansionist autocrat were to come to power once again, NATO membership for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia would make a powerful statement that the United States and Europe will never again accept buffer-state subjugation of the Baltic states.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am greatly dismayed by and strongly opposed to the amendment introduced by Senator BINGAMAN that seeks to express the Sense of the Senate that the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania should not receive accelerated consideration for membership in NATO. This amendment most assuredly does not reflect the views of this Senator, and I am certain that of many more of my colleagues.

I fail to comprehend the purpose in singling-out these independent nations in this manner. It appears to this Senator, after reviewing both the Foreign Appropriations bill and accompanying report, that there is nothing contained in either document that should provoke the offering of this amendment.

It is my firm belief that the NATO alliance can benefit from the inclusion of new Central and East European nations, including the three Baltic states. The Baltic peoples have asked for and deserve protection from foreign invasion, and are willing to join the NATO security alliance to protect other European nations in need of help.

Future NATO membership for Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania is essential to their safety and prosperity. Security concerns will take precedence over continued democratic and economic reforms if the Baltics continue to exist, unprotected, in the shadow of an increasingly nationalistic Russia.

The United States should and must be vigilant in our efforts to extend NATO's reach to all democratic nations in Europe who cannot protect themselves. If we leave these nations exposed to the risk of foreign invasion and influence, the gains made in expanding democracy and freedom around the world will be vulnerable to erosion. The United States must continue to set an example for the world as a promoter and protector of democratic freedom. As victors in the Cold War, we have never had a greater opportunity than this to show democracy's enemies that we have the courage and the will to stand firm against them. NATO expansion is of vital importance to the future of democracy.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico can only have a negative effect on the United States's efforts to expand and protect democratic development in Central and Eastern Europe. To punitively single-out these three nations as they strive to protect their right to independence and freedom, following decades of Soviet domination, is neither constructive, nor in the interests of the United States. It is my sincere hope that this language will not be included in the final Foreign Operations Appropriations bill passed by Congress for Fiscal Year 2000.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, is there an amendment pending now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. LEAHY. Which amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 1165, submitted by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside temporarily so that I may introduce this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1179

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 1179.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SELF-DETERMINATION IN EAST TIMOR

SEC. . (a) The President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury (acting through United States executive directors to international financial institutions) should immediately intensify their efforts to prevail upon the Indonesian Government and military to—

(1) disarm and disband anti-independence militias in East timor;

(2) grant full access to East Timor by international human rights monitors, humanitarian organizations, and the press;

(3) allow Timorese who have been living in exile to return to East Timor to campaign for and participate in the ballot; and

(4) release all political prisoners.

(b) The President shall submit a report to Congress not later than 15 days after passage of this Act, containing a description of the Administration's efforts and his assessment of efforts made by the Indonesian Government and military to fulfill the steps described in paragraph (a).

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the United States executive directors to international financial institutions to take into account the extent of efforts made by the Indonesian Government and military to fulfill the steps described in paragraph (a), in determining their vote on any loan or financial assistance to Indonesia.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to express strong support for a peaceful process of self-determination in East Timor.

The Indonesian Government has a historic opportunity to resolve a conflict that has been the cause of suffering and instability for 23 years.

It has made a commitment to vote on August 21st on East Timor's future, and has recognized its responsibility to ensure that the vote is free and fair.

On May 5, when I introduced a similar resolution, I remarked on Indonesia's accomplishments in the past year: President Suharto relinquished power; the Indonesian Government endorsed a vote on autonomy; and the United Nations, Portugal and Indonesia signed agreed on the procedures for that vote.

There has been more progress in the past month. Democratic elections have

been held, the first members of an international observer mission and police force arrived in East Timor, and Nobel laureate Jose Romos Horta was invited to return to Jakarta for the first time in 24 years.

A year ago few people would have predicted that a settlement of East Timor's future would be in sight. However, there is deep concern that August 21st is quickly approaching, and the violence in East Timor will make a free and fair vote impossible.

In fact, the vote, initially scheduled for August 8th, was postponed by the United Nations until August 21st because of the violence.

Hundreds of civilians have been killed, injured, or disappeared in ongoing violence by anti-independence militias armed by members of the Indonesian military who want to sabotage the vote.

Human rights monitors and humanitarian organizations continue to face problems gaining access to the island, and members of the press have been threatened.

This amendment calls on the administration to immediately intensify its efforts to prevail upon the Indonesian Government to disarm and disband the anti-independence militias, grant full access to humanitarian organizations, and allow Timorese who have been living in exile to return home.

It directs the United State executive directors to international financial institutions to use their influence to encourage the Indonesian Government and military to create a stable and secure environment for the vote.

We should use all the resources at our disposal to convince the Indonesians to stop the violence. This is not only their responsibility, it is in their interests. If the Indonesian military succeeds in sabotaging the vote, Indonesia will face international condemnation.

On June 11th, I and other Members of Congress wrote to World Bank President James Wolfensohn about the need for the World Bank to use its leverage with the Indonesian Government.

Mr. President, the world community has recognized the urgency of this situation. An international monitoring and police presence throughout East Timor is critical to creating a secure environment.

The administration is already helping to pay the costs of the U.N. monitors and police, and they have made some progress in stemming the violence.

But far more needs to be done. It is time for the Indonesian Government and military to do their part—to act decisively to ensure that a free and fair vote can occur.

This amendment reinforces what others have said and what the Indonesian Government has already committed to do. It should be unanimously supported.

Mr. President, yesterday more than 100 anti-independence militiamen surrounded a newly opened United Nation's office in the East Timorese town of Maliana. Hurling rocks, the mob injured a diplomat from South Africa and at least a dozen Timorese who sought refuge inside the office. The U.N. building also sustained considerable damage.

In recent months I have spoken out about the escalating violence in East Timor on numerous occasions. I am offering an amendment today about the situation there.

The Indonesian Government and military have pledged to establish a safe and secure environment prior to the August 21st ballot on East Timor's political status. This alarming incident is a clear example that the Indonesian Government and military are not living up to their obligations. It is a clear example that their failure to act is having and will continue to have international consequences.

This latest attack suggests that despite the May 5th tripartite agreement, the presence of an international observer mission and police force and recent negotiations between the opposing factions about how to stem the violence, the situation is continuing to deteriorate. It could jeopardize the entire peace process.

The East Timorese have endured over 20 years of violence and repression. The international community has committed its resources to helping ensure that a free and fair ballot can be conducted. The United Nations has firmly stated that it has a job to do in East Timor and it will not be chased off by intimidation and harassment.

Mr. President, it is my hope that this violent attack will sound the alarm to the Indonesian government and military that they have an historic opportunity to finally establish peace in East Timor and that they must act immediately or it will be lost.

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.

Mr. LEAHY. 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I will soon send two amendments to the desk, one by the occupant of the chair, Senator VOINOVICH, related to designation of Serbia as a terrorist state, and the other by Senator BIDEN, both of which have been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1180 AND 1181

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes amendments numbered 1180 and 1181.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1180

To SEC. 525.—Designation of Serbia as a Terrorist State add:

(C) This section would become null and void should the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (other than Montenegro and Kosova) complete a democratic reform process that brings about a newly elected government that respects the rights of ethnic minorities, is committed to the rule of law and respects the sovereignty of its neighbor states.

AMENDMENT NO. 1181

(Purpose: To allocate funds for the Iraq Foundation)

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. . ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR THE IRAQ FOUNDATION.

Of the funds made available by this Act for activities of Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraqi Liberation Act (Public Law 105–338). $250,000 shall be made available for the Iraq Foundation.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 1180 and 1181) were agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. 1179

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, are we now back on the Leahy amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). That is correct.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to join my distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, to offer this amendment to encourage a peaceful process of self-determination in East Timor. This amendment closely mirrors what he and I and several other Senators expressed in Senate Resolution 96, and in a similar amendment to the State Department authorization bill. We are offering this amendment today to again highlight the significance of the process underway in East Timor that will once and for all determine its political status.

I want to commend the members of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for including language relating to East Timor in the committee report accompanying this bill. I believe it is important that the Senate go on record regarding its support for the forthcoming ballot and in condemnation of the violence surrounding this historic vote.

As we all know, Indonesian President Habibie announced on January 27 that the Government of Indonesia was finally willing to seek to learn and respect the wishes of the people in that territory. On May 5, the Governments of Indonesia and Portugal signed an

agreement to hold a United Nations-supervised ''consultation'' on August 8 to determine East Timor's future political status. This ballot has since been postponed to an as yet undetermined date in late August.

Despite the positive step forward that the ballot represents, excitement and tension over the possibility of gaining independence have in recent months led to a gross deterioration of the security situation. Militias, comprised of individuals determined to intimidate the East Timorese people into support for continued integration with Indonesia and widely believed to be supported by the Indonesian military, are responsible for a sharp increase in violence.

Just this week, members of a pro-Jakarta civilian militia attacked a United Nations regional headquarters in the Maliana township in East Timor. Several people, including a U.N. election officer, were wounded. This is latest in a string of violent incidents that have been linked to pro-Jakarta militias. Mr. President, this kind of violence and intimidation cannot be tolerated, especially at this crucial time.

In the May 5 agreement, the Government of Indonesia agreed to take responsibility for ensuring that the ballot is carried out in a fair and peaceful way. Unfortunately, it is unclear that they are implementing this aspect of the agreement. Quite the opposite. Whether Indonesian troops have actually participated in some of these incidents or not, the authorities certainly most accept the blame for allowing, and in some cases encouraging, the bloody tactics of the pro-integration militias. The continuation of this violence is a threat to the very sanctity and legitimacy of the process that is underway. Thus, the Leahy-Feingold amendment specifically calls on Jakarta to do all it can to seek a peaceful process and a fair resolution to the situation in East Timor.

Mr. President, I believe the United States has a responsibility—an obligation—to put as much pressure as possible on the Indonesian government to help encourage an environment conducive to a free, fair, peaceful ballot process for the people of East Timor. I am pleased that we have taken a leadership role in offering technical, financial, and diplomatic support to the recently authorized U.N. Assistance Mission in East Timor, known as UNAMET.

Mr. President, it is not in our power to guarantee the free, fair exercise of the rights of the people of East Timor to determine their future. It is, however, in our interest to do all that we can to work with the United Nations, other concerned countries, the government of Indonesia and the people of East Timor to create an opportunity for a successful ballot process. We cannot forget that the Timorese have been living with violence and oppression for more than 23 years. These many years have not dulled the desire of the East Timorese for freedom, or quieted their demands to have a role in the determination of East Timor's status.

We have to do all we can to support an environment that can produce a fair ballot in East Timor. Now. And throughout the rest of this process.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	McConnell
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moynihan
Bayh	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Murray
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grams	Reed
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hatch	Roth
Bunning	Helms	Santorum
Burns	Hollings	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchinson	Schumer
Campbell	Hutchison	Sessions
Chafee	Inhofe	Shelby
Cleland	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Collins	Johnson	Snowe
Conrad	Kennedy	Specter
Coverdell	Kerrey	Stevens
Craig	Kerry	Thomas
Crapo	Kohl	Thompson
Daschle	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Edwards	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—2

Mack	McCain

The amendment (No. 1179) was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FEINGOLD. 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.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1118

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in very strong opposition to the amendment offered to this legislation by my colleague from Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK. I am supportive of the amendment offered by the chairman of the subcommittee to the Brownback amendment, the second-degree amendment. But I want to address the Brownback amendment for just a few minutes here. In the course of doing that, I will underscore why I am supportive of the chairman's amendment and why I oppose the Brownback amendment.

The Brownback amendment is similar to legislation that was considered by the Foreign Relations Committee in May. That bill was reported out on a voice vote, but six members of the committee—six members—joined in submitting minority views in opposition to several of its major provisions. It had been my expectation that if this issue were to come up, it would come up in the course of calling up that bill, which is on the calendar, has been reported out of committee. That is the normal way one would expect to deal with substantive legislation.

What we are confronted with here is an effort to attach this amendment to an appropriations bill. Of course, we all know the problems that are connected with doing that. It slows down the appropriations process. You often engage in major issues of substantive content, which really ought to involve the substantive committees, and, instead, it is shifted into the appropriations context. One would have to be naive not to appreciate that it is done on occasion, but I don't think it is a good idea.

I must say, my view here on this matter is, in part, influenced by that. In other words, it is not as though the bill that came out of committee, which we considered and debated, on which we had a vote and on which some of us were in the minority, the bill went out, and it has been placed on the calendar. It is not as if that bill is before us—substantive legislation. Instead, what we have now is an amendment that takes most of the content of that bill and seeks to add it as an amendment to the appropriations bill.

This isn't an amendment that deals with numbers and figures. It is not, in effect, an amendment that falls clearly within the bailiwick of the appropriators. This is an amendment that really deals with a very important substantive issue of national policy. Senator BROWNBACK proposes to change it, to take out of the law a provision that is now in the law. I think it is very important to understand that. In other words, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas would make a major alteration in existing law, and it would seek to do it, as I have indicated, in the context of considering the appropriations legislation.

I can remember a time in this body where efforts to do that alone were reason enough to oppose an amendment. It was not too long ago. In other words,

efforts to really put in the appropriations context major changes in substantive law would be met with the contention that this should be dealt with by the substantive committee and ought not to be intruded into the appropriations process, that we should not ''legislate on an appropriations bill.'' How many times have we heard that phrase? Particularly, it seems to me when the legislation is on the calendar, it is available at an appropriate time to be considered by this body, in the proper context, where we could have the major debate, which I think this provision requires with respect to the substance of U.S. policy.

Now, one of the things this proposed amendment does, which represents a major shift in policy, is the impact it would have on section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which addresses the question of government-to-government aid to Azerbaijan, so long as they maintain a blockade on Armenia. Section 907 precludes such aid.

This amendment, in effect, would remove that provision in the law. To the credit of the chairman of the committee, he has offered an amendment that would knock out that provision. If that were to prevail, it would significantly reduce my concerns about this amendment, although I have some other concerns, not of the same magnitude as this one.

Let me address a couple of questions here. Section 907, in my judgment, made sense when it was enacted, and it continues to make sense today. To waive it in the absence of any progress toward a lifting of the blockade would reward the Government of Azerbaijan for its intransigence and remove a major incentive for good-faith negotiations from one side in the conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia.

For nearly a decade, the Government of Azerbaijan has prevented the transport of food, fuel, medicine—let me repeat that—food, fuel, medicine, and other vital commodities to Armenia and to Nagorno-Karabakh, causing immense human suffering. During winters, much of the Armenian population has had to live without heat, electricity, or water. Schools and hospitals have been unable to function, and most Armenian industries have been forced to close down, crippling the economy and producing widespread unemployment and poverty.

Think of this. Azerbaijan is imposing a blockade on Armenia —total: no food, no fuel, no medicines. The blockade has been particularly devastating because a similar restriction is imposed by Turkey on traffic to Armenia and because of the civil conflict that makes transport through Georgia difficult. Since Armenia is entirely landlocked, they are left with hardly any alternative. They have a small border with Iran; but, of course, that is the very outcome we do not want to encourage in terms of where they turn for supplies.

This law was written in an effort to move the countries toward negotiating a peaceful resolution of their disputes. All Azerbaijan must do to get section 907 lifted is—and I quote this under existing law—''take demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.''

Again, they must ''take demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.''

This is an entirely reasonable expectation, especially given the ostensible purpose of the amendment which the Senator from Kansas has offered, which is ''to promote trade and commerce and economic cooperation between the countries of the region.''

He wants to promote trade and commerce amongst the countries of the region, and yet Azerbaijan is maintaining this embargo, which precludes any such trade with Armenia.

The Government of Azerbaijan continues to thwart U.S. attempts to promote peaceful conflict resolution and regional economic integration. Although a cease-fire has been in effect in Nagorno-Karabakh since 1994, Azerbaijan has not moved to lift the economic blockade. It is also seeking to exclude Armenia from all East-West commercial corridors.

Let me be very clear what the existing law, section 907, limits or retains, because this is an effort to apply in a nuance way an incentive, or a subtle pressure, to try to move the parties in the region towards a peaceful resolution of their dispute.

We are not talking about commercial trade. Some people refer to this provision as an ''economic sanction.'' Let's examine that.

The provision of the existing law, section 907, prohibits direct U.S. Government aid to Azerbaijan as long as they maintain this blockade. The proposed amendment would lift that. So the aid could be given even though they maintain the blockade, which, as I have indicated, I think would be a terrible step, a very harmful, substantive policy decision.

We are not talking about commercial trade, which is usually where you debate economic sanctions. In fact, the United States has perfectly normal trade relationships with Azerbaijan. To the extent that U.S. companies may not be investing there, it is due to that country's economic and political instability, its corruption, and to the low price of oil—not due to a lack of U.S. taxpayer assistance.

In fact, under the existing law, Azerbaijan receives U.S. assistance. It gets $24 million in economic assistance, which will bring it to a total of over $100 million since 1994. Because section 907, as it is now written in the law, does not apply to the Trade and Development Agency, the Export-Import Bank, to OPIC, to humanitarian assistance, to the foreign and commercial services, to activities to support democracy, nonproliferation, and disarmament, or aid through nongovernmental organizations, all of those activities can take place now under existing 907.

So what 907 does in order to attempt to exercise a certain amount of influence in how matters progress in that area is restrict the direct government-to-government assistance. Assistance through aid through nongovernmental organizations is not touched. Even some government assistance, if it goes to support democracy, nonproliferation, and disarmament, can take place.

Mr. McCONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SARBANES. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. McCONNELL. The distinguished Senator from Maryland has just outlined the ways in which 907 has been modified in many respects since 1992 in order to further nudge Azerbaijan in the direction of getting this conflict settled.

The Senator also pointed out that nothing yet has happened, and to take away the last remaining carrot or stick, if you will, that would encourage the settlement of this dispute, the Senator is entirely correct, would be a very bad policy decision.

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator is absolutely right. This body has responded in the past. The argument was, well, if you just give some carrot, you would see some change in behavior.

When we first started out with 907, it was much more restrictive. Over the passage of time, these various exceptions have been put into the law. But we have retained a more limited number of restrictions. To move them now altogether—I mean the ball game is over with. Why should Azerbaijan be concerned to settle anything?

Some say, well this somehow is a sanction. What we are talking about here is whether U.S. direct foreign assistance will be made available. Foreign assistance is not an entitlement. I want to repeat that. Foreign assistance is not an entitlement.

I hope people aren't going to get up on the floor and say: Well, somehow there is some kind of entitlement and, therefore, Azerbaijan is entitled to get foreign assistance. The placing of conditions upon foreign aid is both reasonable and appropriate for policy as well as budgetary reasons. It is a standard procedure. Conditions should not be considered sanctions. They ensure that U.S. aid serves U.S. interests.

I doubt seriously, if Members would stop and really focus on it, that there would be any Member of this body who would suggest that we should give foreign aid regardless of the recipient's policies and actions; that somehow they have an entitlement claim to foreign assistance, and, therefore, there can be no conditions, or no restrictions placed on it, and regardless of what the recipient's policies and actions are, we need to provide that assistance.

Let me turn to Azerbaijan's performance in the peace process, because there is a peace process underway. Conceivably, if Armenia was blocking the

peace process and Azerbaijan was cooperating with it, one could come along and say: Well, we have to make some accommodation to Azerbaijan because they are now working with the peace process.

It is exactly the opposite. That peace process has been stalled since November when Azerbaijan, the very country that this amendment now seeks to free of any limitations on American foreign assistance, when Azerbaijan unilaterally rejected a compromise proposal put forward by the cochairs of the OSCE's so-called Minsk Group—Russia, France, and the United States. The OSCE has established a Minsk Group that is chaired by Russia, France, and the United States as cochairs, and they have been trying to develop a peace process to resolve this matter between Armenia, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Azerbaijan.

In November of 1998, the Minsk Group called for a common state of Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh. The so-called common state approach was accepted by Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh as the basis for negotiations among the parties in spite of the serious reservations which were held by Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

This is a proposal that the Minsk Group put to the parties in order to advance the peace process. Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, with concerns, nevertheless, accepted this development as a way of going forward with the direct negotiations.

Azerbaijan summarily rejected the peace plan, threatened to overturn the cease-fire, which has been in effect, and then complained about the delay in finding a resolution to the conflict, and recently—from reliable reports—Azerbaijan has provoked a series of armed incidents along the cease-fire line.

Furthermore, in addition to rejecting the peace plan, Azerbaijan objected to Armenia's proposals to foster regional cooperation through open borders and restoration of rail and road links in the Caucasus. Armenia's proposal was set out at the Transport Corridor Europe Caucasus and Asia Conference held in Azerbaijan in September of 1998, but Azerbaijan refused to recognize any of these rights or obligations insofar as they applied to Armenia.

I want to underscore not only this recalcitrance but this absolute repudiation of the peace process, of this effort by the Minsk Group—headed by France, Russia, and the United States, the three cochairs—to try to develop a peace process to resolve this situation in the Caucasus. Azerbaijan has refused to participate.

Do not forget how the war started. After years of denying the people of Nagorno-Karabakh their constitutional rights and freedom, the government of Azerbaijan undertook a massive military offensive against Nagorno-Karabakh in the winter of 1993 to 1994. Although Azerbaijan launched the attacks, they encountered a better organized defense and were forced to negotiate a cease-fire, which has been in effect since May of 1994. As I indicated earlier, they threatened to overturn that cease-fire recently when they rejected the proposal of the Minsk Group.

In the face of this behavior, it is now proposed by an amendment to lift the remaining few limitations on direct American foreign assistance to Azerbaijan. Obviously, Azerbaijan wants a completely normal relationship with the United States, but in a ''prod'' for them to rectify this situation and to give us a more stable, peaceful environment, that remains one of the prods we ought not give away.

The waiving of section 907 of the Freedom Support Act would reward the party that has been intransigent in peace negotiations and has actually thwarted legitimate aspirations for democracy and justice in the region.

I intend later to go into some detail with respect to the human rights practices in Azerbaijan, taken, of course, from the human rights report of the Department of State, the annual report that is made on human rights conditions in various countries around the world. I know there are others who want to speak, so I don't propose to do that right now. If we are seriously entertaining the prospect of changing this law, lifting the remaining limitations that are provided by section 907, obviously one of the things we must do is examine the human rights practices of the country that is going to be freed from these limitations.

Let me read one paragraph from the State Department report, in lieu of a more complete exposition of this situation, which is what I hope to do later. This will give some sense of the problem.

> Azerbaijan is a republic with a presidential form of government. Heydar Aliyev, who assumed presidential powers after the overthrow of his democratically elected predecessor in 1993, was reelected in October in a controversial election marred by numerous, serious irregularities, violations of the election law, and lack of transparency in the vote counting process at the district and national levels. President Aliyev and his supporters, many from his home region of Nakhchivan, continue to dominate the Government and the multiparty 125-member Parliament chosen in the flawed 1995 elections. The Constitution, adopted in a 1995 referendum, established a system of government based on a division of powers between a strong presidency, a legislature with the power to approve the budget and impeach the President, and a judiciary with limited independence. The judiciary does not function independently of the executive branch and is corrupt and inefficient.

Later the report goes on to detail numerous human rights abuses on the part of the police, the ministry of internal affairs, and the ministry of national security. As this debate progresses, I will seek to develop those points in order to make it clear that certainly the human rights record doesn't warrant eliminating the limitation. Certainly, the support of the peace process doesn't warrant what this amendment proposes to do. Certainly, the nature of the blockade which they have imposed, which goes to humanitarian goods and services as well as everything else, doesn't warrant lifting the amendment.

The amendment, obviously, raises very difficult questions. It represents a major departure in substance in terms of our policy. I know the chairman has an amendment which will knock out this provision as it affects section 907. I am very supportive of that. I hope that will carry.

In any event, I am very much opposed to the amendment. I am frank to say I don't think we should be dealing with this amendment on an appropriations bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

Mr. McCONNELL. I have listened carefully to the Senator's comments which quite accurately lay out the sequence of events since the war in the early 1990s. Can my friend from Maryland think of any incentive whatsoever that Azerbaijan might have to settle this conflict if we repeal section 907?

Mr. SARBANES. I think we will have eliminated the last prod that we have to try to get them to settle the war and enter into a more normal, peaceful trading and commercial relationship with Armenia.

It is an irony that this amendment, this Silk Road Act, is supposedly to encourage commerce and trade amongst the countries in the region but that it has a repeal of 907 for one of the countries that is imposing a blockade on such trade and commerce with its neighbor.

It makes absolutely no sense. It runs counter to the announced objective of the legislation and of the amendment. We have a situation where we have a cease-fire, we have a Minsk process in action. We have a proposal submitted by the three cochairs. Azerbaijan rejected it. An effort is being made to revisit that, to try to move that situation forward.

I think to come in with this amendment at this time is certainly not going to help the peace process.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask my friend from Maryland, is it not true one of the things that Azerbaijan wants more than anything is a normal relationship with the United States? If they can achieve that without negotiation, this Senator is very pessimistic about the possibility of ever settling this conflict.

I have had the opportunity to visit refugee camps in both of these countries. I must say to my friend from Maryland, I don't see any end to it. These people have been living in refugee camps now for 5 or 6 years. If this conflict isn't settled some time soon, with its sense of hopelessness and despair, we will have children being born, growing up, and reaching adulthood in these refugee camps with no hope of a normal life.

It seems to me, as the Senator from Maryland has indicated, and I agree

with him totally, we ought to be doing everything we can to encourage the end of this dispute—not to take steps that could well lead to an inevitable and lengthy process. Conceivably, this could never be settled. You could have these refugee camps there 10, 20 years from now, breeding hopelessness and terrorism and all the rest that we have seen coming out of refugee camps in other parts of the world.

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator is absolutely right. The really discouraging thing was that the Minsk people made the proposal. That is the United States, France, and Russia, speaking on behalf of the OSCE. And Azerbaijan rejected participating in that process. Had Azerbaijan accepted it and Armenia rejected it, I can imagine people would say, Azerbaijan is trying to make the peace process work, Armenia is blocking it, and we ought to go ahead and enter into this normal relationship with Azerbaijan. But that was not the case.

Second—I will detail it later—to some extent I am reluctant to detail the human rights performance, because one does not like to come on the floor of the Senate and go into a lengthy exposition of that issue. We want people to improve. When we do these human rights reports, we try to not, as it were, overload them. But now when you offer an amendment that is going to take out the last limitation we have on aid, it seems to me at a minimum it warrants a very careful examination of the human rights performance within Azerbaijan. I am frank to tell you I think, once we undertake to do that, most Members are going to have increasingly growing questions about the nature of this regime and about whether we should be trying now to repeal any limitations on providing assistance which could serve as a way to try to get a better performance.

I have gone on for some time. I see my colleague from Michigan has been on the floor waiting patiently. I will come back, obviously, and revisit this issue; particularly, if necessary, to get into this human rights discussion.

As you know, each year the State Department puts out a country report on human rights practices. This one is for 1998. This is in accordance with legislation enacted by the Congress. There is a lengthy section in here on Azerbaijan, which I think Members certainly ought to have in mind as they consider whether we should adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas which repeals section 907 of existing law. I want it to be very clearly understood, the amendment that has been offered makes a very significant change in existing law, and the second-degree amendment offered by the chairman of the committee would take out the provision that is most offensive in that regard, and that is the proposal of the Senator from Kansas to in effect give up an open waiver on section 907, thereby in effect providing for its repeal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I realize I have spoken on this a couple of times, but I have heard arguments put forward that I want to clarify my response to so it is in the RECORD.

No. 1 is that the administration, the U.S. administration, the U.S. Government, is part of the Minsk Group. It is part of the group trying to negotiate a peace between Azerbaijan and Armenia. The Clinton administration, they support my amendment. They supported it in committee this year. They supported it last year in the Congress. They think this is a good idea. This is the administration that is negotiating, part of the three outside members—France, Russia, and the United States—part of the overall Minsk Group, along with Azerbaijan and Armenia, that is negotiating this peace.

So if this is ill timed, maybe we ought to tell the administration that, because they support my amendment.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. BROWNBACK. If you will let me finish my statement. I have listened for a long period of time to the Senator from Maryland, so I want to just make sure this is clear.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNBACK. If I could just go ahead and finish my statement. You have had a good chance.

The Clinton administration supports my position on this. They think it would help the United States in being an evenhanded negotiator so we do not have a set of unilateral sanctions, sanctions on one of the parties. They think that is important. They have supported it. We have letters to that effect. I will submit those for the RECORD for all my colleagues.

Mr. President, we are not lifting the sanctions. We are providing the administration with the same national interest waiver, the same one that applies to all the former Soviet Union countries. It has in it requirements that if human rights abuses are taking place, we cannot provide aid from the United States. I noted in my statement I made here earlier, I think all these countries are having human rights issues being brought forward, including Armenia, including Azerbaijan. Those are things that should be taken into consideration. But we do not lift the human rights requirements. All we do in this amendment is to provide the administration with national interest waivers. We don't lift them. We provide the administration national interest waivers. They can leave every sanction in and put more on if they deem it wise and prudent and the right thing to do.

They seem to me to be in the right position to consider whether or not sanctions should be lifted, whether or not human rights violations are taking place at the hands of the Azeris, the hands of the Armenians. I think there are enough human rights abuses to go around in this region. I think most of the reports will cite that as well. I think the administration should have the authority to determine that and move this process forward.

I want to make sure it is clear to our colleagues. This is providing the administration the national interest waiver. It does not lift the sanctions. The administration can put those in place. The administration supports the position.

In that regard, I have a letter from the President stating support for the amendment. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 19, 1999.

Hon. SAM BROWNBACK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SAM: I congratulate you for your leadership in working to strengthen ties with all the countries of the Caucasus and Central Asia. The meeting you are hosting, in the context of the NATO Summit, will provide an important opportunity for dialogue among leaders from the region, Members of Congress, representatives of my Administration, and other American opinion leaders. Similarly, I share the goals reflected in your bill, the Silk Road Strategy Act, and will work with you to achieve them.

The United States has a clear stake in the success of the New Independent States of the Caucasus and Central Asia. These young countries have stated that they seek stability, democracy, and prosperity. We have a chance to contribute to their efforts if we stand with them. The United States must continue to play an active and balanced role in the Caucasus and Central Asia—supporting peace in Nagorno-Karabakh and Abkhazia; promoting democracy and market economics through our assistance programs, which should be free from unproductive restrictions; and improving the security environment through bilateral programs and support for NATO's Partnership for Peace.

Your strong leadership helps underscore the bipartisan nature of, and true national interest in, these issues. I look forward to continuing to work with you to achieve our common goals in this area.

Sincerely,

BILL.

Mr. BROWNBACK. People can look at that. As far as this being a sensitive time in the negotiations, I support peace in the region, but this battle, this fight between the sides, has been going on since 1992. We have had a ceasefire for the last 5 years. There has not been significant movement in the peace process or a significant proposal since 1997. If the administration thought it was such a sensitive time, I think they would be here saying don't offer this amendment rather than supporting my position.

So I hope my colleagues will look at all these issues and determine the administration is probably right. This is something we should do. We should put everybody on an equal footing so we can work with all the people in this region, and I think that would be an important thing to do.

With that, I will be happy to yield for a question from my colleague.

Mr. SARBANES. I listened to my colleague with interest. First of all, I find it intriguing he finds himself so supportive of the administration in this instance. Let me ask my colleague this question. Does he know of any administration that would not want to be given, by the Congress, a total waiver authority?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I don't know that I can answer that, but I know this administration would appreciate that. But it is not just that. They also say here the administration strongly supports passage of the Silk Road Strategy Act, which may be added to the bill as an amendment. They appreciate the committee's continued efforts to reduce restrictions in section 907 of the Freedom Support Act.

There is very specific and very clear support.

Mr. SARBANES. Absolutely. Because the Senator gives the administration a blank check. No administration is going to spurn that. Every administration, if you offer them a blank check, is going to take it. They would be fools not to. Obviously they are supportive. You are, in effect, giving them all the authority. The Congress made a judgment in this matter, and it has consistently held to that judgment over the years, and I don't think Congress should go back on that judgment.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Reclaiming my time, I note this is the administration that is negotiating peace in this region. They want peace as I want peace in this region. They are saying: Look, this is an appropriate thing to bring up at this particular time, and it will help us in moving forward to peace in the region. They are in a better position to judge that, with all due respect to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. President, my colleague from Michigan was kind enough to yield me time to speak. I appreciate that. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I enjoyed listening to this discussion. I spoke earlier on this same amendment and want to speak again.

I am a cosponsor with the Senator from Kentucky of the second-degree amendment which was offered earlier today to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

As many of my colleagues may know, contained within S. 579 is the waiver, which we have been discussing, of section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. Section 907 restricts some forms of U.S. assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until it takes demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. The Azerbaijan blockade has cut off transport of fuel, food, medicine, and other vital goods and commodities to these regions. This in turn has forced the United States to send ongoing emergency lifesaving assistance to Armenia and, more recently, Nagorno-Karabakh as well.

The present conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia has been the subject of an ongoing peace process. With the consent of the United States, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, their Minsk Group, as we have heard, has been assigned the responsibility of fashioning a peace proposal satisfactory to the conflicting parties.

Despite serious reservations, Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh have accepted the OSCE's recommendations. As the Senator from Maryland just pointed out, Azerbaijan has not. In fact, they have summarily rejected the compromise peace proposal. If Azerbaijan had accepted the compromise plan, cowritten by the United States, direct negotiations would already be underway, and this conflict may have well been on its way to being resolved.

If we vote today to abolish section 907, we, in effect, would reward Azerbaijan's rejection of the OSCE compromise peace proposal. We will have undermined what I believe and what I think a number of my colleagues who have already spoken believe to be a primary objective of that proposal, which is ending Azerbaijan's ongoing blockade.

The comments of both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Maryland have been right on point. It could not be more self-evident that if the one and only leverage we have in the peace process to bring an end to this blockade and to the hostile relationships is taken away, there will be no incentives whatsoever.

It would be, in my judgment, counterproductive in the extreme to create incentives for the intransigent party to stay the course, to remain intransigent. This, in my judgment, will not bring lasting peace to the region, and I question seriously the conclusion that apparently the administration has reached that somehow this administration, or any other, will be more effective as a negotiator if this changes.

There are plenty of countries that have an interest in this region that do not have a provision like section 907 in place. Yet they have been no more successful in influencing Azerbaijan. The Minsk proposal was rejected by Azerbaijan. I do not understand how, in effect, rewarding Azerbaijan for its resistance is going to change anything.

I want to comment on another point the Senator from Kansas made. He has mentioned several times today his provision, the Silk Road Act, includes a so-called national security waiver. He indicates that it does not, of course, eliminate the sanctions, it just simply allows the President to exercise the waiver which would remove those sanctions if, in the President's view, the circumstances allowed that. This provision, as the Senator from Maryland just said, would, in effect, give the President the power to repeal section 907 or to maintain it.

However, its practical effect would be to eliminate section 907. The administration is on record, and very clearly on record, in supporting the repeal of this principal provision of the law and has been a vocal supporter of the Silk Road bill itself, as the Senator from Kansas just indicated.

The notion we are not, in effect, repealing section 907, we are simply putting the President in a position to consider using a national security waiver to repeal it, may be technically true. But as a practical matter, if we act today to eliminate section 907 and replace it with a waiver language that is suggested, we would be eliminating the section 907 sanctions automatically, because I find it hard to believe the President, in light of his statements and his support, would retain section 907.

I reiterate to my colleagues the importance of our second-degree amendment. Irrespective of your views on the Silk Road Act, either substantively or, for that matter, as a part of the foreign operations appropriations bill, our amendment would be consistent with our policies in this region, and it would maintain existing law with respect to the Government of Azerbaijan.

I hope my colleagues will support Chairman MCCONNELL and myself and others who are supporting this very important amendment.

Also, I personally believe the treatment that has been received by the people of Armenia—and this is not the only time in this century that the people of Armenia have been victims of actions by military forces beyond their control—the treatment is simply unacceptable. I am not saying there are not arguments of sympathy toward all parties in this region, but the U.S. Government made the right step when we instituted section 907, that we expressed an appropriate level of sympathy, as well as support, and appropriately so, for the people of Armenia. It would be a tragic mistake for us today to reverse course and to set in motion what, in effect, would be a repeal of section 907. It will send the wrong message to the Azerbaijanis, and I believe just from a human rights point of view, it would send the wrong message with regard to our feelings toward the people of Armenia.

Actions such as that would not be evenhanded, but clearly it would be a decisive gesture on behalf of Azerbaijan. In my judgment, when one takes into account the entire historic scope of things, that is not an appropriate action for our country to take.

I urge colleagues to support our second-degree amendment, to then vote their conscience with regard to the Silk Road Act, both on substance as well as its inclusion in this legislation. As I indicated earlier, I support the efforts of the Senator from Kansas in virtually all other respects with regard to this effort and with regard to that legislation, except for this provision.

Today, on behalf of myself and the others who have joined on the second-

degree amendment, I hope we will have support. Let's not make this dramatic change in American foreign policy in this context. Let's send a message to the people of Azerbaijan that we hope they will take seriously the negotiation of the peace process and that America remains firm in its resolve to not continue or to open up these additional forms of aid until such time as the proposal we have already offered is favorably acted on.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point, please?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Certainly.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I bring to the Senator's attention a statement that was adopted on April 15 of this year by 23 political parties in Azerbaijan that are members of the movement for electoral reform and democratic elections. These are the major opposition parties in Azerbaijan. Listen to this:

> The existing Government of Azerbaijan, having usurped powers as a result of a plot in 1993, created an antidemocratic regime in the country, violated human rights and freedoms, performed brutal repressive policies against political parties and opposition forces, pursued and jailed hundreds of citizens for political reasons, falsified presidential elections, remained indifferent to the assassination of deputies of the people, brought social economic conditions of the population down to a deep precipice, illegally redirected credits from foreign countries for their own purposes, failed to achieve significant improvements in the oil industry, created conditions for the session of some already-signed oil contracts, misappropriated industrial enterprises and violated the labor rights of hundreds of thousands of citizens, substantially destroyed the industrial potential of the country, brought agriculture to a disastrous state, created conditions where a selected group of individuals accumulate state property in their hands but conceal it under the name of reforms, raise corruption and bribery to historically high levels and, thus, brought many sectors of the life of the country to a state of catastrophe.

Then they talk later—I am not going to quote it all—about the cruel pressure of the Government against the free and independent mass media, how citizens were illegally arrested for participating in election rallies and sentenced to jail terms.

Imagine the courage it took to make this statement. And now the Congress of the United States is going to come along and repeal section 907? What message does that send to these brave people who are challenging their own authoritarian government on its practices?

The Senator is absolutely right. It would send absolutely the wrong message; would it not?

Mr. ABRAHAM. It would.

I say to the Senator from Maryland, I obviously do not know, with respect to each and every one of those issues that was raised by opposition parties, the full story, but I also would suspect that very few of our colleagues know the full story or have examined that aspect of this debate.

It seems to me, in the absence of a fuller examination, it would really be a mistake for the Members of the Senate to vote to remove, effectively repeal section 907 unless they know more of the background that the Senator just discussed.

I know the Senator from Maryland plans to discuss some of the other issues today, but I urge colleagues who are not on the floor and maybe are not following this as closely to just take note of that list and other similar kinds of lists of concerns that have been raised and very serious charges that have been leveled against the government that we would now, in effect, set in motion a potential plan to support. It seems to me this is the kind of issue that requires far greater scrutiny by the Members of the Senate before we would take that action.

I appreciate the Senator from Maryland raising those issues at this time.

Mr. McCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. If I could pick right up on the comments made by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Michigan, we are talking about a major change in American foreign policy in this amendment. This is a very serious change in our policy toward that part of the world. It is not as if, as the Senator from Maryland has pointed out and as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out, the United States has no relationship with Azerbaijan.

The administration already, without the repeal of 907, can do Export-Import Bank loan guarantees and support. It can do OPIC insurance and support. It can do Trade Development Agency feasibility studies and support. It can do any activities sponsored by the U.S. Foreign Commercial Service. It can do election and democracy support. It can do Nunn-Lugar nonproliferation support. And last but not least, it can do humanitarian support, which includes food, medicine, and related relief.

In other words, 907 has basically been stripped down over the last few years so that all of those activities between our Government and Azerbaijan can take place. So there is not much left of 907.

But as the Senators from Maryland and Michigan have pointed out, what is left is significant because without it there is no real reason for Azerbaijan to pursue the much-needed peace with Armenia that the citizens of both countries richly deserve.

So I thank both Senator SARBANES and Senator ABRAHAM for their contributions to this important debate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I have noted in my opening statement, and I have noted later, the human rights issues that exist throughout the region. There is no doubt that they exist. I think the same standards should be applied to Azerbaijan as apply to the other countries in the region. And those do stay in place.

This is talk of a major shift in U.S. foreign policy. I, again, remind people that we are simply providing the President with waiver authority. If he determines that human rights abuses are such that any of the sanctions should not be lifted, they will not be lifted. The administration is given that authority. We do not lift those sanctions. The President maintains that.

I also note, in the human rights area—because this is an area of key concern, as it should be an area of key concern to everybody—we recently had a coffee for the Israeli Minister of Trade and Industry, Natan Sharansky. That name should be familiar to some Members. He is one of the leading human rights voices in the world. This is a person who understands the connection between the U.S. position and human rights problems.

He was here specifically to support the Silk Road Strategy Act of the bill. He said this:

> Look at the human rights situation and weigh this against the importance of the threat that is facing us. It is very important to engage and to continue to encourage a positive process and the way to do this is to strengthen the role we are playing in the region.

Strengthen the U.S. role played in the region. Sharansky is clearly a person who understands the importance of tying legislation to human rights. He is a clear beneficiary of that having been done in the past. This is one of the clearest voices in the world. That is not to deny that human rights abuses have occurred. But we are not lifting the standards of human rights. We are not saying that Azerbaijan has a lower standard than everybody else. We are saying everybody has the same standard. And we provide the President the national waiver authority. This does not shift U.S. policy if the President determines it is not in our national interest, which is the same standard we put to all countries.

I plead with my colleagues to look seriously at this because while we can get down here in the weeds of some particular issues, we are talking about a region of the world that the Iranians are aggressively playing in now. All these Silk Road countries that I am talking about, the Iranians are there. They are providing aid, they are providing hate, and they are trying to overturn these governments. They can say that the authors of the amendment are saying: OK, let's just pull this 907 provision out. The rest is fine.

Azerbaijan is a key part of this Eurasian connection of connecting this region together for democracy, for a growing competitive economy that can stand against the threat of the Iranians and the militant fundamentalists expanding in this region that is taking place now.

The notion that we have not looked at this enough—I bet we have had nearly 10 hearings in the Foreign Relations

Committee between this Congress and last Congress on this issue. It passed the Foreign Relations Committee last Congress and this Congress. We have looked at it and looked at it. I wish we studied most issues as much as we have studied this one. We have. This one has been around. People have looked at it. This 907 provision has been in place for a number of years and it has not helped Armenia.

My final point here is, I am seeking, by this, to help all the countries in this region and U.S. policy. I am seeking, by this, to help Armenia as well. I realize that the people that are in opposition on this would not see that as such. But has our past policy helped Armenia? Has that been of any help?

I talked with the Foreign Minister 3 or 4 months ago, and he talked about how terrible the situation was in Armenia. And I agree, it probably is. But that is suffering under the law we put in place. Let's try something that can lift the whole region up and build stakeholders who can say: We ought to cooperate and work together.

Let's try something that can work instead of this failed policy that is a unilateral sanction. Let's provide to the President the authority to be able to do that, to move that peace process forward. This is the time to do that. I hope we can get to a vote here quickly.

I inquire of my colleague from Kentucky, I know he would like to move this bill, it would seem to me that probably we have had sufficient time. If there is a chance to move forward and vote, I think we are probably getting to that point.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Kansas, we are going to try to process a lot of other amendments. But we have not been offered a time agreement on this yet.

I see my colleague from Maryland is on his feet. If he would like to——

Mr. SARBANES. I want to ask the Senator from Kansas a question, if he would yield for a question.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Yes. And then I would like to yield to Senator HUTCHISON of Texas.

Mr. SARBANES. Were any other countries encompassed within your Silk Road strategy that are imposing a blockade on their neighbors the way Azerbaijan is on Armenia?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. Who?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Armenia.

Mr. SARBANES. On whom?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Azerbaijan. I think the Senator and I talked about this earlier today. The Senator will agree that Armenia has taken about 20 percent of the territory of Azerbaijan. The U.N. has condemned that. And what effectively you have in place is a mutual battle line that has existed between those two. The U.N. has condemned this action and told Armenia: Let's hold this back.

Mr. SARBANES. The Minsk group is trying to resolve that issue. The war began because Azerbaijan moved into an aggressive mode. Does the Senator dispute that?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Would you dispute who is occupying whose territory?

Mr. SARBANES. Let's do it step by step. Does the Senator dispute that Azerbaijan began the war by moving into an aggressive mode?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I don't think that would necessarily be the case. I am not going to start to debate the origins of that war.

Mr. SARBANES. It becomes a highly relevant question, doesn't it?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I think the relevant question is how we move forward in this region of the world. That is the issue that we debate.

Mr. SARBANES. The argument the Senator made about trying to move forward was responded to by the committee in the past with the Exim exception, with the OPIC exception, with the encouraging democracy exception, all of the provisions that provide some aid. Now the Senator wants to lift any limitations altogether. I think any chance of getting this situation resolved will simply be gone.

I know the pressures that exist. The Silk Road strategy involves tremendous oil interests. We ought to put that out on the table, I guess. Someone ought to lay that out as an important consideration. But it ought not to result in overturning what has been an established policy in the way we are trying to do it today, particularly in a situation when, last fall, we thought we would be able to move this peace process. Had Azerbaijan participated in the peace process last fall, we would have been able to move forward. They refused to do so.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, if I could reclaim my time, my colleague from Texas is here and desires to address this overall issue. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

I appreciate Senator BROWNBACK giving me a little time to talk about this, because I think it is a very important issue. There are a number of American investments being made in Azerbaijan right now. There are a number of American jobs that will be dependent on our keeping a good relationship with Azerbaijan.

I have been able to visit Azerbaijan. I was there at the same time as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. He knows this issue very well.

I look at this a different way. I talked to the President of Azerbaijan while I was in his country and then when he visited our country to sign agreements with several American companies to do business in his country. It is of utmost concern to him that we are beginning to make investments in his country. He welcomes us. He wants to do business with us. Yet we have sanctions on his country because of internal conflicts.

This is not a policy that is evenhandedly put forward by our country. We do business with other countries where we don't agree with the way they are treating certain people within their own country. There are border disputes with other countries, but we don't put sanctions on them in order to impose our will.

I hope Senator BROWNBACK's amendment will pass, at least this part of the amendment, because I think it is important that we send a message to the President of Azerbaijan and to the people of Azerbaijan that we want to be partners with them, that it is an important relationship to this country, and that we should continue to be able to help them work out this internal problem. But I don't think imposing our will on them is the right thing to do.

Senator BROWNBACK is trying to give the President the ability to maneuver in the interest of the United States. I think it is a reasonable request. It is a good amendment. I hope that the Senate will support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, in light of the comments of the Senator from Texas, I want to reemphasize something I said earlier. Section 907 is not a sanction. There is no provision currently in place that prevents American companies from trading or doing commerce in Azerbaijan. The only thing section 907 limits is it doesn't allow foreign assistance direct from the U.S. Government to Azerbaijan unless Azerbaijan—listen to this —takes demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. So it is an absolute misrepresentation of the current situation to assert that this is a sanction. There are no trade sanctions. In fact, as the chairman of the subcommittee indicated, there are a number of Government programs that are operating in Azerbaijan.

The only thing not now permitted is direct foreign aid. There is not an entitlement to foreign aid. All we have said—I think, quite reasonably—is that you can't get any foreign aid unless you take demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia. That is what 907 provides.

Why should we give them foreign aid and allow them to continue the blockade? We want the blockade to cease.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator from Maryland makes a very good point. I visited these countries. American business is there. The American oil companies are there. I do not know why the American oil companies are so interested in the repeal of 907 because it is certainly not inhibiting their ability to do business in Azerbaijan or to drill in the Caspian Sea. Some of us have had an opportunity to see those offshore wells. I might say that the American

oil industry is doing a wonderful job, very environmentally sound drilling practices in the Caspian Sea. It is high time because the Russians committed a number of environmental atrocities both onshore and offshore in Azerbaijan during their decades there.

No American business I am aware of is being inhibited from doing business in Azerbaijan by what little remains of 907. I think the Senator from Maryland is correct in his interpretation of what remains of section 907.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, not to delay this extraordinarily, because I think we should move to a vote, we have had an extended debate. We have had extended hearings on this. It is time to go ahead and move forward to a vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. We do not yet have an agreement to move to a vote on this amendment. That may come later in the day. We do have a number of amendments we hope to be able to accept momentarily. So I can inform the Senate, I hope we are down to just a handful of remaining amendments that might require rollcall votes. Obviously, the Brownback amendment, as amended by the McConnell-Abraham amendment, is one that is going to require a rollcall vote. Before we get to that, we are going to dispose of a number of amendments by consent very shortly.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, if I could just reclaim my time, I want to correct one assertion that this is just about oil. I hope we would look at the people who live in this area of the world which is affected by this Silk Road Strategy Act. It is interrelated. It does all tie together to create this Eurasian corridor.

If you pull Azerbaijan out of it and you say, okay, we will work with everybody but not with them, the corridor and its work towards lifting all of their economies in their countries doesn't work, we are talking a total of nearly 72 million people in this region. If you look at a map of it, you need to work on this together. They have a lot of pressure on them from various areas.

You really need to have this all hooked in together. We need to replace 907 with a national interest waiver that the President can put, and then have a coherent U.S. policy so that we meet our interests in the region. It is clearly to have this engaged, not fall in the hands of the Iranians or back to the Russians, so we can build and grow with them and not force them to become militant fundamentalist countries.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I just want to join in expressing real reservations about the Brownback proposal that effectively would provide discretionary provisions to the President of the United States. Obviously, it has been represented by a number of those who have spoken on this issue that the U.S. does have interests in this particular part of the world. But it does seem to me, as someone who has followed this situation closely over a number of years, for the United States now to be in a position where we are seeing a significant alteration of the balance of power by taking unilateral action, rather than trying to add to a resolution of the dispute, I think, only makes it more complicated, more difficult to try to reach some real chance for peace.

I think in many different parts of the world, ultimately, the people who do have responsibility, authority, and power have to be willing to come to the negotiating table and be prepared to make tough and difficult decisions. To think that the United States, by somehow changing and altering its position in terms of effectively siding with one side in this, thinks that we can really advance the cause for peace in that area, I think, is shortsighted. I think it really misunderstands the region and the historical and significant political forces at play in that region.

All of us see there is a different opportunity in that part of the world currently. As we have seen the change in history in different parts of the world, whether in Northern Ireland, or perhaps even today in terms of the Middle East, or in other parts of the world, we have seen, with the change of circumstances by outside forces, progress made. But for the United States now to be in a position where it moves unilaterally in terms of its interests, I don't feel it really advances the cause of peace. There are those who have advanced different options about moving this whole political process forward, who can advance the country's interest in that part of the world in a positive and constructive way. But I fail to see how this change will advance that interest. I don't believe it does.

I strongly support the position my friend and colleague, Senator SARBANES, has mentioned. We find out now there are indirect contacts that are available and accessible. We have the private sector already engaged. There are indirect lines of support to Azerbaijan at the present time. But for the United States now to be in a position which effectively would commit itself to one side in this, after all of the various situations and the current situations, I think would be enormously counterproductive.

So I certainly hope we will not take that action at this time. I don't think it is warranted. It is not justified, and I think it would be counterproductive in terms of the interests of the people in that region. There have been initiatives for the cause of peace in that part of the world. The Armenians have indicated a willingness to move that process forward, and those have been rejected, as I understand it, by the Azerbaijanis. For the U.S., under these circumstances, to be in a situation where we could effectively—and we understand what is really at the bottom of this, and that is effectively coming down on one side—I think there fails to be a persuasive argument about trying to advance this process for peace and real prosperity, and freeing that region from the kinds of tensions it has faced in the past.

I hope when the Senate comes to deal with this issue, we will maintain what I think has been a sound policy in the past and, with the new initiatives out there in terms of advancing peace, try to find ways to move the process forward rather than interfering in these negotiations by favoring one side over another.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment to the Silk Road Strategy Act. I support the many worthwhile provisions in the Act, but I oppose the waiver of Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which was enacted by Congress in 1992. Section 907 restricts U.S. assistance to Azerbaijan because of Azerbaijan's continuing economic blockade of Armenia. This blockade has led to great suffering by the people of Armenia, who have had to endure years of shortages of vital commodities.

Azerbaijan's cut off of fuel supplies had a devastating effect on Armenia's industry. Factories were unable to operate, throwing tens of thousands of people out of work. Malnutrition increased because of the shortage of food. Schools and hospitals had to shut down or operate under dire circumstances for only a few hours a day.

Over the years, the humanitarian needs have been so great in Armenia. The 1988 earthquake, followed by the blockade, has resulted in continuing devastating circumstances for the people of Armenia. I can remember talking to doctors about the humanitarian needs of the Armenia people. I worked with the Department of Defense airlifting goods donated by the people of Massachusetts and other states to help alleviate the suffering.

Although conditions are somewhat better today than they were a few years ago, Armenia still suffers from the effects of this blockade. It continues to obstruct Armenia's ability to import food, fuel, medicine and other important commodities and items.

Unfortunately, the Silk Road Strategy Act contains no provision requiring Azerbaijan to lift this blockade as a condition of receiving additional U.S. aid. It makes no sense to reward Azerbaijan while that nation continues this inhumane blockade. Azerbaijan already receives $24 million a year in indirect U.S. assistance. Current law allows the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the U.S. Trade and Development Agency to provide support to the private sector, and USAID is authorized to provide humanitarian aid and democracy-building assistance to Azerbaijan.

Section 907 is an important incentive for Azerbaijan to come to the negotiating table to resolve the continuing controversy between Azerbaijan and

Armenia. The amendment offered by Senator MCCONNELL, Senator ABRAHAM, and Senator SARBANES will retain this essential lever of sanctions, and I urge the Senate to adopt it. Unless the waiver of Section 907 is removed, it would be a serious mistake for the Senate to approve the Silk Road Strategy Act.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise to support the McConnell amendment striking the provision in the Brownback amendment, also called the Silk Road Act, which would grant the President authority to waive Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. Section 907 is an important provision of our law which prohibits U.S. Government assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until it takes ''demonstrable steps to cease all blockades and other offensive uses of force against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh.'' For the last 10 years, the Government of Azerbaijan has resisted taking such simple steps and instead has maintained its blockade of the transportation of food, medicine, fuel and other important items to Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh. The Azeri blockade has led to great human suffering while seriously hampering economic development of the region. I cannot support the Silk Road Act as offered because by allowing for the waiver of Section 907 we would be removing one of the last remaining incentives we have to induce the Azeris to enter into good faith negotiations over this conflict. I believe that we all have similar goals for the region which include: economic development and cooperation; fostering of democratic principles; and the adherence to universally recognized human rights standards. Allowing for the waiver of Section 907 runs counter to these important goals by rewarding a nation which has blockaded its neighbors, maintained an authoritarian government that took power in a nondemocratic fashion, and has a human rights record that has been recognized by the U.S. State Department as ''poor.'' I urge my colleagues to support the continuation of Section 907.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. This amendment gives the President authority to provide assistance for the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia—that is, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. The purpose of this amendment is to reestablish the ancient Silk Road trading route and to gain access to the oil and gas resources of the region. In so doing, it has serious implications for Armenia and for ongoing international efforts to promote a solution to the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh, because it allows the President to waive Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which I originally authored. That legislation prohibited aid to the Government of Azerbaijan as long as it maintains a blockade against Armenia.

One of the objectives of the Brownback amendment is to foster the development of regional economic cooperation. Yet, this amendment ignores some fundamental facts on the ground. First, Armenia continues to be blockaded to the east by Azerbaijan and to the West by Turkey. Second, Azerbaijan insists on establishing and maintaining east-west energy, rail and road corridors that deliberately bypass Armenia. Although Armenia is one of the countries that could benefit from this bill in theory, in reality it is totally isolated by the situation on the ground.

This bill does nothing to address these realities. There are no provisions requiring that blockades be lifted or that all borders be opened before aid is extended. By failing to include these requirements, the bill in effect legitimizes these blockades and helps Azerbaijan to continue to use them to marginalize Armenia and keep it weak.

The ten-year blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh by the Azeri government has cut off the transport of food, fuel, medicine and other vital goods. This blockade has been strengthened by Turkey, which has had a similar blockade for the last six years.

Section 907 is not a sanction but rather an effort to use the leverage embodied in US aid to create a level playing field for Armenia and to encourage the government of Azerbaijan to take some of the basic steps necessary if a peaceful resolution of the conflict is to be found. Section 907, as formulated in current law, prohibits US government economic and military assistance to the Azeri government, but it permits humanitarian and democracy building aid.

All Azerbaijan must do to get section 907 lifted is to ''take demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.'' By allowing the President to waive Sec. 907, this bill legitimizes Azerbaijan's blockade and rewards its rejection of the 1998 OSCE compromise peace proposal. This only complicates efforts by the international community to foster a settlement to the conflict. The greatest weakness of this Brownback amendment is that it is totally silent on the peace process.

Mr. President, I will vote against the Brownback amendment and in support of the McConnell amendment, which removes the President's ability to waive Sec. 907.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, our foreign policy must reflect our values. That's why I oppose the Silk Roads Strategy Act amendment.

The sponsors of this legislation say that we should build stronger ties with the nations of the South Caucasus and Central Asia. I agree. We must promote peace, democracy and economic growth in this important region. But to do this, we can't ignore basic human rights or fundamental American values.

The Silk Roads Strategy Act would enable the President to waive Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. Section 907 prohibits most direct American aid to Azerbaijan until it takes demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. Section 907 has been modified in recent years to enable humanitarian aid and aid provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Trade Development Agency and the Export Import Bank. Yet Azerbaijan has done nothing to end the embargo and has been recalcitrant in the OSCE peace process.

American foreign aid is not an entitlement. We have a right to place conditions on our assistance. We have a right to demand that countries receiving US aid live up to certain basic humanitarian standards.

For almost ten years, Azerbaijan has maintained a blockade of Armenia. This blockade prevents the delivery of basic human needs—including food, medicine and fuel. What does this mean for the people of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh? It means terrible human suffering. It means a high infant mortality rate and poor maternal health. It means hunger. It means shortages of the basic needs of life—food, medicine and energy.

Senator MCCONNELL has offered a second degree amendment that would maintain Section 907. This is a reasonable approach. The McConnell amendment would enable us to strengthen relations with the Caucasus—without compromising our values.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the McConnell amendment—and in opposing the Silk Roads Strategy Act.

SILK ROAD STRATEGY ACT OF 1999

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I think there has been more heat than light evidenced by those who have attempted to characterize what the amendment offered by Senator BROWNBACK seeks to achieve with the proposed amendment or with legislation that he introduced earlier this year—the so called Silk Road Strategy Act.

I call attention to the language of the amendment and what it seeks to achieve support, the bill has even more expansive language in these areas.

Let me highlight for my colleagues just a few of these goals: to promote and strengthen independence, sovereignty, democratic government and respect for human rights; to promote tolerance, pluralism, and understanding and counter racism and anti-Semitism; to assist actively in the resolution of regional conflicts and to facilitate the removal of impediments to cross-border commerce; and to help promote market oriented principles and practices.

The assistance authorized by this legislation is intended to promote reconciliation, economic development, and broad regional cooperation.

Mr. President, I think we would all agree that these are appropriate goals

and programs that are worthy of U.S. support.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what the bill and the proposed amendment will do.

It does not supersede the Freedom Support Act nor does it repeal section 907 of the Freedom Support Act which restricts assistance to Azerbaijan. Rather it gives the President the ability to waive continued application of the restrictions if he determines they do not serve United States national interests.

I opposed last year's version of the Silk Road legislation because I believed it went further than was wise or necessary in superseding the Freedom Support Act and in the outright repeal of restrictions on assistance to Azerbaijan.

Having said that, I have made no secret of the fact that I am increasingly opposed to Congressionally mandated foreign policy restrictions that do not include Presidential waiver authority. I think that it makes the conduct of foreign policy extremely difficult and is not the most effective way to promote the goals that Congress is seeking in the legislation it enacts.

Senator BROWNBACK has struck the right balance in the legislation that is before us today. It recognizes the challenges we face in promoting democracy and respect for human rights in the region and it gives the President sufficient tools to make progress in these areas.

I believe it also gives an incentive for governments in the region to make progress in these important areas, knowing that if they do, they will improve relations with the U.S. and open the door to economic assistance which they need if they are to make progress to building democratic institutions in their countries.

For that reason I support the underlying Brownback amendment and do not believe that the perfecting amendment offered by Senator MCCONNELL is necessary.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, (Mr. BROWNBACK), the so-called ''Silk Road Strategy Act.'' I certainly support the Senator's desire to promote peace and democracy in Central Asia and the South Caucasus region, but I remain concerned about the approach this legislation takes toward achieving these laudable goals.

In particular, I am troubled by the provision in the Silk Road Strategy Act which would allow the President to waive Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. Section 907 prohibits United States assistance to the government of Azerbaijan until it takes demonstrable steps to end the blockade of Nagorno-Karabakh. No such steps have been taken, Mr. President. The blockade continues, as do human rights violations against the Armenian population in the region. I am concerned that the waiver of Section 907 would, in effect, reward the Azeri government for its refusal to end the blockade.

For those reasons, I opposed prior versions of the Silk Road Strategy Act in the Committee on Foreign Relations in the 105th and 106th Congresses, and I signed on to the minority views contained in the committee report both times. Those views stated, in part, that ''to waive [Section 907] in the absence of any progress toward a lifting of the blockade would reward the Government of Azerbaijan for its intransigence and remove a major incentive for good-faith negotiation from one side in the conflict.''

Mr. President, a decision not to provide foreign assistance to a government is not a sanction. The United States Congress has the responsibility to prohibit the provision of bilateral assistance to governments with which we have serious concern. This is not a sanction; rather, it is a means of making our foreign policy goals clear. Foreign assistance is not an entitlement. Section 907 plainly states that there will be no U.S. assistance to the government of Azerbaijan until the blockade is lifted. Period. As my colleagues well recall, this body has placed numerous conditions on bilateral assistance to a variety of countries. Section 907 is a condition, not a sanction. Moreover, many types of bilateral assistance are exempt from Section 907, and U.S. trade with Azerbaijan has been unaffected by this provision.

I will support the McConnell-Abraham second degree amendment to strike the waiver authority for Section 907 from the bill, and I will oppose the Brownback amendment in its current form. I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the 2nd degree Amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. Without the McConnell Amendment, I find that I must oppose the underlying Amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

Although I think that many of the goals and objectives of Senator BROWNBACK's Amendment are worthwhile—I too believe in establishing a policy of greater U.S. engagement with the countries of the Caucasus and Central Asia—I find that I must oppose this Amendment because it contains a fatal flaw: I do not think that Congress should get rid of Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which this Amendment does, so long as Azerbaijan continues its decade-long blockade of Armenia and Karabakh.

The McConnell Amendment, which retains Section 907, would fix this flaw.

Expanding Azerbaijan's eligibility for assistance from the United States without seeking progress on the resolution of this issue runs the risk of legitimizing precisely the sort of behavior which the United States, on the cusp of a new century, must seek to discourage.

Azerbaijan is already eligible for U.S. humanitarian assistance, as well as funds for democracy building and many trade benefits. All that Azerbaijan has to do under Section 907 to be eligible for the full range of U.S. assistance is to ''take demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.''

In other words, all it has to do is end hostilities, end an act of war, and seek to settle this dispute peacefully. If Azerbaijan were to take these simple steps there would be no need to repeal Section 907—its restrictions would no longer apply. Is it too much to ask another country that it end a state of war before we provide it with additional foreign assistance?

In fact, given Azerbaijan's continued unwillingness to make an effort to peacefully resolve this issue, gutting Section 907 rewards Azerbaijan for continued bad behavior, and sends a very disturbing message to others who might behave likewise. Basically we would be saying that it is O.K. to attack your neighbor, impose a blockade, stop food, fuel, and medicine from getting through to those in need, the United States will simply look the other way. In fact, we will do more than look the other way, we will consider offering you military assistance. I do not think this is the sort of message we should be sending.

The nations of the region must solve their problems via direct negotiations and mutual compromise, not by acts of war. When Azerbaijan shows a willingness to end its blockade and seeks a peaceful resolution of the outstanding issues with Armenia then, and only then, should the United States provide it with the sort of assistance that this Amendment would allow.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the McConnell Amendment. And, unless the McConnell Amendment, which retains Section 907, is passed by this body, I would urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to the underlying Brownback Amendment.

SILK ROAD STRATEGY ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator BROWNBACK's amendment to the FY 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, the aptly named ''Silk Road Strategy Act.'' This act puts in place a much-needed strategy toward a much-overlooked part of the world, a part of the world that the U.S. would ignore at considerable risk.

I commend my colleague from Kansas for the extraordinary effort he has committed to shaping this policy and drafting this legislation. Senator BROWNBACK has spent several years studying this region, traveling through it, meeting with political leaders and economic decision makers and discussing his thoughts with the Administration. The fruits of this in-depth research and commitment are evident in this amendment.

I also thank my colleague for working with me to include language in this bill that strengthens the U.S. policy of opening these markets and raising

these countries' level of economic cooperation with the United States through bilateral investment treaties.

As the senior Senator from Utah, I am very fortunate to represent a State with many far-sighted international commercial ventures, and the language I proposed, which Senator BROWNBACK has thoughtfully accepted, supports those interests by requiring the Secretary of State to report annually on the progress that is being made in negotiating investment treaties with nations of the region. I believe this measure will, for the time being, be sufficient to monitor progress in these important negotiations and will alert these nations to the serious concerns that the U.S. Congress has in protecting U.S. investments abroad. U.S. companies investing in this region should have the protections of bilateral investment agreements.

This is entirely consistent with the strategy of the ''Silk Road Act,'' which is posited on the accurate belief that increased U.S. participation in this region is fundamental to their development and our interests.

The economic component is only one part of the strategy of this amendment. By promoting infrastructure development, democratic political reforms, sovereignty, independence, and conflict resolution, the Brownback proposal will contribute to political stability and progress as well.

Last fall, during a visit to the region, I went to the Republic of Georgia and renewed an acquaintance with Edouard Shevardnadze. An artful negotiator as foreign minister in the last years of the Soviet Union, President Shevardnadze returned to has native Georgia, which became independent as a result of the demise of the Soviet Union. As President of Georgia, Edouard Shevardnadze has been a stalwart promoter of democracy and an open economy, and he has done so under very, very difficult circumstances.

Close to one-quarter of his nation's territory is not under central government control. Russian soldiers remain stationed on some of that territory, against the will of the Georgian government. President Shevardnadze has twice narrowly avoided assassination—one of his assassins freely resides in Russia today. In my discussions with President Shevardnadze, we discussed the need for increased U.S. attention to this region and increased participation by U.S. commercial interests. This ''Silk Road Strategy Act'' promotes these goals.

The region of the world that this act addresses remains rife with internal conflicts, cross-border incursions, and—perhaps most disturbing—continued challenges by radical Islamic interests, supported in many cases by the extremists in Iran. If these conflicts succeed in destabilizing the region, millions of people recently freed from nearly a century of communist totalitarianism will be denied their economic and political progress, nations surrounding the region will be drawn into wider conflicts, and international markets will be affected.

Further, and most importantly, if this region slips toward instability, I am deeply concerned that the U.S. will see the Central Asian and Caucasus States become the source of many future conflicts. Some of these conflicts could have troubling transnational consequences that directly affect us, such as the spread of terrorism and international crime.

I commend Senator BROWNBACK for this valuable legislation, which makes a solid and important step in refocusing U.S. interests to a part of the world that is important to us now, and will be even more important in the future.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of this amendment and the preservation of Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. It is important that we maintain our commitment to the Armenian people.

One of the greatest foreign policy priorities in the post-Cold War world is to assist former Communist countries in making the difficult transition to democracy. The fall of the Soviet Union was not the final victory of the Cold War. That will come only when all of these former adversaries embrace liberty, free markets, and the rule of law. Senator BROWNBACK's underlying amendment has the potential to further economic and political progress in the Caucasus and Caspian Sea regions. In its current form, however, it severely weakens one of Congress' central achievements of the post-Cold War era.

The 102nd Congress in 1992, passed the Freedom Support Act. This bill acknowledged that we can help countries make the transition to democracy both with the carrot of economic aid and the stick of withholding such assistance. It included a provision, Section 907, which mandated that Azerbaijan will not receive any direct economic aid until it ceases the blockade of neighboring Armenia and the Armenian enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh. Even still, the United States has supported the Azeri people with over $180 million in humanitarian assistance through NGOs since 1992. The Foreign Operations Appropriations bill itself also allows OPIC and TDA activities in Azerbaijan which we approved last year.

The Azeri blockade of Armenia and of Karabakh is a direct result of the dispute between the two countries over the status of Karabakh. This is the longest-running ethnic conflict in the former Soviet Union. So far, the human cost has been 35,000 lives and 1.4 million refugees. Outside of the conflict, the brutality of the Azeri blockade has been equally devastating for Armenia. As a land-locked country where only 17 percent of the land is arable, its ties to the outside world are its lifeline. Humanitarian assistance cannot get to Armenia, which is still trying to rebuild from the devastating earthquake of a decade ago. In Karabakh, the blockade has produced a critical shortage of medical equipment.

True regional cooperation is unrealistic as long as this conflict continues. By passing the underlying amendment in its current form, we are virtually guaranteeing that the OSCE peace process will fail. Armenia will have little incentive to participate in the future, and Azerbaijan will receive the message that its rejection of any future peace proposals is acceptable. I support Senator BROWNBACK's attempts to promote an East-West axis in the region, and I believe it is critical that we encourage these former republics to look westward. By allowing the blockade to endure, however, we are leaving Armenia with only North-South options. If our intent is to truly improve the quality of life in the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea, we must make a positive impact on the Caucasus without undermining our commitment to the Armenian people. I urge my colleagues to support the McConnell-Abraham amendment and allow Section 907 to remain in place.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT, MOHAMMED HOSNI MUBARAK

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HELMS, is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I have the honor and privilege of presenting to Members of the Senate and to the Pages the distinguished and very popular President of the Republic of Egypt, Mohammed Hosni Mubarak.

RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for six minutes so we can greet President Mubarak.

I thank the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:13 p.m., recessed until 4:19 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, which amendment is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is No. 1165, offered by Senator BINGAMAN of New Mexico.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask the Bingaman amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1125, 1146, 1150, 1151, 1158, 1162, 1163, 1167, 1168, AND 1173 THROUGH 1177, EN BLOC

Mr. MCCONNELL. There are a number of amendments that have been cleared by both sides that I send to the desk:

Amendment No. 1125 by Senator SMITH of Oregon related to CDC; amendment No. 1146 by Senator LAUTENBERG related to war crimes; amendment No. 1150 by Senator HELMS related to Serbia; amendment No. 1151 by

Senator BURNS dealing with narcotics; amendment No. 1158 by Senator DODD dealing with IMET; amendment No. 1162 by Senator BOXER, dealing with tuberculosis; amendment No. 1167, by Senator KERRY of Massachusetts relating to arms transfer; amendment No. 1168 by Senator KERRY of Massachusetts relating to Cambodia; amendment No. 1173 by Senator BIDEN relating to threat reduction; amendment No. 1174 by Senator LEVIN relating to KEDO; amendment No. 1175 by Senator DOMENICI relating to Habitat for Humanity; amendment No. 1177 by Senator SCHUMER relating to ETRI; amendment No. 1176 by Senator COCHRAN relating to IMET; amendment No. 1163 by Senator CLELAND relating to the Balkans conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes amendment Nos. 1125, 1146, 1150, 1151, 1158, 1162, 1163, 1167, 1168, and 1173 through 1177, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1125

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section and renumber any remaining sections accordingly:

SEC. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CITIZENS DEMOCRACY CORPS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) with regard to promoting economic development and open, democratic countries in the former Soviet Union and Central Eastern Europe, the Committee commends the work of the Citizens Democracy Corps (CDC), which utilizes senior-level U.S. business volunteers to assist enterprises, institutions, and local governments abroad. Their work demonstrates the significant impact that USAID support of a U.S. non-governmental organization (NGO) program can have on the key U.S. foreign policy priorities of promoting broad-based, stable economic growth and open, market-oriented economies in transitioning economies. By drawing upon the skills and voluntary spirit of U.S. businessmen and women to introduce companies, CDC furthers the goals of the Freedom of Support Act (NIS) and Support for Eastern European Democracy (SEED), forging positive, lasting connections between the U.S. and these countries. The Committee endorses CDC's very cost-effective programs and believes they should be supported and expanded not only in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but in transitioning and developing economiecs throughout the world.

AMENDMENT NO. 1146

(Purpose: To provide substitute language relating to restrictions on assistance to countries providing sanctuary to indicted war criminals)

Beginning on page 100, strike line 11 and all that follows through line 13 on page 107 and insert the following:

RESTRICTIONS ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES, ENTITIES, AND COMMUNITIES IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA PROVIDING SANCTUARY TO PUBLICLY INDICTED WAR CRIMINALS

SEC. 567. (a) POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use bilateral and multilateral assistance to promote peace and respect for internationally recognized human rights by encouraging countries, entities, and communities in the territory of the former Yugoslavia to cooperate fully with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia—

(1) by apprehending publicly indicted war criminals and transferring custody of those individuals to the Tribunal to stand trial; and

(2) by assisting the Tribunal in the investigation and prosecution of crimes subject to its jurisdiction.

(b) SANCTIONED COUNTRY, ENTITY, OR COMMUNITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A sanctioned country, entity, or community described in this section is one in which there is present a publicly indicted war criminal or in which the Tribunal has been hindered in efforts to investigate crimes subject to its jurisdiction.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Subject to subsection (f), subsections (c) and (d) shall not apply to the provision of assistance to an entity that is not a sanctioned entity within a sanctioned country, or to a community that is not a sanctioned community within a sanctioned country or sanctioned entity, if the Secretary of State determines and so reports to the appropriate congressional committees that providing such assistance would further the policy of subsection (a).

(c) BILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds made available by this or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs may be provided for any country, entity, or community described in subsection (b).

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Not less than 15 days before any assistance described in this subsection is disbursed to any country, entity, or community described in subsection (b), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, shall publish in the Federal Register a written justification for the proposed assistance, including a description of the location of the proposed assistance program or project by municipality, its purpose, and the intended recipient of the assistance, including the names of individuals, companies and their boards of directors, and shareholders with controlling or substantial financial interest in the program or project.

(d) MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors of the international financial institutions to work in opposition to, and vote against, any extension by such institutions of any financial or technical assistance or grants of any kind to any country or entity described in subsection (b).

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Not less than 15 days before any vote in an international financial institution regarding the extension of financial or technical assistance or grants to any country or community described in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall provide to the appropriate Congressional committees a written justification for the proposed assistance, including an explanation of the United States position regarding any such vote, as well as a description of the location of the proposed assistance by municipality, its purpose, and its intended beneficiaries, including the names of individuals with a controlling or substantial financial interest in the project.

(e) EXCEPTIONS.—Subject to subsection (f), subsections (c) and (d) shall not apply to the provision of—

(1) humanitarian assistance;

(2) assistance to nongovernmental organizations that promote democracy and respect for human rights; and

(3) assistance for cross border physical infrastructure projects involving activities in both a sanctioned country, entity, or community and a nonsanctioned contiguous country, entity, or community, if the project is primarily located in and primarily benefits the nonsanctioned country, entity, or community and if the portion of the project located in the sanctioned country, entity, or community is necessary only to complete the project.

(f) FURTHER LIMITATIONS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO PUBLICLY INDICTED WAR CRIMINALS AND OTHER PERSONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (e) or subsection (g), no assistance may be made available by this Act, or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs, in any country, entity, or community described in subsection (b), for any financial or technical assistance, grant, or loan that would directly benefit a publicly indicted war criminal, any person who aids or abets a publicly indicted war criminal to evade apprehension, or any person who otherwise obstructs the work of the Tribunal.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—At the end of each fiscal year, the President shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that no assistance described in paragraph (1) directly benefited any person described in that paragraph during the preceding 12-month period.

(g) WAIVER.—The Secretary of State may waive the application of subsection (c) with respect to specified United States projects, or subsection (d) with respect to specified international financial institution programs or projects, in a sanctioned country or entity upon providing a written determination to the appropriate congressional committees that the government of the country or entity is doing everything within its power and authority to apprehend or aid in the apprehension of publicly indicted war criminals and is fully cooperating in the investigation and prosecution of war crimes.

(h) CURRENT RECORD OF WAR CRIMINALS AND SANCTIONED COUNTRIES, ENTITIES, AND COMMUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Ambassador at Large for War Crimes Issues, and after consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, shall establish and maintain a current record of the location, including the community, if known, of publicly indicted war criminals and of sanctioned countries, entities, and communities.

(2) REPORT.—Beginning 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not later than September 1 each year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report in classified and unclassified form to the appropriate congressional committees on the location, including the community, if known, of publicly indicted war criminals and the identity of countries, entities, and communities that are failing to cooperate fully with the Tribunal.

(3) INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.—Upon the request of the chairman or ranking minority member of any of the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State shall make available to that committee the information recorded under paragraph (1) in a report submitted to the committee in classified and unclassified form.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(2) CANTON.—The term ''canton'' means the administrative units in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(3) COMMUNITY.—The term ''community'' means any canton, district, opstina, city, town, or village.

(4) COUNTRY.—The term ''country'' means Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia-Montenegro), the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Slovenia.

(5) DAYTON AGREEMENT.—The term ''Dayton Agreement'' means the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, together with annexes relating thereto, done at Dayton, November 10 through 16, 1995.

(6) ENTITY.—The term ''entity'' refers to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republika Srpska, Brcko in Bosnia, Serbia, Montenegro, and Kosovo.

(7) INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''international financial institution'' includes the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Multilateral Investment Guaranty Agency, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(8) PUBLICLY INDICTED WAR CRIMINALS.—The term ''publicly indicted war criminals'' means persons indicted by the Tribunal for crimes subject to the jurisdiction of the Tribunal.

(9) TRIBUNAL OR INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL FOR THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA.—The term ''Tribunal'' or the term ''International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia'' means the International Tribunal for the prosecution of persons responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991, as established by United Nations Security Council Resolution 827 of May 25, 1993.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to thank Senator MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY for including my amendment No. 1146 in the managers' package.

Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to ensure U.S. aid does not go to countries or regions or communities in the former Yugoslavia which continue to harbor indicted war criminals.

This amendment would improve language we adopted last year with a clearer provision covering all of the former Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, we have seen terrible atrocities committed in Croatia, in Bosnia, and most recently in Kosovo.

The International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia has publicly indicted 89 persons for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. There are almost certainly more indictments which remain sealed. Ongoing investigations in Bosnia and now in Kosovo will surely lead to more indictments.

However, the justice of the War Crimes Tribunal relies on the governments of countries in the region to apprehend indicted war criminals and transfer them to The Hague to stand trial.

Because the Republika Srpska authorities failed to fulfill their responsibilities, United States and other NATO armed forces in the United Nations-authorized peacekeeping force in Bosnia have arrested 7 war criminals. However, 36 publicly indicted war criminals remain at large.

Mr. President, our aid programs provide important leverage to motivate governments in the former Yugoslavia to stop harboring war criminals and start arresting them.

United States policy linking aid to cooperation with the war crimes tribunal is clear.

Indeed, a few years ago, Secretary Albright said the following in her remarks at the Tribunal:

. . . The United States has made full cooperation with the War Crimes Tribunal, especially the transfer of indictees to The Hague, a prerequisite for U.S. assistance, our support for assistance by others, and our backing for membership in international institutions.

Unfortunately, the administration has resisted putting this policy into practice. Indeed, Secretary Albright has issued broad waivers of the provision included in the fiscal year 1998 and 1999 appropriations bills. The United States now provides aid to the city of Prijedor which hosts no fewer than 8 indicted war criminals.

Just this month Secretary Albright signed another waiver to provide $10 million in budget support to the Republika Srpska Government—the very Government which includes the Bosnian Serb police force which should be carrying out arrest warrants and is not.

Mr. President, ever more atrocities committed by Serbian police and paramilitary forces in Kosovo are coming to light: executions, torture, rape, burning of homes, expulsions on a massive scale.

We must now send a strong signal that we are determined to see the perpetrators of these crimes face justice. We must end our support for so-called moderates in Republika Srpska until and unless they fulfill their obligations to arrest war criminals and cooperate with the War Crimes Tribunal.

The Amendment I am offering today clearly states the policy of the United States ''to use bilateral and multilateral assistance to promote peace and respect for internationally recognized human rights by encouraging countries, entities, and communities in the territory of the former Yugoslavia,'' among other things ''by apprehending publicly indicted war criminals and transferring custody of those individuals to the Tribunal to stand trial.''

The amendment sets out mechanisms to ensure that U.S. and multilateral aid will go to areas like the Bosnian Federation, where no war criminals remain at large, while prohibiting aid to authorities and areas that harbor war criminals.

Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to ensure that the perpetrators of horrible crimes in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo will ultimately face justice.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1150

(Purpose: Providing assistance to promote democracy in Serbia)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ASSISTANCE TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN YUGOSLAVIA.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE.—The purpose of assistance under this subsection is to promote and strengthen institutions of democratic government and the growth of an independent civil society in Yugoslavia, including ethnic tolerance and respect for internationally recognized human rights.

(2) AUTHORIZATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized to furnish assistance and other support for individuals and independent nongovernmental organizations to carry out the purpose of paragraph (1) through support for the activities described in paragraph (3).

(3) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—Activities that may be supported by assistance under paragraph (2) include the following:

(A) Democracy building.

(B) The development of nongovernmental organizations.

(C) The development of independent media.

(D) The development of the rule of law, a strong, independent judiciary, and transparency in political practices.

(E) International exchanges and advanced professional training programs in skill areas central to the development of civil society and a market economy.

(F) The development of all elements of the democratic process, including political parties and the ability to administer free and fair elections.

(G) The development of local governance.

(H) The development of a free-market economy.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the President $100,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 1999, and ending September 30, 2001, to carry out this subsection.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subparagraph (A) are authorized to remain available until expended.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENT OF SERBIA.—In carrying out subsection (a), the President shall take all necessary steps to ensure that no funds or other assistance is provided to the Government of Yugoslavia or to the Government of Serbia.

(c) ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENT OF MONTENEGRO.—In carrying out subsection (a), the President is authorized to provide assistance to the Government of Montenegro, if the President determines, and so reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, that the Government of Montenegro is committed to, and is taking steps to promote, democratic principles, the rule of law, and respect for internationally recognized human rights.

AMENDMENT TO 1151

(Purpose: To allocate funds to continue mycoherbicide counter drug research and development)

On page 26, line 15, before the period insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not less than $10,000,000 shall be made available to continue mycoherbicide counter drug research and development''.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues, Senator BURNS and Senator DEWINE, to offer an amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. This amendment would provide $10 million to the State Department Bureau of International Law Enforcement Affairs

for mycoherbicide research and development to be used for narcotic crop eradication. The appropriations bill, as it currently stands, provides no funding for this important tool in our war against illegal drugs.

Many of my colleagues and I view this mycoherbicide technology as a promising new tool that will reduce the cultivation and supply of narcotic crops, and thereby increasing our capacity to combat illegal drugs. I have been briefed on the mycoherbicide technology and understand that it is a naturally occurring plant pathogen that can be introduced into an area to control a target plant species. The program is also environmentally friendly—it posses no threat to humans or animals, other crops, or water supply and replaces the use of harmful chemicals. In addition, the program is a cost effective tool in our war on drugs. The mycoherbicides will remain in the soil for an extended period of time, for up to 40 years, and costs a fraction of the $2.65 billion we spend on other supply reduction methods.

I remind my colleagues that Congress has recognized the importance of this technology and its ability to eradicate deadly crops when it endorsed the program last year in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. The program was funded in the amount of $23 million for fiscal year 1999. I strongly urge my colleagues to continue their support for this program by passing this amendment and supporting the continued development of the mycoherbicide program.

Mr. President, as illegal drugs continue to cross our borders and threaten the welfare of American citizens, this program is a top priority that can significantly reduce the production of narcotics crops. We know that elimination of illicit crops is the best way of preventing deadly drugs from reaching our streets and destroying untold lives and communities. I urge my colleagues to join with Senator BURNS, Senator DEWINE and me in support of this amendment and in support of this important program.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss yet again one of the key problems I have been addressing, as a U.S. Senator, over the last four years. The problem is the inflow of illegal drugs into America. I have heard it said that if we eliminate demand, if we address the domestic side of drug abuse, we really don't have to worry about illegal narcotics producers and importers, because they would then have no market for their drugs.

Mr. President, this argument makes sense on a superficial level, but it does not reflect reality. I have been, throughout my career as a local, state and Federal elected official, a strong supporter of domestic efforts to reduce drug demand. But I have always believed—and continue to believe—that we need a balanced program to attack the drug problem on all fronts. We need to invest not only in domestic demand reduction and law enforcement programs, but also in international programs to increase interdiction and reduce production of illegal narcotics. We need to do our best to stop drugs from ever reaching our borders.

Mr. President, for nearly a year, I have expressed my belief that this Administration is not doing its best to address this problem. Little seems to have changed in one year.

Before this Administration took office, almost one-third of our counter narcotics resources were committed to stopping drugs outside our borders. Today, that figure is less than 14 percent. Although overall funding for counter narcotics programs has increased dramatically in the last decade, from $4.5 billion to $17.8 billion, statistics show an increase in drug use among our youngest citizens. I am disturbed by how easily and how cheaply illegal drugs can be purchased. I am disturbed that the Administration is not taking seriously the initiatives Congress passed last year as part of the bipartisan Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act.

Mr. President, President's Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2000 provided ZERO funding for any of the initiatives in that Act. In fact, the President's overall anti-drug budget for next year is $100 million less than what Congress provided in 1999. The Coast Guard received no funding to acquire additional ships and planes to stop drug trafficking in the Caribbean; the Drug Enforcement Administration received ZERO funding for new agents; the US Customs Service received ZERO funding to acquire maritime/air assets, and ZERO increases for inspectors.

In addition, the Administration has also ignored other key initiatives sought by Congress, including mycoherbicide research and development, and eradication and alternative crop development assistance to our Latin American neighbors, particularly, Colombia and Bolivia. I very much appreciate the efforts of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations in working with me on these issues. They have done a remarkable job to incorporate a key anti-drug initiative that was not sought by the President.

Specifically, Mr. President, I commend the managers of the bill for accepting the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana, Senator BURNS, to fund the mycoherbicide program which we began funding last year under the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. Mycoherbicide technology is a new and promising eradication technique for coca, poppy, and marijuana. The concept is to employ a natural disease that only attacks a specific narcotics plant without harming neighboring vegetation. Mycoherbicides can be applied through aerial spraying and will remain in the soil to prevent future growth of the narcotics crops in that area. Mr. President, this has the potential to be a very cost-effective and low-risk way to drastically reduce drug production at its source. We must pursue this technology and fund the additional research and testing necessary to bring about a deployable product as soon as possible.

Mr. President, let me now turn to the subject of eradication and alternative crop development assistance to Colombia and Bolivia. I am particularly concerned about the lack of resources made available by this Administration for what I consider to be our most urgent foreign assistance project—counter narcotics funding. I fear that we are sending a signal abroad that the United States is not entirely serious about the fight against drugs.

The report language accompanying this bill makes special mention of the progress made in the drug fight by the Government of Bolivia, and I want to add my voice to the committee report as well. Since coming to power in August of 1997, the Government of President Hugo Banzer and Vice President Jorge Quiroga has undertaken an ambitious plan to remove Bolivia from the illegal narcotics trade by the time they leave office in 2002.

Mr. President, many, myself included, were skeptical that this goal could be reached in the time allotted. Now, nearly two years into their ''Dignity Plan,'' the Bolivian Government has shown that this goal can be reached. Since taking office, the Banzer Government has successfully reduced Bolivia's cocaine production potential by a remarkable 40 percent. This has been accomplished by an effective eradication program and an aggressive and successful program of interdiction and control of the chemical precursors which go into cocaine production.

The Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill makes mention of Bolivia's success, and its financial needs. I am deeply concerned that we are not providing sufficient support to the historic effort of the Bolivian Government. They have moved tens of thousands of farmers out of the illegal coca fields and it is absolutely imperative that we help to provide viable commercial alternatives for these farmers and their families. It would be a great tragedy to be within sight of a major victory in the drug war and to lose it for want of resources. The anticipated level of funding in this Bill falls far short of what is required to finish the job in Bolivia in the next two years.

Mr. President, I look forward to working with the Senator from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, the Senator from Georgia, Senator COVERDELL, and the Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, to help Bolivia and other countries in their fight against drugs. We will work with the appropriators during conference to provide the highest possible level of funding for this effort. This is a key investment in the future safety of our own streets—and it will bring us closer to the drug-free America our children deserve.

AMENDMENT NO. 1158

At the appropriate place in the bill at the following new section:

SEC. . FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING REPORT.

(a) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly provide to the Congress by January 31, 2000 a report on all military training provided to foreign military personnel (excluding sales) administered by the Department of Defense and the Department of State during fiscal years 1999 and 2000, including those proposed for fiscal year 2000. This report shall include, for each such military training activity, the foreign policy justification and purpose for the training activity, the cost of the training activity, the number of foreign students trained and their units of operation, and the location of the training. In addition, this report shall also include, with respect to United States personnel, the operational benefits to United States forces derived from each such training activity and the United States military units involved in each such training activity. This report may include a classified annex if deemed necessary and appropriate.

(b) For purposes of this section a report to Congress shall be deemed to mean a report to the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the Appropriations and International Relations Committees of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 1162

(Purpose: To increase the commitment to control and eliminate the growing international problem of tuberculosis)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5 . (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Since the development of antibiotics in the 1950s, tuberculosis has been largely controlled in the United States and the Western World.

(2) Due to societal factors, including growing urban decay, inadequate health care systems, persistent poverty, overcrowding, and malnutrition, as well as medical factors, including the HIV/AIDS epidemic and the emergence of multi-drug resistant strains of tuberculosis, tuberculosis has again become a leading and growing cause of adult deaths in the developing world.

(3) According to the World Health Organization—

(A) in 1998, about 1,860,000 people worldwide died of tuberculosis-related illnesses;

(B) one-third of the world's total population is infected with tuberculosis; and

(C) tuberculosis is the world's leading killer of women between 15 and 44 years old and is a leading cause of children becoming orphans.

(4) Because of the ease of transmission of tuberculosis, its international persistence and growth pose a direct public health threat to those nations that had previously largely controlled the disease. This is complicated in the United States by the growth of the homeless population, the rate of incarceration, international travel, immigration, and HIV/AIDS.

(5) With nearly 40 percent of the tuberculosis cases in the United States attributable to foreign-born persons, tuberculosis will never be eliminated in the United States until it is controlled abroad.

(6) The means exist to control tuberculosis through screening, diagnosis, treatment, patient compliance, monitoring, and ongoing review of outcomes.

(7) Efforts to control tuberculosis are complicated by several barriers, including—

(A) the labor intensive and lengthy process involved in screening, detecting, and treating the disease;

(B) a lack of funding, trainer personnel, and medicine in virtually every nation with a high rate of the disease; and

(C) the unique circumstances in each country, which requires the development and implementation of country-specific programs.

(8) Eliminating the barriers to the international control of tuberculosis through a well-structured, comprehensive, and coordinated worldwide effort would be a significant step in dealing with the increasing public health problem posed by the disease.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that if the total allocation for this Act is higher than the level passed by the Senate, a top priority for the additional funds should be to increase the funding to combat infectious diseases, especially tuberculosis.

AMENDMENT NO. 1163

(Purpose: Supporting an international conference to achieve a durable political settlement in the Balkans)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE BALKANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conducted large-scale military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(2) At the conclusion of 78 days of these hostilities, the United States and its NATO allies suspended military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia based upon credible assurances by the latter that it would fulfill the following conditions as laid down by the so called Group of Eight (G–8):

(A) An immediate and verifiable end of violence and repression in Kosovo.

(B) Staged withdrawal of all Yugoslav military, police, and paramilitary forces from Kosovo.

(C) Deployment in Kosovo of effective international and security presences, endorsed and adopted by the United Nations Security Council, and capable of guaranteeing the achievement of the agreed objectives.

(D) Establishment of an interim administration for Kosovo, to be decided by the United Nations Security Council which will seek to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all inhabitants in Kosovo.

(E) Provision for the safe and free return of all refugees and displaced persons from Kosovo and an unimpeded access to Kosovo by humanitarian aid organizations.

(3) These objectives appear to have been fulfilled, or to be in the process of being fulfilled, which has led the United States and its NATO allies to terminate military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(4) The G–8 also called for a comprehensive approach to the economic development and stabilization of the crisis region, and the European Union has announced plans for $1,500,000,000 over the next 3 years for the reconstruction of Kosovo, for the convening in July of an international donors' conference for Kosovo aid, and for subsequent provision of reconstruction aid to the other countries in the region affected by the recent hostilities followed by reconstruction aid directed at the Balkans region as a whole.

(5) The United States and some of its NATO allies oppose the provision of any aid, other than limited humanitarian assistance, to Serbia until Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic is out of office.

(6) The policy of providing reconstruction aid to Kosovo and other countries in the region affected by the recent hostilities while withholding such aid for Serbia presents a number of practical problems, including the absence in Kosovo of financial and other institutions independent of Yugoslavia, the difficulty in drawing clear and enforceable distinctions between humanitarian and reconstruction assistance, and the difficulty in reconstructing Montenegro in the absence of similar efforts in Serbia.

(7) In any case, the achievement of effective and durable economic reconstruction and revitalization in the countries of the Balkans is unlikely until a political settlement is reached as to the final status of Kosovo and Yugoslavia.

(8) The G–8 proposed a political process towards the establishment of an interim political framework agreement for a substantial self-government for Kosovo, taking into full account the final Interim Agreement for Peace and Self-Government in Kosovo, also known as the Rambouillet Accords, and the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the other countries of the region, and the demilitarization of the UCK (Kosovo Liberation Army).

(9) The G–8 proposal contains no guidance as to a final political settlement for Kosovo and Yugoslavia, while the original position of the United States and the other participants in the so-called Contact Group on this matter, as reflected in the Rambouillet Accords, called for the convening of an international conference, after 3 years, to determine a mechanism for a final settlement of Kosovo status based on the will of the people, opinions of relevant authorities, each Party's efforts regarding the implementation of the agreement and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

(10) The current position of the United States and its NATO allies as to the final status of Kosovo and Yugoslavia calls for an autonomous, multiethnic, democratic Kosovo which would remain as part of Serbia, and such an outcome is not supported by any of the Parties directly involved, including the governments of Yugoslavia and Serbia, representatives of the Kosovar Albanians, and the people of Yugoslavia, Serbia and Kosovo.

(11) There has been no final political settlement in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where the Armed Forces of the United States, its NATO allies, and other non-Balkan nations have been enforcing an uneasy peace since 1996, at a cost to the United States alone of over $10,000,000,000, with no clear end in sight to such enforcement.

(12) The trend throughout the Balkans since 1990 has been in the direction of ethnically based particularism, as exemplified by the 1991 declarations of independence from Yugoslavia by Slovenia and Croatia, and the country in the Balkans which currently comes the closest to the goal of a democratic government which respects the human rights of its citizens is the nation of Slovenia, which was the first portion of the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to secede and is also the nation in the region with the greatest ethnic homogeneity, with a population which is 91 percent Slovene.

(13) The boundaries of the various national and sub-national divisions in the Balkans have been altered repeatedly throughout history, and international conferences have frequently played the decisive role in fixing such boundaries in the modern era, including the Berlin Congress of 1878, the London Conference of 1913, and the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.

(14) The development of an effective exit strategy for the withdrawal from the Balkans of foreign military forces, including the armed forces of the United States, its NATO

allies, Russia, and any other nation from outside the Balkans which has such forces in the Balkans is in the best interests of all such nations.

(15) The ultimate withdrawal of foreign military forces, accompanied by the establishment of durable and peaceful relations among all of the nations and peoples of the Balkans is in the best interests of those nations and peoples.

(16) An effective exit strategy for the withdrawal from the Balkans of foreign military forces is contingent upon the achievement of a lasting political settlement for the region, and that only such a settlement, acceptable to all parties involved, can ensure the fundamental goals of the United States of peace, stability, and human rights in the Balkans;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should call immediately for the convening of an international conference on the Balkans, under the auspices of the United Nations, and based upon the principles of the Rambouillet Accords for a final settlement of Kosovo status, namely that such a settlement should be based on the will of the people, opinions of relevant authorities, each Party's efforts regarding the implementation of the agreement and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act;

(2) the international conference on the Balkans should also be empowered to seek a final settlement for Bosnia-Herzegovina based on the same principles as specified for Kosovo in the Rambouillet Accords; and

(3) in order to produce a lasting political settlement in the Balkans acceptable to all parties, which can lead to the departure from the Balkans in timely fashion of all foreign military forces, including those of the United States, the international conference should have the authority to consider any and all of the following: political boundaries; humanitarian and reconstruction assistance for all nations in the Balkans; stationing of United Nations peacekeeping forces along international boundaries; security arrangements and guarantees for all of the nations of the Balkans; and tangible, enforceable and verifiable human rights guarantees for the individuals and peoples of the Balkans.

AMENDMENT NO. 1167

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) The President shall continue and expand efforts through the United Nations and other international fora, including the Wassenaar Arrangement, to limit arms transfers worldwide. The President shall take the necessary steps to begin multilateral negotiations within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, for the purpose of establishing a permanent multilateral regime to govern the transfer of conventional arms, particularly transfers to countries:

(1) that engage in persistent violations of human rights, engage in acts of armed aggression in violation of international law, and do not fully participate in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms; and

(2) in regions in which arms transfers would exacerbate regional arms races or international tensions that present a danger to international peace and stability.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—(1) Not later than 6 months after the commencement of the negotiations under subsection (a), and not later than the end of every 6-month period thereafter until an agreement described in subsection (a) is concluded, the President shall report to the appropriate committees of the Congress on the progress made during these negotiations.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering today calls on the President to begin multilateral negotiations for the purpose of establishing a permanent multilateral regime to govern the transfer of conventional arms to countries that engage in persistent violations of human rights, engage in acts of armed aggression, do not fully participate in the United Nations Register of Conventional, and countries in regions in which arms transfers would exacerbate regional arms races or international tensions.

As the United States and its allies work to expand the community of democratic nations and prevent the spread of violence and ethnic conflict, we must give higher priority to consideration of how conventional arms transfers may work to undermine these important objectives. It is simply not in our interest to allow weapons to flow freely into countries who abuse the rights of their citizens or who are engaged in conflict or destabilizing arms races.

International restraint in arms exports is important to U.S. national security interests, as well as for the furtherance of democracy and human rights. The June 1996 ''Report of the Presidential Advisory Board on Arms Proliferation Policy'' concluded that U.S. and international security are threatened by the proliferation of advanced conventional weapons. According to the Report, ''The world struggles today with the implications of advanced conventional weapons. It will in the future be confronted with yet another generation of weapons, whose destructive power, size, cost, and availability can raise many more problems even than their predecessors today. These challenges will require a new culture among nations, one that accepts increased responsibility for control and restraint, despite short-term economic and political factors pulling in other directions.'' An international Code of Conduct is a step toward that new culture.

The United States is far-and-away the world's biggest arms merchant, and we must lead the way for the rest of the world in addressing this issue. But we cannot do it alone. A unilateral decision by the United States to limit conventional arms transfers would be an important signal of our commitment to this issue, but it would not stop the flow of weapons into the countries about whom we are most concerned. We should be under no illusion about the ability or willingness of other arms-producing nations to rush in and fill any gap we might create. This amendment will require the President to expand international efforts to curb worldwide arms sales through the United Nations and other fora, such as the Wassenaar Agreement, and to report to the Congress on progress made during these negotiations.

The United States should lead the way to establishing a multilateral regime to prevent nations that ignore the rights of their citizens or bully their neighbors from obtaining the weapons that support these nefarious activities. This legislation can be the vehicle to accomplish this important objective. I thank the managers of this bill for accepting my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1168

Purpose: To restrict U.S. aid to Cambodia

On page 13, strike lines 2 through the colon on line 14, and insert in lieu the following:

''None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for activities or programs for the Central Government of Cambodia until the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Government of Cambodia has established a tribunal consistent with the requirements of international law and justice including the participation of international jurists and prosecutors for the trial of those who committed genocide or crimes against humanity and that the Government of Cambodia is making significant progress in establishing an independent and accountable judicial system, a professional military subordinate to civilian control, and a neutral and accountable police force:''

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the pending bill prohibits the Administration from providing aid to the central government of Cambodia pending certification by the Secretary of State that Cambodia has held free and fair elections, that the Central Election Commission was comprised of representatives from all parties, and that the Cambodian government has established an international panel of jurists to try individuals who have committed genocide against the Cambodian people.

I share the Committee's view that aid can be a source of leverage in dealing with the new Cambodian government, and I agree that we should use our aid to encourage the Cambodian government to establish a credible, internationally acceptable genocide tribunal. However, I do not believe that the conditions in the bill provide us with effective leverage because they are outdated and irrelevant to the realities on the ground in Cambodia today.

All of us who are involved with Cambodia recognize full well that the elections held last July in Cambodia were a mixed bag at best. The process leading up to the elections had flaws. The elections themselves were quite successful in terms of large voter turnout, lack of intimidation, international monitoring, and lack of violence. But they were less than perfect.

Cambodians know this, but they have moved on. They have formed a new coalition government with what appears to be a workable power sharing arrangement between the two major parties. They have an effective opposition party. The Khmer Rouge is no longer a military or political player, looming as a threat to the new government. The climate of political intimidation and violence that has so often characterized Cambodia is no longer prevalent.

The new Cambodian government has put forth a policy platform which, if implemented, would enable Cambodia to make real strides toward the establishment of democratic institutions and processes.

In light of these realities, it makes no sense to put restrictions on our aid that simply cut off the aid and prevent us from using US aid as an incentive to move the Cambodian government to deal with the serious problems that are on the table now—building an independent judiciary, reforming the military and the policy so that they are professional, neutral and accountable, providing health care and schooling, and tackling the overwhelming problem of poverty.

The amendment that I am offering with Senator MCCAIN replaces the conditions in the bill with new conditions designed to promote the building of democratic institutions and to encourage the Cambodian government to establish a tribunal consistent with the requirements of international law and justice to try those guilty of genocide and crimes against humanity.

Specifically, this amendment prohibits aid to the central government pending a certification by the Secretary of State that Cambodia is making significant progress in establishing an independent and accountable judicial system, a professional military subordinate to civilian control, and a neutral and accountable police force. The amendment also requires the Secretary to certify that the Cambodian government has established a tribunal consistent with the requirements of international law and justice and including the participation of international jurists and prosecutors for the trial of those who committed genocide or crimes against humanity.

Let me say a word about the condition related to the tribunal. When I was in Cambodia in April, I had extensive discussions with Prime Minister Hun Sen, National Assembly Chairman Prince Ranarridh, King Sihanouk, and others about the issues related to the constitution of a genocide tribunal. While the Prime Minister insisted that the tribunal be in Cambodia, he agreed with my proposal that international judges, prosecutors and investigators actively participate in the process. He also indicated that he would support changes in Cambodian law to allow these individuals to actively operate within the Cambodian judicial system. Prince Ranariddh and King Sihanouk also were supportive of this concept.

I believe that this kind of tribunal, with meaningful international participation, could provide a credible and accountable process, consistent with international law and standards, for trying those who committed genocide and crimes against humanity. The carrot of US aid can serve as an important incentive for the Cambodian government to follow through on this process.

Mr. President, I believe this is a good amendment and I thank the managers for accepting it.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to join with Senator KERRY in offering an amendment to the foreign operations appropriations bill that would replace language currently in the bill pertaining to Cambodia with language that I firmly believe will prove far more productive in accomplishing our goals in that strife-torn nation. The amendment would replace the current prohibition on assistance pending unrealistic and counterproductive certifications with attainable goals consistent with the positive developments that have occurred in Cambodia since its elections last July.

Few countries in the entire world have experienced the scale of suffering since the Second World War that was inflicted upon the people of Cambodia between 1975 and 1979. A phrase that has become a part of our normal lexicon in discussions of tragedies of great proportion in foreign countries originated in descriptions of the killing fields of Cambodia. What transpired in that country during the rule of the Khmer Rouge defies comprehension. It is a history, however, that must not be forgotten.

After decades of struggling with political events in Cambodia, we have an opportunity to finally help it move in a positive direction. We have an opportunity to help the people of that beautiful nation to begin to put their painful past behind them, and to join the community of nations in good standing. We cannot accomplish that objective, however, with the language currently in the bill before us today. That language prohibits all direct U.S. assistance to the central government of Cambodia until the Secretary of State certifies that the July 1998 elections were free and fair, with emphasis on the period leading up to election day.

Few would argue that numerous irregularities occurred in the months leading up to the election of July 26, 1998. I wish that had not been the case. But those irregularities took place, and we cannot change the past. The question, however, becomes where we go from here. The election itself was, by and large, a free and fair election, and it is unlikely that the pre-election irregularities fundamentally altered its outcome. Since the election, the main competing factions have agreed at an amicable arrangement, and Cambodia today stands its best chance of making significant political and economic progress. A U.S. role, which is currently limited to support of nongovernmental organizations anyway, can be instrumental in facilitating greater levels of liberalization. The Central Government of Cambodia shows every sign of wanting to move in that direction. That is why the language in this bill is so troubling. It fails to account for a far more positive political atmosphere in Cambodia than has existed in decades.

We can help Cambodia to move forward, or we can stand aside and see an opportunity to act productively in Southeast Asia squandered. I am under no illusions about the scale of problems that continue to plague that troubled nation. The government of Phnom Penh must move forward on the issue of establishing an international tribunal for the prosecution of Khmer Rouge officials, it must continue to address pressing issues like deforestation, and it must carry out needed political and economic reforms. But we must not let an important opportunity to help such reforms move forward by restricting aid unless the State Department certifies to something all parties know cannot be certified. We can predicate our policy toward Cambodia on the past, or we can remember the past but look to the future. The Kerry-McCain amendment provides an opportunity to do the latter. I urge its support.

AMENDMENT 1173

At the appropriate place, insert the following section:

SEC. . EXPANDED THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the programs contained in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative are vital to the national security of the United States and that funding for those programs should be restored in conference to the levels requested in the President's budget.

AMENDMENT 1174

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING U.S. COMMITMENTS UNDER THE U.S.-NORTH KOREAN AGREED FRAMEWORK.—It is the Sense of the Senate that, as long as North Korea meets its obligations under the U.S.-North Korean nuclear Agreed Framework of 1994, the U.S. should meet its commitments under the Agreed Framework, including required deliveries of heavy fuel oil to North Korea and support of the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the foreign operations appropriations bill being considered by the Senate. There is one area of this bill that I believe deserves particular attention, and that is the series of provisions relating to U.S. funding for the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, or KEDO. This is the organization that is implementing certain provisions of the U.S.-North Korean nuclear Agreed Framework of 1994. U.S. funds for KEDO pay for the heavy fuel oil that the U.S. is committed to provide to North Korea in exchange for its agreement to freeze and eventually dismantle its plutonium production program that could be used for nuclear weapons.

Mr. President, that Agreed Framework is working in our national security interests now. Under that agreement, North Korea has frozen its plutonium production facilities and canned almost all of the spent nuclear reactor fuel from its graphite-moderated reactor in Yongbyon, all under the watchful eye of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) personnel and monitoring instruments.

As recent Secretaries of Defense and Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

have repeatedly and consistently testified to Congress, it is clearly in our security interest that North Korea not produced any more plutonium and that its spend reactor fuel be canned and removed from North Korea. In addition, it is important for North Korea to account for all its past plutonium production to the satisfaction of the IAEA. If, and only if, North Korea satisfies all those requirements of the Agreed Framework, then KEDO, will provide two lightwater nuclear power production reactors to North Korea, with South Korea and Japan paying the overwhelming majority of the cost of those reactors.

The U.S. is required to provide heavy fuel oil to North Korea on an agreed schedule, and we have had a spotty record so far, largely because of Congressional funding reductions and restrictions. But we have managed to deliver the required oil, albeit sometimes late.

This bill would reduce the Administration's funding request for heavy fuel oil from $55 million to $40 million dollars, a decrease of $15 million. This reduction would prevent the U.S. from purchasing and delivering the required heavy fuel oil to North Korea. In my view, what would be a serious mistake.

If we do not provide the required heavy fuel oil under the Agreed Framework, we would be failing to meet our commitments under the Agreed Framework. This would provide North Korea with a ready-made excuse to withdraw from or violate the Agreed Framework, something we should all recognize would be contrary to our national interests and bad for U.S. security.

As long as North Korea meets its obligations under the Agreed Framework, we should meet our commitments and obligations under the Agreed Framework, including providing the funds necessary to deliver all the required heavy fuel oil to North Korea.

Mr. President, this bill also places unnecessary and unworkable restrictions on the obligation of the $40 million that is provided for KEDO. These are contained in certifications required before the funds can be obligated. Two of these certifications go beyond the terms of the Agreed Framework and would make it very hard for the U.S. to provide funds to KEDO, unless the President uses a waiver.

I believe it is important that we work in good faith to keep North Korea in compliance with its obligations under the Agreed Framework, and that includes our obligation to provide the necessary funds to deliver the required heavy fuel oil to North Korea.

When the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee members met recently with Former Defense Secretary William Perry, the President's Special Advisor on North Korea, one of my colleagues asked Dr. Perry what Congress could do to help move North Korea in a more peaceful and cooperative direction. Dr. Perry indicated that the most important Congressional action would be to provide full funding for KEDO. I believe Dr. Perry is correct.

Mr. President, for these reasons I offer an amendment to the bill that states the sense of the Senate that, ''as long as North Korea meets its obligations under the U.S.-North Korean nuclear Agreed Framework of 1994, the U.S. should meet its commitments under the Agreed Framework, including required deliveries of heavy fuel oil to North Korea and support of the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO).''

This amendment puts the Senate on record as stating its view that the United States should meet its commitments under the Agreed Framework, including the heavy fuel oil and KEDO commitments.

Mr. President, I believe this amendment improves the bill and makes it clear that the Senate wants the U.S. to uphold its end of the Agreed Framework, and I hope that the bill's provisions relating to KEDO can be modified in conference and that the Administration's requested funding will be restored in conference, to reflect the view of the Senate as expressed in my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1175

(Purpose: To provide Tibetan refugee relief)

On page 17, line 10, before the period insert the following:

''That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $1.5 million shall be made available to Habitat for Humanity International for the purchase of 14 acres of land on behalf of Tibetan refugees living in northern India, and the construction of multi-unit development.''

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment that would provide Habitat for Humanity $1.5 million for construction of a multi-unit development for Tibetan refugees living in Northern India.

These refugees were forcibly driven from their homes by the Chinese communists. They are living in the Dehradun area and are among the poorest people on earth. They are without citizenship rights and cannot own land. As such, they exist as squatters in burned out homes and shacks remaining after the Hindu-Moslem conflicts of a few years ago. The conditions are deplorable; soaking wet in the monsoon season and freezing in the winter.

Many Americans are aware of the plight of these Tibetan refugees and have started taking actions to help them. The Dalai Lama is a full partner in this project and has put the full weight of his friends and government behind this.

This money will fund a plan to purchase 14 acres of land on behalf of the Tibetans and provide for the construction of a multi-unit development for 160 of the poorest families. An American architect has volunteered his time to visit the site, direct the preliminary clearing, and draw the plans for the village.

General Mick Kicklighter, U.S. Army, Ret., serves as President of Habitat for Humanity International and will oversee the direction of resources for this project. The President of the Arundel County, Maryland, Habitat for Humanity affiliate is working to lay out detailed building time and cost management for the village. The property has been obtained, building permits secured and the land has been cleared by the hand effort of the refugees.

I ask my colleagues to join me and the cosponsors to this amendment to support funding in the amount of $1.5 million to directed to Habitat for Humanity International for completion of this project. The creation of this village with U.S. assistance will serve as a model for the international aid community. I firmly believe that the impact of this modest sum will be felt globally.

AMENDMENT NO. 1176

On page 33, line 6, before the colon, insert the following: '', of which no less than $1,000,000 shall be available for the Defense Institute of International Studies to enhance its mission, functioning and performance by providing for its fixed costs of operation''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1177

At the appropriate place, insert:

It is the sense of the Senate that:

The Senate finds, that: The proposed programs under the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI) are critical and essential to preserving U.S. national security.

The Department of State programs under the ETRI be funded at or near the full request of $250 million in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2000 prior to final passage.

Mr. McCONNELL. These amendments have been cleared on both sides, and I ask they be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1125, 1146, 1150, 1151, 1158, 1162, 1163, 1167, 1168, and 1173 through 1177) were agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1159 AND 1170 THROUGH 1172, EN BLOC, AS MODIFIED

Mr. McCONNELL. I send the following modifications to amendments that are at the desk:

No. 1159, Senator LANDRIEU on orphans; No. 1170, Senator BROWNBACK, the Sudan; No. 1171, Senator DEWINE on Colombia; and No. 1172, Senator REID on Iraq.

The amendment (No. 1170), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ___. INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds made available under chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international disaster assistance) for fiscal year 2000, up to $4,000,000

should be made available for rehabilitation and economic recovery in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan. Such funds are to be used to improve economic governance, primary education, agriculture, and other locally-determined priorities. Such funds are to be programmed and implemented jointly by the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture, and may be utilized for activities which can be implemented for a period of up to two years.

SEC. ___. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR SUDANESE INDIGENOUS GROUPS.

The President, acting through the appropriate Federal agencies, is authorized to provide humanitarian assistance, including food, directly to the National Democratic Alliance participants and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement operating outside of the Operation Lifeline Sudan structure.

SEC. ___. DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.

(a) INCREASE IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—The President, acting through the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to increase substantially the amount of development assistance for capacity building, democracy promotion, civil administration, judiciary, and infrastructure support in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORT.—The President shall submit a report on a quarterly basis to the Congress on progress made in carrying out subsection (a).

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment that has been cleared, I understand, by both sides. I would like to submit into the RECORD a clarification regarding the distribution of humanitarian assistance, including food, directly to the National Democratic Alliance participants operating outside of the Operation Lifeline Sudan structure. Namely, the intent and expectation of the Senate through this language is for the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement to be a recipient as a leading member participant in the National Democratic Alliance.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, it is important to view this amendment in the greater context of the current humanitarian situation in southern Sudan.

The situation is dire, to say the least: the famine of last year took the lives of hundreds of thousands as flights of relief were banned by Khartoum from large areas outside their control, an act which triggered famine and starvation. The regime in Khartoum is allowed to halt U.N. relief flights at will because of the terms of the 1989 agreement which establish Operation Lifeline Sudan—the U.N. relief organization. As I noted in an op-ed in The Washington Post on July 19, 1998, the ''practice starves combatants and noncombatants alike and compromises the integrity and effectiveness of relief groups desperately trying to fend off famine.''

I ask unanimous consent that op-ed be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 1998]

SUDAN'S MERCILESS WAR ON ITS OWN PEOPLE

(By Bill Frist)

When the United Nations World Food Program announced last week that up to 2.6 million people in southern Sudan are in imminent danger of starvation, the news was received with surprising nonchalance. Such news is becoming almost routine from misery-plagued East Africa, but what is unfolding in southern Sudan is at least the fourth widespread, large-scale humanitarian disaster in the region in the past 15 years.

In all cases, the United States' record is not one of success. Ethiopia in 1984, a disastrous military involvement in Somalia in 1993 and shameful neglect in Rwanda in 1994 have left the public bitter toward the prospect of yet more involvement. But again, as famine hovers over the region, we face a disconcertingly similar quandary on the nature of our response.

In January I worked in southern Sudan as a medical missionary, and I have seen firsthand the terrible effects of the continuing civil war and how that war came to help create this situation. As a United States senator, however, I fear that by failing to make necessary changes in our response, American policy toward Sudan may be a contributing factor in the horrendous prospect of widespread starvation.

The radical Islamic regime in Khartoum is unmatched in its barbarity toward the sub-Saharan or ''black African'' Christians of the country's South. It is largely responsible for creating this impending disaster through a concerted and sustained war on its own people, in which calculated starvation, bombing of hospitals, slavery and the killing of innocent women and children are standard procedure.

Our policy toward Khartoum looks tough on paper, but it has yet to pose a serious challenge to the Islamic dictatorship. Neither has our wavering and inconsistent commitment to sanctions affected its behavior or its ability to finance the war.

Khartoum is set to gain billions of dollars in oil revenues from fields it is preparing to exploit in areas of rebel activity. The U.S. sanctions prohibit any American investment, but recent evidence indicates that enforcement is lax. Additionally, relief groups operating there report that new weapons are flowing in as part of a deal with one of the partners—a government-owned petroleum company in China.

It is our policy toward southern Sudan that is of more immediate importance to the potential humanitarian disaster. From my own experience operating in areas where U.S. government relief is rarely distributed, I fear that both unilaterally and as a member of the United Nations, the United States unnecessarily restricts our own policy in odd deference to the regime in Khartoum.

In southern Sudan our humanitarian relief contributions to the starving are largely funneled through nongovernmental relief organizations that participate in Operation Lifeline Sudan. All of our contributions to the United Nations efforts are distributed through this flawed deal.

In this political arrangement the Khartoum regime has veto power over all decisions as to where food can be sent. That which is needed in the areas outside their control is often used as an instrument of war, with Khartoum routinely denying permission for a flight to land in an area of rebel activity, especially during times when international attention lacks its current focus. This practice starves combatants and noncombatants alike and compromises the integrity and effectiveness of relief groups desperately trying to fend off famine.

Despite associated risks, some relief groups operate successfully outside the arrangement's umbrella, getting good and medicine to areas that the regime in Khartoum would rather see starve. Out of concern that the Khartoum regime would be provoked into prohibiting all relief deliveries under the scheme, the U.S. Agency for International Development and its Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance do not regularly funnel famine relief through outside organizations, and thus our relief supplies are only selectively distributed—a decision that unnecessarily abets Khartoum's agenda.

The U.S. policy in Sudan does not seek an immediate rebel victory and the fragmenting of Sudan that could follow. Because the splintered rebel groups could not provide a functioning government or civil society at this time, that policy cannot be thrown out wholesale. Yet our failure to separate this policy from the action necessary to save these people from starvation result in absurdity.

Thus even while generously increasing the amount of aid, for political reasons we seek the permission of the ''host government'' in Khartoum to distribute it and feed the very people they are attempting to kill through starvation and war. A second reason for this posture is, presumably, a fear that even modest, calculated food aid would allow the rebels to mobilize instead of foraging for their families—a factor that could turn the outcome on the battlefield in their favor.

The prospect of widespread starvation in southern Sudan does not necessitate that the United States seek a quick solution on the battlefield. Military victory and an end to hostilities are not a substitute for food. However, the administration should make an immediate and necessary distinction between the policy principle and the humanitarian challenge. It should articulate a response without political limitations, which, frankly, are trivial in comparison to the human lives at stake, and it should press the United Nations to do the same.

We can no longer afford to dance around the issues of sovereignty and political principles while restraining our response to a looming disaster that Khartoum helped create. Such academic debates and diplomatic concerns are for the well fed, but offer no solace to the starving.

Mr. FRIST. The Government of Sudan continues to prosecute the war against the south, including the bombing of hospitals and churches, and a campaign of terror, including slavery. Nearly 2 million have died since 1983, with over 4 million displaced from their homes.

In January of last year, I worked in southern Sudan as a medical missionary, in areas outside of government control, and in ''hospitals'' and clinics where I treated people who had never seen a doctor. What I saw was the product of an indiscriminate and savage war.

Since that time I have worked with other Senators, relief organizations, and the administration in trying to make our humanitarian policy as effective as it possibly can be. It must be a policy which does more than meet the immediate food needs of those who hover on the brink of starvation. It must be a policy which seeks to eliminate the root causes. The inability of the populations in areas outside of the control of the Government of Sudan to protect themselves is at the root of

their vulnerability to starvation and famine.

That is not a politically or logistically easy task. It does not have a single solution which can simply be enacted. It requires that we constantly push the policy to adapt and become more effective, rather than simply become an amount for which we simply write a check each fiscal year. This amendment does not represent the solution to the root causes of the human tragedy in Sudan, but it is one critical piece which we must consider.

The authorization in this amendment will open this issue and place it at the top of the list of issues which we continue to work through with the administration. That process of Congress and the administration jointly working on a more effective Sudan policy has had its moments of disagreement, but it has been largely productive and one where our shared goals have never been compromised.

Additionally, it is worth noting that, beyond the traditional chiefdoms, the groups designated in this amendment are really the only organizations functioning in areas outside of the control of the government of Sudan. As a consequence, these are the only organizations which are defending these populations against the heinous attacks by the Government of Sudan and, increasingly, by irregular or paramilitary organizations sponsored by Khartoum—including slaving parties.

The more than 1 million dollars' worth of relief distributed in Sudan on a daily basis is done so in such a way that it is purposefully steered away from combatants. From the relief organizations' view point, that is essential to maintain some level of insulation from the political aspects of the war. They see themselves as strictly humanitarian organizations.

However, from a practical standpoint, that practice has an unintended, but not surprising consequence. Because the members of the resistance groups have to eat too—for they suffer from starvation as much as women and children—they regularly divert food donations to their own use.

Possibly more important than that is the effect on these organizations themselves and their ability to provide protection for the populations they defend. Because their food supply is erratic and dependent on diversions of other aid, they are often forced to demobilize to either collect food on their own, to steal food, or to leave to plant their crops. The practical effect of that is that they cannot stay mobilized and cannot provide any reliable or cohesive defense.

It is important to remember then that this amendment should not be seen as a reward to the resistance groups. Yet I remind my colleagues that they are the only line of defense between those people and the regime in Khartoum which seeks to subdue or exterminate them in a sustained effort of low-level ethnic cleansing.

The timing of presenting this authority to the President is critically important. The government of Sudan is poised to begin receiving billions of dollars in hard currency from the sale of newly exploited oil in contested areas. The regime in Khartoum has repeatedly and publically said their intention is to convert that hard currency straight into an renewed effort to subdue or eradicate the people in areas outside their control. The ability of the resistance groups to stay mobilized and coherent is arguably more important now than since the beginning of the war. A predictable supply of food is the key to realizing that defense. Again, more so than the weapons Khartoum is purchasing or receiving from the outside world, it is food which most devastating.

Besides the obvious human cost of an ineffective defense against Khartoum and their proxies, is the potential cost to the renewed effort to bring the combatants into an effective peace process. As I noted in a further piece in The Washington Post, we must use all available tools to bring the combatants to the table.

I ask unanimous consent that be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1999]

AN END TO THE SUDAN TRAGEDY

(By Bill Frist)

The Post's May 7 editorial ''Sudan: The Unending War'' brought to light two critical points about that barbaric war of ''ethnic cleansing.'' One is that our actions in Kosovo emphasize our failure to act in the much larger war in Sudan. Without Kosovo, the war in Sudan would continue in obscurity. The other is that it is time for the United States to redouble its efforts toward bringing the war to a conclusion. As bad as the situation has become and intractable as the conflict may seem, we may have a small chance for peace.

But the United States must redouble its efforts strategically with a realistic understanding of our strengths and limitations. What may seem like minor differences among our options actually can represent fundamental differences between success and failure. The appointment of a special envoy may bring needed attention and diplomatic weight to that effort, but it would represent neither a clear understanding of our limitations nor a strategy that can maximize our effectiveness.

A strategy that does so requires three basic steps in the coming months:

We must recognize the conflict for what it is: a calculated and sustained effort by the regime in Khartoum to subdue, eradicate or forcibly convert to Islam large segments of their own population. The fact that it is not exclusively a Muslim against Christian or Arab against black African war must not distract us from its barbarity. Even without a clear ''good guy,'' the war is indiscriminate and patently evil. As the editorial pointed out, it already has claimed more lives than the wars in Bosnia, Kosovo, Chechnya and Somalia combined.

We must conduct our relief operations so they address the roots of the humanitarian disaster, not just the symptoms. We must continue to change our operations so they do not inadvertently abet the agenda of Khartoum by allowing the government to use our food donations as a weapon—as it dose with its calculated denial of access to relief flights that carry out contributions through the United Nations.

We also must change the nature of our generous contributions, moving away from simply food, literally falling from the sky into starving villages, to one where we seek to help establish the most basic civil and economic institutions in the areas outside the government's control. It is the near absence of those institutions in some areas that prevents the Sudanese from sustaining themselves. I plan to introduce legislation that will address those shortcomings, both in our own programs and in the United Nations. Congress can urge the president to continue implementing those changes, but we also must be prepared to support him fully as he does.

We must work harder to reinvigorate the existing multilateral peace process and bring significant pressure to bear on the warring parties and supporters to come to the peace table. Khartoum uses seductive diversions—''confessions'' of war-weariness and other hints that a ''breakthrough'' is at hand—to avoid a process in which it would actually have to produce results.

The rebels continue to be fractious on their endgame. A strong peace process based on an airtight list of principles and measures of success can encourage both to deliver tangible results. A special envoy alone, secret ''diplomatic missions'' or any other effort that does not bring the combatants and their supporters to the table cannot provide three essential elements: the elimination of a scapegoat for a failed process, sustained pressure on all parties to show progress and a healthy dose of embarrassment for the world regarding the situation.

The tragedy of Sudan has been perpetuated by shameful, worldwide neglect and a stunning lack of resolve. Until Khartoum succeeds in its goal of ethnic cleansing, the war will never go away on its own. Short of military intervention or comprehensive U.N. sanctions, for which there is no political will, a coherent, cooperative and realistic strategy offers the best chance for progress—albeit 16 years late.

Mr. FRIST. The most important tool to bring them to the table is to continue to highlight the fact that neither side will win this war outright on the battlefield. If Khartoum believes they can not win the war on the battlefield because of their new found source of hard currency, they have absolutely no reason to come to the table and work for real peace. Short of military intervention on our own, the best way we can disabuse them of that notion and continue to press them to commit to a peace process is to clearly eliminate the greatest weaknesses which they will exploit. The greatest weakness is not so much the southern Sudanese's vulnerability to attack, but their inability to defend. That inability is not caused by a lack of weaponry, but a lack of calories.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes amendments Nos. 1159, 1171 and 1172, as modified, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1159, AS MODIFIED

On page 21, line 22, before the period insert the following: ''*Provided further;* That of the

amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available for grants to nongovernmental organization that work with orphans who are transitioning out of institutions to teach life skills and job skills''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1171, AS MODIFIED

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COLOMBIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Colombia is a democratic country fighting multiple wars:

(A) a war against the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC);

(B) a war against the National Liberation Army (ELN);

(C) a war against paramilitary organizations; and

(C) a war against drug lords who traffic in deadly cocaine and heroin.

(3)Colombia is the world's third most dangerous country in terms of political violence with 34 percent of world terrorist acts committed there.

(4) Colombia is the world's kidnaping capital of the world with 2,609 kidnapings reported in 1998 and 513 reported in the first three months of 1999.

(5) In 1998 alone, 308,000 Colombians were internally displaced in Colombia. Over the last decade, 35,000 Colombians have been killed.

(6) The FARC and ELN are the two main guerrilla groups which have waged the longest-running anti-government insurgency in Latin America.

(7) The Colombian rebels have a combined strength of 10,00 to 20,000 full-time guerrillas; they have initiated armed action in nearly 700 of the country's 1073 municipalities, and control or influence roughly 60 percent of rural Colombia including a demilitarized zone using their armed stranglehold to abuse Colombian citizens.

(8) Although the Colombian Army has 122,000 soldiers, there are roughly only 20,000 soldiers available for offensive combat operations.

(9) Colombia faces the threat of the armed paramilitaries, 5,000 strong, who are constantly driving a wedge in the peace process by their insistence in participating in the peace talks.

(10) More than 75 percent of the world's cocaine HCL and 75 percent of the heroin seized in the northeast United States is of Colombian origin.

(11) The conflicts in Colombia are creating spillovers to the border countries of Venezuela, Panama and Equador: Venezuela has sent 30,000 troops to its border the Ecuador is sending 10,000 troops to its border.

(12) Venezuela is our number one supplier of oil.

(13) By the end of 1999, all U.S. military troops will have departed from Panama, leaving the Panama Canal unprotected.

(14) In 1998, two-way trade between the United States and Colombia was more than $11 billion, making the United States Colombia's number one trading partner and Colombia the fifth largest market for U.S. exports in the region.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should recognize the crisis in Colombia and play a more pro-active role in its resolution;

(2) the United States should mobilize the international community to pro-actively engaged in resolving Colombian wars; and

(3) pledge or political support to help Colombia with the peace process.

AMENDMENT NO. 1172, AS MODIFIED

At the appropriate place, add the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that the President and the Secretary of State should—

(1) raise the need for accountability of Saddam Hussein and several key members of his regime at the International Criminal Court Preparatory Commission, which will meet in New York on July 26, 1999, through August 13, 1999;

(2) continue to push for the creation of a commission under the auspices of the United Nations to establish an international record of the criminal culpability of Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi officials;

(3) continue to push for the United Nations to form an international criminal tribunal for the purpose of indicting, prosecuting, and imprisoning Saddam Hussein and any other Iraqi officials who may be found responsible for crimes against humanity, genocide, and other violations of international humanitarian law; and

(4) upon the creation of a commission and international criminal tribunal, take steps necessary, including the reprogramming of funds, to ensure United States support for efforts to bring Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi officials to justice.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments, as modified, be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc, as modified.

The amendments (Nos. 1159, and 1171 and 1172) as modified, were agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. MCCONNELL. There are six amendments at the desk that will not be proposed. I ask unanimous consent the following amendments not be proposed:

No. 1120, Senator BROWNBACK on the Sudan; No. 1147, Senator BROWNBACK on the Sudan; No. 1149, Senator GRASSLEY on narcotics; No. 1156, Senator BIDEN on Iraq; No. 1169, Senator KERRY of Massachusetts, code of conduct; No. 1155, Senator BIDEN on Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We approved earlier in the day 19 amendments in the managers' package. We just approved 18 more from a list compiled at 1 p.m., the deadline for getting amendments to the desk.

There are 5 more amendments we withdrew that will not be offered. That leaves 12 amendments, I say to my friend from Vermont, that remain to be addressed.

We are working on paring that list down further.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I call up an amendment at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has two amendments?

Mr. DODD. One amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1157

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], for himself and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 1157.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill at the following new section:

SEC. . TERMINATION OF PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL TO CUBA.

(a) TRAVEL TO CUBA.—

(1) FREEDOM OF TRAVEL FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LEGAL RESIDENTS.—Subject to subsection (b), the President shall not regulate or prohibit, directly or indirectly, travel to or from Cuba by United States citizens or legal residents, or any of the transactions incident to such travel that are set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSACTIONS INCIDENT TO TRAVEL.—The transactions referred paragraph (1) are—

(A) any transaction ordinarily incident to travel to or from Cuba, including the importation into Cuba or the United States of accompanied baggage for personal use only:

(B) any transaction ordinarily incident to travel or maintenance within Cuba, including the payment of living expenses and the acquisition of goods or services for personal use;

(C) any transaction ordinarily incident to the arrangement, promotion, or facilitation of travel to, from, or within Cuba;

(D) any transaction incident to non-scheduled air, sea, or land voyages, except that this subparagraph does not authorize the carriage of articles into Cuba or the United States except accompanied baggage; and

(E) any normal banking transaction incident to any activity described in any of the preceding subparagraphs, including the issuance, clearing, processing, or payment of checks, drafts, travelers checks, credit or debit card instruments, or similar instruments; except that this paragraph does not authorize the importation into the United States of any goods for personal consumption acquired in Cuba.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The restrictions on authority contained in subsection (a)(1) do not apply in a case in which—

(1) the United States is at war with Cuba; or

(2) armed hostilities between the two countries are in progress.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to actions taken by the President before the date of the enactment of this Act which are in effect on such date, and to action taken on or after such date.

(d) SUPERSEDES OTHER PROVISIONS.—This section supersedes any other provision of law, including section 102(h) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996.

AMENDMENT NO. 1182 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1157

(Purpose: To terminate prohibitions and restrictions on travel to Cuba)

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the second degree and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] proposes an amendment numbered 1182 to amendment No. 1157.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike everything after ''SEC_____.'' and insert in lieu thereof the following:

RELAXATION OF RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL BY AMERICAN CITIZENS TO CUBA.

(a) TRAVEL TO CUBA.—

(1) FREEDOM OF TRAVEL FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LEGAL RESIDENTS.—Subject to subsection (b), the President shall not regulate or prohibit, directly or indirectly, travel to or from Cuba by United States citizens or legal residents, or any of the transactions incident to such travel that are set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSACTIONS INCIDENT TO TRAVEL.—The transactions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) any transaction ordinarily incident to travel to or from Cuba, including the importation into Cuba or the United States of accompanied baggage for personal use only;

(B) any transaction ordinarily incident to travel or maintenance within Cuba, including the payment of living expenses and the acquisition of goods or services for personal use;

(C) any transaction ordinarily incident to the arrangement, promotion, or facilitation of travel to, from, or within Cuba;

(D) any transaction incident to nonscheduled air, sea, or land voyages, except that this subparagraph does not authorize the carriage of articles into Cuba or the United States except accompanied baggage; and

(E) any normal banking transaction incident to any activity described in any of the preceding subparagraphs, including the issuance, clearing, processing, or payment of checks, drafts, travelers checks, credit or debit card instruments, or similar instruments;

except that this paragraph does not authorize the importation into the United States of any goods for personal consumption acquired in Cuba.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The restrictions on authority contained in subsection (a)(1) do not apply in a case in which—

(1) the United States is at war with Cuba;

(2) armed hostilities between the two countries are in progress; or

(3) there is imminent danger to the public health or the physical safety of United States travelers.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to actions taken by the President before the date of the enactment of this Act which are in effect on such date, and to actions taken on or after such date.

(d) SUPERSEDES OTHER PROVISIONS.—This section supersedes any other provision of law, including section 102(h) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Dodd amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to it being in order to request the yeas and nays on the first-degree amendment?

Mr. DODD. On the Dodd amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. LEAHY. 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.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, as I understand it, the second-degree amendment is what is pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second on the second-degree amendment? There is not.

Mr. LOTT. 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.

Mr. LOTT. 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. LOTT. I believe the Senator would like to renew his request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LEAHY. I renew the request on the second-degree amendment, Mr. President. 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 Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Vermont for his second-degree proposal. We will take a very short amount of time. It is not our intention to spend a great deal of time on this particular proposal. We have proposed the pending amendments because we believe the time has come to lift the very archaic, counterproductive, and ill-conceived ban on Americans traveling to Cuba. Not only does this ban hinder rather than help our effort to spread democracy, it unnecessarily abridges the rights of ordinary Americans.

The United States was founded on the principles of liberty and freedom. Yet when it comes to Cuba, our Government abridges these rights with no greater rationale than political and rhetorical gain.

Cuba lies just 90 miles from America's shore. Yet those 90 miles of water might as well be an entire ocean. We have made a land ripe for American influence forbidden territory. In doing so, we have enabled Fidel Castro's regime to hold onto power longer and contributed to the continued oppression of the Cuban people.

Surely we do not ban travel to Cuba out of concern for the safety of Americans who might visit that island nation. Today Americans are free to travel to Iran, Sudan, Burma, Yugoslavia, North Korea—but not to Cuba. You can fly to North Korea; you can fly to Iran; you can travel freely. Yet it seems to me if you can go to those countries, you ought not be denied the right to go to Cuba. If the Cubans want to stop Americans from visiting that country, that ought to be their business. But to say to an American citizen that you can travel to Iran, where they held hostages for months on end, to North Korea, which has declared us to be an enemy of theirs completely, but not to travel 90 miles off our shore to Cuba I think is a mistake.

To this day, some Iranian politicians believe the United States to be ''the Great Satan.'' We hear it all the time. Just two decades ago, Iran occupied our Embassy and took innocent American diplomats hostage. To this day, protesters in Tehran burn the American flag with the encouragement of the members of their Government. Those few Americans who venture into such inhospitable surroundings often find themselves pelted by rocks and accosted by the public.

Similarly, we do not ban travel to Sudan, a nation we attacked with cruise missiles last summer for its support of terrorism; to Burma, a nation with one of the most oppressive regimes in the world today; to North Korea, whose soldiers have peered at American servicemen through gun sights for decades; or Syria, which has one of the most egregious human rights records and is one of the foremost sponsors of terrorism.

I can go to Iran, but I cannot go to Cuba. There is an inconsistency here that I think we ought to undo. We ban travel to Cuba, a nation which is neither at war with the United States nor a sponsor of terrorism. I fail to see how isolating the Cuban people from democratic values and ideals will foster the transition to democracy in that country.

I fail to see how isolating the Cuban people from democratic values and from the influence of Americans when they go to that country to help bring about the change we all seek serves our own interests.

Before I go on, let me be perfectly clear: I strongly support effective measures to bring democratic values and rule to all people, including Cuba. No one, certainly not Cubans, should have to live under a dictator's fist. Cubans cannot travel freely to the United States. That is because Fidel Castro does not allow them to do so. Those of us who watched our television screens last night and saw those Cubans trying to escape the dictatorial regime in Cuba, picked up by Cuban boats were horrified by that kind of activity.

Because Fidel Castro does not permit Cubans to leave Cuba and come to this country is not justification for adopting a similar principle in this country

that says Americans cannot travel freely. We have a Bill of Rights. We have fundamental rights that we embrace as American citizens. Travel is one of them. If other countries want to prohibit us from going there, then that is their business. But for us to say that citizens of Connecticut or Alabama cannot go where they like is not the kind of restraint we ought to put on people.

If I can travel to North Korea, if I can travel to the Sudan, if I can travel to Iran, I do not understand the justification for saying I cannot travel to Cuba. I happen to believe that by allowing Americans to travel there, we can begin to have the influence in Cuba that can begin to change the demographics politically to make a difference in bringing about the change we all seek in that country.

Today, every single country in the Western Hemisphere is a democracy, with one exception: Cuba. American influence through person-to-person and cultural exchanges was a prime factor in this evolution from a hemisphere ruled predominantly by authoritarian or military regimes to one where democracy is the rule, with one exception: Cuba.

Our policy toward Cuba blocks these exchanges and prevents the United States from using our most potent weapon in our effort to combat totalitarian regimes, and that is our own people. They are the best ambassadors we have.

Most totalitarian regimes bar Americans from coming into their countries for the very reasons I just mentioned. They are afraid the gospel of freedom will motivate their citizens to overthrow dictators, as they have done in dozens of nations over the last half century. Isn't it ironic that when it comes to Cuba we do the dictator's bidding for him in a sense? Cuba does not have to worry about spreading democracy. Our own Government stops us from doing so.

The current state of regulations governing who can and cannot travel to Cuba is a complex and subjective morass. My colleague, Senator LEAHY, has first-hand experience in attempting to navigate the sea of bureaucracy.

When he attempted to travel to Cuba earlier this year with his wife Marcelle, he discovered that while his travel was exempt from certain licensing requirements, his wife's travel was not. Ultimately, she was able to accompany her husband after applying for a license based on her work as a registered nurse.

The fact is, the entire process is a farce and everyone knows it. Other couples, not a U.S. Senator and his wife, would probably not fare as well in gaining a license to travel to Cuba.

Let me review for my colleagues who may travel to Cuba under current Government regulations and under what circumstances. The following categories of people may travel to Cuba without applying to the Treasury Department for a specific license to travel. They are deemed to be authorized to travel under so-called general license: Government officials, regularly employed journalists, professional researchers who are ''full time professionals who travel to Cuba to conduct professional research in their professional areas,'' Cuban Americans who have relatives in Cuba who are ill but only once a year they can go back.

There are other categories of individuals who theoretically are eligible to travel to Cuba as well, but they must apply for a license from the Department of the Treasury and prove they fit a category in which travel to Cuba is permissible.

What are these categories?

One, freelance journalists, provided they can prove they are journalists; they must also submit their itinerary for the proposed research.

Two, Cuban Americans who are unfortunate enough to have more than one humanitarian emergency in a 12-month period and therefore cannot travel under a general license.

Three, students and faculty from U.S. academic institutions that are accredited by an appropriate national or regional educational accrediting association who are participating in a ''structural education program.''

Four, members of U.S. religious organizations.

Five, individuals participating in public performances, clinics, workshops, athletic and other competitions and exhibitions.

Just because you think you may fall into one of the above enumerated categories does not necessarily mean you will actually be licensed by the U.S. Government to travel to Cuba.

Who decides whether a researcher's work is legitimate? Who decides whether a freelance journalist is really conducting journalistic activities? Who decides whether or not a professor or student is participating in a ''structured educational program''? Who decides whether a religious person is really going to conduct religious activities?

I will tell you who does. Some Government bureaucrats are making those decisions about those personal rights of American citizens.

It is truly unsettling, to put it mildly, when you think about it, and probably unconstitutional at its core. It is a real intrusion on the fundamental rights of American citizens.

It also says something about what we as a Government think about our own people. Do we really believe that a journalist, a Government official, a Senator, a Congressman, a baseball player, a ballerina, a college professor or minister are somehow superior to other citizens who do not fall into those categories; that only these categories of people are ''good examples'' for the Cuban people to observe in order to understand American values?

I do not think so. I find such a notion insulting. There is no better way to communicate America's values and ideals than by unleashing average American men and women to demonstrate by daily living what our great country stands for and the contrasts between what we stand for and what exists in Cuba today.

I do not believe there was ever a sensible rationale for restricting Americans' right to travel to Cuba. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and an end to the cold war, I do not think an excuse remains today to ban this kind of travel.

This argument that dollars and tourism will be used to prop up the regime is specious. The regime seems to have survived 38 years despite the Draconian U.S. embargo during that entire period. The notion that allowing Americans to spend a few dollars in Cuba is somehow going to give major aid and comfort to the Cuban regime is without basis, in my view.

This spring, we got a taste of what people-to-people exchanges between the United States and Cuba might mean when the Baltimore Orioles and the Cuban National Team played a home-and-home series. The game brought players from two nations with the greatest love of baseball together for the first time in generations. It is time to bring the fans together. It is time to let Americans and Cubans meet in the baseball stands and on the streets of Havana.

Political rhetoric is not sufficient reason to abridge the freedoms of American citizens. Nor is it sufficient reason to stand by a law which counteracts one of the basic premises of American foreign policy; namely, the spread of democracy. The time has come to allow Americans—average Americans—to travel freely to Cuba. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Again, I make this point to my colleagues: There are no restrictions on you if you want to travel to the Communist Government of North Korea, to the Communist Government of the People's Republic of China, to the Communist Government of Vietnam, to the terrorist-supported Government of Iran, or to travel to the Sudan. This is a completely uneven standard we are applying in order to satisfy some political rhetoric.

If you really want to create some change in Cuba, then unleash the flood of U.S. citizens going down there and talking to average Cubans on the streets of Havana and Santiago and the small communities. Give the 11 million people in Cuba a chance to interface and interact with American citizens. If Fidel Castro wants to say, ''No, you can't come here,'' let him say that, but let not us do his bidding by saying to average citizens: You cannot go there. That is a denial, in my view, of a fundamental right and freedom, unless there is an overriding national interest which would preclude and prohibit American citizens from traveling to a given country. That case has not been

made. It cannot be made when it comes to Cuba.

Senator LEAHY and I urge the adoption of this amendment to begin to create the change we all want to see on this island nation 90 miles off our shore.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut has stated the arguments so very well. Like he, I have traveled to Cuba. I visited Cuba 3 months ago with the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED.

We were able to go there because we are U.S. Government officials. If we had been private citizens, as the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said, we would have had some problems.

My friend from Connecticut mentioned the problems that my wife Marcelle faced when she went to Cuba. He and I have discussed that because of the absurdity of it.

My wife Marcelle has accompanied me on many foreign trips. We have gone abroad representing our country, at the request of the Senate, at the request of the President; and sometimes we have traveled on our own just to visit friends abroad.

So we did not think there was much of a difference that time. Our passports were in order. We were going to a Caribbean country, having traveled in that area often, so we didn't need any special shots or anything.

We were about to go. But a few days before we were to leave —this is what the Senator from Connecticut referenced—we received a call from the State Department saying they were not sure they could approve my wife's travel to Cuba.

I cannot speak for other Senators, but I suspect that most Senators would react the same way I did if they were told that a State Department bureaucrat had the authority to prevent their spouse or their children from traveling with them to a country with which we are not at war and which, according to the Defense Department, and practically every other American, poses no threat to our national security.

At first I thought it was a joke. They said no. My wife is not a Government official. She is not a journalist. They did not think she could go. She is, and has been, a practicing, registered nurse throughout her professional life. In the end, she was able to join me because an American nurses association asked her to report on an aspect of current health in Cuba, and she agreed to report back to them.

Actually she has visited, with me, other parts of the world where we have used the Leahy War Victims Fund or where we have gone to visit landmine victims or looked at health care. I have always relied on her knowledge and expertise and did on this trip.

But I thought, how many Senators realize that if they wanted to take their spouse or their children with them to Cuba, they could be prevented from doing so by U.S. authorities. They can take them anywhere else in the world, any other country that would allow them in, but here it is not that the other country would not allow them in. Our country is saying: We're not going to allow you to leave if that is where you're going.

The authors who put that law together knew the blanket prohibition on travel by American citizens would be unconstitutional, so they came up with a nifty way to avoid that problem while still having the same result. They said: Well, Americans could travel to Cuba; they just cannot spend any money there.

Think of it. You can go to Cuba but you can't stay anywhere if it is going to cost you money to stay; you can't eat anything if it is going to cost you money for the food; you can't take a cab, or anything, from the airport if it is going to cost you money.

Well, come on. Almost a decade has passed since the collapse of the former Soviet Union. But even before that Americans went there. Now they freely travel to Russia by the thousands every year, as they did before the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Eight years have passed since the Russians cut their $3 billion subsidy a year to Cuba, and we now give hundreds of millions of dollars in aid to Russia, even though that was our great enemy during the cold war.

Americans, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, can travel to North Korea. There are no restrictions on the right of Americans to travel there or to spend money there.

I ask a question of my colleagues: Which country poses a greater threat to the United States or world stability? North Korea or Cuba? I think the answer, especially if you watch the news at all, is North Korea, for it is in South Korea where we have tens of thousands of U.S. troops poised to defend it.

Americans can travel to Iran, a country that is in total, gross violation of all international law. They took over our embassy, held our diplomats hostage, broke every single possible international law there was—they still hold our property that they confiscated from us—but we can travel freely there; we can spend money there.

The same goes for Sudan. These are countries that are on our own terrorist list, but we can travel there.

Americans travel to China and Vietnam, countries that have had abysmal human rights records. We not only travel there, we actively promote American investment there.

So our Cuban policy is hypocritical, inconsistent, self-defeating, and contrary to our values—to give it the benefit of the doubt. We are a nation that prides itself on our tradition of encouraging the free flow of people and ideas. It is simply impossible to make a rational argument that Americans should be able to travel freely to North Korea or Iran but not to Cuba. You cannot make that argument.

I cannot believe that Members of Congress want the State Department or the Treasury Department deciding where their family members or constituents can travel, unless we are at war or there is a national emergency to justify it. But that is what is happening.

So because it is happening, it should not be surprising to anybody in this Chamber that the law is being violated by tens of thousands of Americans who are traveling to Cuba every year, and almost none of them are prosecuted. I kept running into people on the streets of Havana from the United States. I said: Do you have licenses or anything? No. We just came down.

I know people from my own State who drive an hour's drive away to Montreal and then fly to Cuba; people who go to the Hemingway Marina in their boats and then spend time in Cuba.

Mr. DODD. Will my colleague yield on that point?

Mr. LEAHY. Certainly.

Mr. DODD. I think it is an important point you are making. But I think in almost every single case, what these citizens are doing is flying through Canada or Cancun and in a sense violating the law; they are acting illegally.

Mr. LEAHY. That is right.

Mr. DODD. So in a sense we are promoting, by this particular provision in our existing law, illegal travel.

Mr. LEAHY. And also promoting a complete disrespect for our laws because everybody knows they are not going to be prosecuted. It is a ridiculous thing. Why have this significant law on the books and then not prosecute it? Yet if it was being prosecuted, maybe we would hear more of a hue and cry to change it.

It is demeaning to the American people. It is damaging to the rule of law. We have been stuck with this absurd policy for years, even though almost everybody knows—and most say privately—that it makes absolutely no sense. It is beneath the dignity of a great country.

But I also say it not only helps strengthen Fidel Castro's grip on America, it has a huge advantage for our European competitors who are building relationships and establishing a base for future investment in a post-Castro Cuba.

When the Castro era ends is anybody's guess. I was a student in law school here in Washington shortly after the Bay of Pigs. I remember people talking: It will be any minute now—any minute now—Castro is out.

Well, I graduated in 1964, 35 years ago, and he is still there. President Castro is not a democratic leader; he is not going to become one. But maybe it is time we start pursuing a policy that is in our interest, not in a lobbyist's interest or somebody else's interest. I should be clear about this amendment. It does not—I repeat and underscore

that—lift the U.S. embargo. It is narrowly worded so it does not do that. It permits travelers to go there but to carry only their personal belongings. We are not opening up a floodgate for imports to Cuba.

It limits the value of what Americans can bring home from Cuba to the current amount that we Government officials could bring back. That is $100. You are not going to start a huge trade in Cuban goods of whatever sort for $100, especially some of the more popular Cuban goods.

It reaffirms the President's authority to prohibit travel in times of war, armed hostilities, or if there is imminent danger to the health or safety of Americans.

Those who oppose this amendment, who want to prevent Americans from traveling to Cuba, will argue that spending dollars there helps prop up the Castro government. To some extent that is true, because the Cuban Government does run the economy. It also runs the schools, the hospitals, maintains roads. As is the U.S. Government, it is responsible for a full range of social services. Any money that goes into the Cuban economy supports the programs that support ordinary Cubans.

There is a black market in Cuba because no one can survive on their meager Government salary. So the income from tourism also fuels that informal sector and goes in the pockets of ordinary Cubans.

It is also worth mentioning that while the average Cuban cannot survive on his or her Government salary, you do not see the kind of abject poverty in Cuba that is so common elsewhere in Latin America. In Brazil, Panama, Mexico, or Peru, all countries we support openly, there are children searching through garbage in the street for scraps of food next to gleaming highrise hotels with limousines lined up outside.

In Cuba, with the exception of a tiny elite consisting of the President and his friends, everyone is poor. They do have access to some basics: A literacy rate of 95 percent; their life expectancy is about the same as that of Americans, even though the health system is focused on preventive care.

The point is that while there are obviously parts of the Cuban economy we would prefer not to support, as there is in North Korea, where we are sending aid, or China or Sudan or any country the government of which we disagree, much of the Cuban Government's budget benefits ordinary Cubans. So when opponents of this amendment argue that we cannot let Americans travel to Cuba because the money they spend there will prop up Castro, remember what they are not saying: The same dollars also help the Cuban people.

We are not going to weaken President Castro's grip on power by keeping Americans from traveling to Cuba. History has proven that. He is as firmly in control now as he was 40 years ago. So let us put a little sense into our relationship with Cuba. Let's have a little more faith in the power of ideas.

I would rather have U.S. citizens down there speaking about democracy than to have the only voice being the Government's voice speaking about our embargo. Let's have the courage to admit the cold war is over, but let's also get the State Department out of the business of telling our spouses and our children and our constituents where they can travel and spend their own money, especially in a tiny country where most people are too poor to own an extra pair of shoes or clothes, a country that poses no security threat to us.

This amendment will do far more to win the hearts and minds of the Cuban people than the shortsighted approach of those who continue to pretend that nothing has changed since 1959.

I am not one who supports the nondemocratic actions of the Castro government. I have spoken very critically both here and in Cuba, of the trials and arrests of those who dared to speak out for a different government. But I was struck over and over again by Cubans of all walks of life basically saying, what are we afraid of? Do we deny our people, U.S. citizens, the ability to travel in other countries around the world? When I say no, we don't stop them from going to Iran, North Korea, China, Russia, Sudan, elsewhere, countries that are even on our terrorist list, but we do here, they shake their heads in disbelief—this in a country where, during the baseball game down there, when the United States flag was carried out on to the baseball field, the Cubans stood and cheered. We ought to think about that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I understand the remarks the Senators have made. It has been suggested earlier that we have had an absurd policy for years and that Cuba is not a real threat to us, certainly not as much of a threat as North Korea. I suggest if that is so—and it certainly has not been so for very long; I suggest Cuba could in the future be a threat to the United States—it is because we stood up to them. We contained them. We basically defeated them and stopped them when they had a systematic determination to subvert the Western Hemisphere and even sent troops into Africa on behalf of Russia, when there was a Soviet Union to subvert Africa for totalitarian communism.

That is what it was about. We have done some things that I think were necessary and have preserved democracy for this hemisphere. It is something we ought to be proud of.

As for Castro, it is time for him to retire. It is time for him to give it up. It is time for him to put his people above his own personal aggrandizement and lust for power. If he cares about his people, he ought to give it up. He can go to North Korea, if he wants to go to a Communist nation.

I don't have any sympathy for the man. I do not know why people want to go to Cuba. All the time: I want to go to Cuba, go to Cuba. Well, I would suggest maybe Honduras. Those people have suffered terrifically. There are people in Haiti we could help. I do not know why everybody wants to help a nation that is oppressing its people so much.

Be that as it may, there are provisions now for people to gain exemptions, if they have a just cause to do so, to go to Cuba. Those who have a legitimate reason can find a way to go there, as the Senator noted. I think we have an appropriate policy. I will oppose changing it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, a case has been made that Americans cannot travel to Cuba. Indeed, the facts reveal that Americans travel to Cuba by the thousands. The policy that this Congress has endorsed, President Reagan, President Bush, and President Clinton have supported.

There has been a calculated policy of American contacts in travel to Cuba. Today American students, journalists, people with archeological interests, cultural interests, travel to Cuba by the thousands. Cuban Americans travel to visit family members who have problems, medical emergencies, by the thousands. The restriction of the U.S. Government is not about travel.

We are using travel as a weapon to help convince the Cuban people to put pressure on the Cuban Government, support for democracy, free markets, that their contact with Americans is helpful in changing the politics of the repression of Cuba. Restrictions in travel is not about denying Americans the right to go to Cuba. It is about denying Fidel Castro the economic benefits of American tourism. Travel that enhances knowledge, causes political difficulties, we not only allow but we have encouraged.

Travel that simply provides Fidel Castro with millions of dollars to support his regime, his military, his security forces, we are denying, and appropriately so. Nor is it a static policy.

On January 9 of this year, President Clinton revised the policy again, for the second time in 2 years, to add new remittances by American citizens to Cuba, so that people can send money and support their families at appropriate levels that are humanitarian, to help with medical or food emergencies but not so much that it would allow Fidel Castro to profit by it. President Clinton has allowed charter passenger flights to cities other than Havana for the first time, and the measure permits direct mail service to Cuba. The measure also authorizes the sale of food and agricultural inputs to independent nongovernment entities.

New regulations for all of this were issued on May 10—flights, new authority for travel, food and medicine—as

part of a calculated policy to always test Castro: When you are ready to talk about democracy, to respect human rights, American policy will begin to change. Several days after President Clinton announced these new initiatives, the Cuban Government responded and Castro announced that it constituted a policy of ''aggression.'' Once again, as President Carter found, as did Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton, every time you make an act of concession—in this case, a legitimate concession—to test Fidel Castro to see whether he is interested in a bilateral relationship, we are denounced for redressing the Cuban nation by disallowing travel.

My colleagues offer an amendment now to remove these restrictions and open travel and allow Fidel Castro to get the full economic benefit of millions, potentially hundreds of millions of dollars worth of travel.

What kind of regime is it that they will be visiting? If Castro is to receive the benefit of our tourist dollars, what is it he would be doing with this money? It is worth taking a look at Cuba, not of 1961 when the cold war brought us to sanctions, but the Cuba of 1999. It is suggested by my friend and colleague from Vermont that the cold war is over, implying that perhaps we have no argument with this regime.

Our argument with Cuba is about more than the cold war. It is about all the things that have always motivated the United States: human rights, human decency, the nature of the regime itself. Our argument with Fidel Castro is not over. The causes of that argument still endure.

While the United States has been seeking to ease sanctions, look at the record in the last 24 months in response to our review and change of policy. In February, Fidel Castro criminalized all forms of cooperation or participation in any prodemocracy efforts—not a fine, not an arrest, but 20 years in jail if you participate in a prodemocracy effort. This is the Cuba you will be visiting. He imposes a 30-year jail term on anybody who cooperates with an agency of the U.S. Government. That includes Radio Marti, distribution of food or medicine by a government agency, or anyone acting on behalf of anyone associating with this Government.

On March 1, the law was tested. Four prominent human rights dissidents were tried in secrecy for their criticism of the Communist Party of Cuba. International diplomats who traveled to Cuba to witness the trial were barred from attending any of the proceedings. After being held without charges for 1 year—no foreign press, no foreign visitors, no diplomats, held in secrecy for 1 year—they were found guilty and sentenced for up to 5 years in jail. This is the Cuba of 1999.

Amnesty International, in its recent report, concludes that there are now 350 political prisoners in Cuba. Ten unarmed civilians, in the meantime, have been shot by Cuban security officials on the streets of Havana.

I do not ask the Senate to do anything it has not done before. Just on March 25, the Senate voted 98–0, stating that the United States should make all efforts to criticize Cuba and condemn its human rights record. What is the price of this conduct? They hold hundreds of political prisoners, people are shot in the streets, people are held in secret trials, and our response is: Let's go for a visit. Let's go see how they are doing and have a good meal in Havana. No. My colleague is right. There is no cold war, but there is a great deal at issue that this country cares a great deal about.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TORRICELLI. Yes.

Mr. LEAHY. People have been shot in the streets in China, and held in prisons in China, and tortured and executed in China; are we allowed to go and visit there without having to get a license from our country to do so?

Mr. TORRICELLI. Let me, in my time, answer the Senator's question with a question. Do you believe that travel restrictions on China would change Chinese policy?

Mr. LEAHY. I don't think it would change the policy any more than it would change the policy with Cuba.

Mr. TORRICELLI. That is where we agree.

Mr. LEAHY. I have a further question.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I will answer the question first and continue my remarks. I don't think travel restrictions on China would change Chinese policy. I oppose those restrictions. I do believe travel restrictions on Cuba will change Cuban policy. That is why I support them. I do believe that continued international resolve—for the first time, the Senator's amendment would weaken America's policy. We have gotten Europeans and Latins so outraged by the jailing of these dissidents and these secret trials that European and Latin nations that have voted against us for 20 years have joined with us this year in Europe in voting to condemn the Cuban Government. Just as they are joining the fight for human rights, the United States would abandon it.

There is one other thing that is important. I will finish making my case and I will be glad to yield. There is one other change. This isn't just about what Cuba does internally anymore. This is also about what they are doing to our country. The government that you would have us now visit, in lifting these restrictions, is a Cuba that has crossed a very important threshold.

Just this last year, indicted by the government of Cuba on May 7, were 14 Cubans captured in Miami. Let me suggest to you the nature of that indictment to see whether it makes an impression on the Senator and see whether or not he thinks this is an appropriate time to ease restrictions on travel to Cuba. The indictment of Cuban agents in Miami last fall was for attempting to penetrate the U.S. Southern Command and planning ''terrorist acts against U.S. military installations.'' The indictment was further revised to include 2 of the 14 with conspiracy to murder 4 American citizens by shooting down their aircraft over the Straits of Florida.

Let me suggest that I, as all of my colleagues, am prepared to respond to initiatives from Havana. The day there are elections, the day there are open trials, the day there is a free press, the day they respond to a request for extradition of people who murder American citizens, I will join you with my colleagues on that day on this floor matching the Cuban Government 2-to-1, 3-to-1, 1 of their initiatives to 3 of ours, 10 of ours, or 20 of ours. We will meet them 95 percent of the way down the field.

But, my friends, to ask this Senate to respond to the record of the last year of jailing dissidents, secret trials, shooting people on the streets, the indictment of 14 Cuban agents penetrating the United States military installations to commit terrorist acts against the United States, and the indictment of Cubans for murdering American citizens—this, my colleagues, would not appear to me to be the best time to suggest that it is time to forgive and forget, and have thousands—maybe tens of thousands—of Americans visit Cuba to rescue the Cuban economy from its current position of collapse, and provide Fidel Castro with the revenue to strengthen his regime.

These sanctions are having an effect. Fidel Castro has had to reduce his military by one-half. He cannot afford to keep them in uniform. The secret police have been reduced by nearly a third in their size. We are causing the collapse of the Communist Party of Cuba—not in a timely way, not as I would like it to be, but it is having an impact.

Why, given this record of indictments and terrorism and murder against American citizens, would we choose this moment?

Those in the world who have been the most critical of our policy—the Holy Father in the Vatican, who led an initiative himself to ease restrictions on Cuba, has now joined the chorus of those. Fidel Castro broke his promise about priests. The Holy Father appealed to him not to proceed with these jail terms, and he did it anyway. The Vatican is now joining the criticism.

The states of Latin America for the first time are voting against his human rights record. And we in the United States who led this effort for all of these years are about to change sides.

This Senate has been resolute on this issue in the past.

I will join with my friend from Kentucky, Senator MCCONNELL, I hope in a motion to table this amendment.

I think the debate has been worthwhile.

My friend from Connecticut and my friend from Vermont have made it very clear to the Cuban Government that we are ready, willing, and able to change our policy if they change theirs. But I believe the motion to table is the right way to proceed in the Senate at the moment.

I would be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, let's be clear where we are. My friend from New Jersey speaks of the trial of the dissidents. Many who have spoken on the floor were critical of that.

I sat 10 feet across the table from Fidel Castro and strongly and harshly criticized the trial of the dissidents. I went to visit each of their families and strongly and harshly criticized that trial and spoke also on the floor. With my reputation on free speech issues, I would be the last person to yield to anybody on the question of criticism of those who try cases against dissidents and those who spoke out against the Government.

I was very pleased to see our European allies speak out about it. But I note for the RECORD that while they spoke out on that, not one of those European allies that the Senator from New Jersey says now come over to our side—not one of those countries—has put limits on the travel of their people to Cuba as we have—not one.

The United States, the most powerful, wealthiest nation on Earth, limits its population in traveling only to this country.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey said quite correctly that we limited travel of our people to China. It might not make much difference in what they did. I suspect it made some, but probably not much. I say that it probably wouldn't make any more difference in that Government than it does in the Government of Cuba. But we see a huge market there, so we are not going to do that anyway.

I suggest that during the cold war the fact was that we encouraged travel to places like the Soviet Union and China, and we got a diversity of views. Our thoughts and our views were heard more and more, not as much as we would like but more and more.

The Holy Father spoke out, as did most of us in this body, about the trial of the dissidents. But I point out that the Holy Father has never withdrawn his very strong criticism of the United States.

Mr. TORRICELLI. May I reclaim my time for the moment? I yielded to the Senator——

Mr. LEAHY. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Please conclude.

Mr. LEAHY. That is my mistake. I assumed the Senator had yielded the floor.

One last thing: We indicted, and we are using our criminal justice system to try, Cuban spies, just as we have Russian spies, Chinese spies, Japanese spies, Israeli spies, and spies from even our NATO allies. We have done that. We have not broken our relationships with any one of those countries when we have done that, and some of the things some of those countries have done to us have been very serious crimes, indeed.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I recognize that. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Let me further present the case, in case the Senator misunderstood me, that this is not a case that Cuba spied against the United States. That we expect. This is a case where the President of the United States, in my judgment, rightfully sought to ease restrictions on travel to Cuba and did so in allowing charter flights, the expansion of flights throughout Cuba, the easing of restrictions on travel to Cuba, and the response that he received is that we now have 14 Cubans under indictment, not for responding but for attempting to infiltrate an American military installation and committing a terrorist act.

What I want the Senator from Vermont to do is put himself in the position of Fidel Castro. The United States makes concessions to allow greater travel, which we have now done twice in 24 months. The Cuban Government attacks those concessions with acts of aggression and attempts to commit terrorist acts against the United States. The human rights situation further deteriorates. People are jailed. Contact with the U.S. Government is criminalized. And now this Senate returns not in outrage but says, Mr. President, we don't think you went far enough; let's go further and further and liberalize trade.

That is my concern, recognizing how this will be seen in Havana.

I agree with the Senator's analysis. The United States allows travel to many places. But the Senator has to concede to me that travel has often been an effective tool in altering international conduct.

This country participated in prohibiting flights to Libya after it shot down the Pan Am flight over Lockerbie, Scotland. We prohibited flights. After a period of 10 years, the Libyan Government relented and allowed extradition to an international court those who are responsible for the act. I don't ask anything with regard to the victims of Lockerbie that we are not asking now of those in the Cuban Government.

What is the difference? How do you look at the families of the young men shot down over the Straits of Florida and murdered by the Cuban Government, and tell them, well, we will overlook this, though we will resolve it with Libya?

When Americans have been in jeopardy, whether it was in Iran, or in Libya, or years ago in Vietnam, when they were arresting people and putting them in concentration camps, we prohibited travel. I suggest to the Senator that that prohibition is still an effective mechanism of policy.

In any case, I yield the floor to allow my friend from Connecticut to speak.

I urge my colleagues to join with Senator MCCONNELL on a motion to table. This is the wrong judgment with the wrong signal at the wrong moment—not undermining the historic American policy, but it is undermining the policy of the Clinton administration which has been well calibrated and very well defined.

This is not a partisan matter. It is bipartisan against the leadership of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate led by Senator HELMS and by President Clinton. It counters both policies.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, very briefly, if I may, I will not take much time, because my colleague from Florida wants to be heard, as well as others.

Let me say to my friend and colleague from New Jersey, I admire his rhetorical skills immensely. He made a valiant effort to shift the argument and debate implying we are doing a favor, this is somehow a great act of generosity and kindness, that those who are proposing lifting a restraint on travel to Cuba are trying to help out Fidel Castro.

It is a good, clever argument. I hope it is not a persuasive argument.

We are talking here not about what we are trying to do to help Fidel Castro but a right that American citizens ought to have to travel freely.

My colleague from New Jersey and others have pointed out the dastardly deeds that go on in Cuba. I don't disagree at all. I am outraged by it and condemn it.

I point out, if that is the basis upon which we restrict Americans to travel freely, we would have bans on travel all over the world. It goes on every day. We don't say to a single American citizen: You can't travel to the People's Republic of China. Every day, that government abuses its own people far more egregiously than occurs in Cuba. We see it in Vietnam, Sudan, Yugoslavia, Iran, North Korea. Is there any more oppressive government on the face of this Earth than the Republic of North Korea? Yet any citizen in this country tomorrow or tonight can get on a plane and fly there without having to get permission from the State Department or the Treasury.

My point is, we are applying a standard that is not being applied equally or fairly. I subscribe to the notion that by opening up access you begin to create change. I argue that in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia it was the access and the interchange between citizens of the free world and those countries which helped create the kind of change that caused communism in those nations to fall. It wasn't isolation that did it; it was contact that did it.

I have watched for 40 years a policy in Cuba that has not produced the change that the Senator from North Carolina and I both want. We disagree how to get there, but I agree with the conclusion he seeks. I believe he agrees with the conclusion I seek.

Why don't we try a different tactic? What is the point of further isolation after 40 years if there is no change? If I can say to a citizen of my State: You can fly to the North Korea, you can fly to the People's Republic of China, you can fly to Iran—countries that have done far worse than the incidents that have occurred in Cuba, far more egregious—we have understood we don't deny citizens of our own country the right to travel.

Let Fidel Castro shut the door and say to my constituents: You can't come to my country. I don't want to sit in the Senate and do his bidding. I don't think I ought to be saying to the citizens of New Jersey, North Carolina, or Florida that you can't travel there. Let them say that.

To tell Cuban Americans: You can go back to your country once a year, and if someone is sick, apply for an application, a license, and maybe we will let you go see your family, maybe we will let you go, that is not my view of the way we ought to be conducting our foreign policy.

This is about American rights. We provide in the Leahy amendment that unless we are involved in a state of war, hostilities, or public health reasons or good reasons why the Government may restrain the travel of its citizens—we are not in that condition here.

If you want to create change in Cuba, let good, honest, average American citizens interface with these people. They are the best ambassadors in the world. They do more good on an hourly basis on behalf of our country than all the diplomats combined. Give them a chance to make that difference and go to the country 90 miles off our shore.

I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts 1 minute for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may yield for a question.

Mr. KERRY. I congratulate my colleague on his leadership with respect to this. In the years that the Senator served on the Foreign Affairs Committee, in all those years with the visits of Lech Walesa, the visits of Vaclav Havel, and we have all shared wonderful moments with leaders of countries where the curtain fell—I think I recall each of those leaders saying it was the ability of people to come in during the time things were shut, to share with them the sense of what was happening elsewhere, the possibilities, bringing information, to bring them hope; that, indeed, was one of the great sustaining values and empowerments that brought them ultimately to the point of sharing the freedom that we have.

I wonder if the Senator wouldn't agree that it is almost totally contradictory with a Stalinist, tight police structure. In fact, by not having intercourse with other people elsewhere—the discussion, the movement of people, the discourse, the exchange of ideas that comes with it—you are, in fact, empowering the capacity of that secrecy and of that closed society to keep the hammer down on people, and that flies directly contrary to all of the experience we have learned from those wonderful visits we have had.

Mr. DODD. I say in response to my colleague from Massachusetts, he makes an excellent point. I think the observation he has drawn is correct. No one can grant with any certainty whether or not we will create change overnight.

I look down the list of the people who can get licenses to go to Cuba. Members of Congress can; journalists can; people who are involved in some cultural exchanges. Ballerinas can go through a licensing process to get there.

I like the idea that an average citizen in my State, in Massachusetts, in Florida, can go into Cuba and walk those streets, talk to people in the marketplaces, and share with them what we stand for as a nation. Every time we have allowed that to occur, we have created change—maybe not in the People's Republic of China. We did in Poland. We did in Czechoslovakia. We did in Hungary. We did throughout the Soviet bloc when we had a constant flow of people; that opening up, that engagement, that creates change.

It seems to me after 38 years of saying no one can go there, this might be worth trying. Then Fidel Castro can say: I'm not going to allow these people in.

Let him be the one who shuts the door to U.S. citizens traveling there. Let us not deny our own citizens the right to try and make a difference, if that is what they want to do, without going through some bureaucratic licensing process. Even the wife of a distinguished colleague had to go through this process, as a registered nurse, to qualify under the regulations. The spouse of a Senator. She can go to North Korea, China, abusive governments, but she cannot go 90 miles off the shore with her husband, a Senator. If that woman were not the wife of a Senator, she would have been denied that license. We all know that.

I bet there are nurses all across this country who might go to Cuba and make a difference through their engagement in conversation, interfacing with the people of that country, and to begin to create the kind of change we seek.

It is absurd. As my colleague from Massachusetts has suggested by his question, it is absurd. We are 185 days away from the millennium and we sit in this Chamber and tell American citizens that because we disagree, strongly disagree, with the Government of Cuba, we are going to deny them the right to travel there and put it in the same basket as Iraq and Libya.

That doesn't make sense.

I yield.

Mr. KERRY. I ask my colleague if, in fact, by denying that exchange, those people the right to travel and connect with relatives and others within the country, if we don't provide Fidel Castro with the selectivity and greater capacity to restrict what information they get, when they get it, how they get it, and if, in fact, we aren't playing right into his capacity to keep a stranglehold—which is the very thing we are trying to undo.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, again, my colleague from Massachusetts makes an excellent point. When you restrict the ability of average citizens to travel, you then restrict the ability of information exchanges about what is going on around the world to actually reach the average citizen in the streets. It can make a difference. So in a sense you empower Mr. Castro and those who support him by giving them the ability to restrain the amount of information people in the streets ought to be able to get about what is going on in the rest of the world. As a matter of fact, we become a coconspirator, if you will, in sustaining this man in power, in my view. But by opening up this process, given the examples we can cite—there are concrete examples all over the world where, when we allowed that travel and that contact to occur, we have made a difference; we created change. The only place there has been no change that I know of is in Cuba, and it is the only place where we have not changed our policy.

There seems to be some logic in that argument. If you want to follow other examples, and those who argue against this resolution who simultaneously argue they want Castro to go, it seems to me our best formulation is to give this a chance to see if we cannot create the kind of change the Senator from Massachusetts and I strongly support. I thank him for his questions. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know this is spirited debate but we need to wrap up a couple of items. Let me notify the Senate, before returning to the debate on this amendment, we are just about to completion. So let me ask unanimous consent the Dodd-Leahy amendments be temporarily laid aside. We will come back to them in just a moment.

Mr. KERRY. Reserving the right to object, could I ask a question? I inquire, I ask the Senator, where we are with respect to the Brownback amendment?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Brownback amendment is yet to be disposed of. There are a couple of amendments upon which we are going to have to have rollcall votes. I would like to proceed, if I may.

Mr. KERRY. If I can ask, will there be time to speak to that amendment?

Mr. McCONNELL. We are trying to wrap the bill up. I would very much like the Senator from Massachusetts to say a few words on that amendment, knowing full well where he stands. But if he will just suspend for a minute and let us wrap up a few housekeeping items here?

Mr. KERRY. Fine.

AMENDMENT NO. 1165

Mr. McCONNELL. I understand there is a Bingaman amendment still at the desk that has now been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent we return to the Bingaman amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1165) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment by the Senate majority leader that has been cleared on both sides.

AMENDMENT NO. 1183

(Purpose: To require annual reports on arms sales to Taiwan)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL], for Mr. LOTT, proposes an amendment numbered 1183.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . CONSULTATIONS ON ARMS SALES TO TAIWAN.

Consistent with the intent of Congress expressed in the enactment of section (3)(b) of the Taiwan Relations Act the Secretary of State shall consult with the appropriate committees and leadership of Congress to devise a mechanism to provide for congressional input prior to making any determination on the nature of quantity of defense articles and services to be made available to Taiwan.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer this amendment that would require that the Congress be notified in a timely fashion of any report or list submitted by the Taiwanese Government for the potential purchase or other acquisition of any defense article or defense service.

This amendment would remedy a long-festering situation whereby the Congress has ceded virtually all decisionmaking authority to the executive branch with respect to arms sales to Taiwan. This situation is contrary to the letter and spirit of the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, which established that arms sales decisions regarding Taiwan must be made jointly between the legislative and executive branches of government.

Specifically, the relevant sections of Public Law 96–8, the ''Taiwan Relations Act'' of April 10, 1979, are as follows: Section 3(a) states, ''. . . the United States will make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.'' And Section 3(b) states, ''The President and the Congress shall determine the nature and quantity of such defense articles and services based solely upon their judgment of the needs of Taiwan, in accordance with procedures established by law. Such determination of Taiwan's defense needs shall include review by United States military authorities in connection with recommendations to the President and the Congress.''

When Congress passed the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979, it was in response to the Carter administration's abrupt efforts to curtail long-standing defense ties between Washington and Taipei. At the time of the adoption of the Taiwan Relations Act, Congress wanted to make clear that the enduring ties between the American people and the people of Taiwan included a clear and sustained commitment to ensuring that the people of Taiwan had the means to defend themselves. Taiwan's ability to maintain a credible deterrent, qualitatively superior to that of the mainland's forces across the narrow Taiwan Strait, has been crucial in keeping peace in East Asia.

The central tenet of the Taiwan Relations Act was stated very clearly in section 3, namely, that the President and Congress together would determine what Taiwan required for its legitimate self defense without regard to pressures imposed by any third party nation. This provision was written in the law to ensure that executive branch officials would not become excessively concerned with the protestations of the PRC whenever the United States proposed to provide Taiwan defense articles and services needed for Taiwan's self-defense. Unique among laws governing United States defense ties with other nations, the Taiwan Relations Act explicitly requires in law that Congress and President together decide what Taiwan's military defenses require.

The first year after the TRA's enactment, this provision was sorely tested when the executive branch failed to inform Congress fully and currently on what Taiwan needed for its defense. The Foreign Relations Committee under the leadership of Senator Frank Church lambasted executive branch officials. Together with Senator Glenn, Senator Javits, and others, Chairman Church insisted that the administration provide full details on those weapon systems Taiwan had requested.

This practice of involving Congress in reviewing procurement decisions—as required by law—lapsed since that time. In recent years, the executive branch has met with representatives of Taiwan in secret and has refused to share with Congress the complete list of those defense articles and services requested formally or informally by Taiwan.

In this regard, on May 11 of this year I wrote to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright requesting a copy of the list of defense articles and services sought by Taiwan in the most recent round of annual arms procurement talks. Those talks ended on April 21. I received a reply to my letter on May 21, signed by Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs Barbara Larkin. Mrs. Larkin's reply asserted that the Department would only provide information on ''the systems for which we [the Administration] have given Taiwan a positive response.''

In other words, the State Department refused my legitimate request to be informed in writing of Taiwan's request for potential purchase or other acquisition of defense articles and services. Frankly, I was shocked and dismayed by this response, especially given the fact the most recent round of talks had already been concluded and given the clear intent of Section 3 of the Taiwan Relations Act. Instead, Mrs. Larkin's letter provided information only on those portions of Taiwan's request that the administration unilaterally had decided to approve.

I understand that a similar, written request by the chairman of the House International Relations Committee Representative BENJAMIN GILMAN, and others, have received the same unsatisfactory response from the administration.

Mr. President, the current situation is intolerable and must be changed. The law of the land requires that Congress be involved in decisions regarding Taiwan's legitimate defense needs. The President and future administrations should know that the American people's representatives in Congress will meet our obligations under the law to be involved in this decisionmaking process.

Toward this end, my amendment requires that Taiwan's procurement request be furnished, on an appropriate basis and in a timely fashion, to the appropriate committees of Congress. I believe this is a necessary step in ensuring that there is a meaningful dialogue between the legislative and executive branches of government and that the decisionmaking process regarding what Taiwan legitimately needs for its self defense, proceeds on a basis that is fully consistent with the letter and spirit of the Taiwan Relations Act.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1183) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask Senator MACK be added as a cosponsor to amendment No. 1136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the following amendments will not be offered. They are at the desk. They will not be offered: amendment No. 1121 by Senator THOMAS; amendment No. 1122, amendment No. 1152, and amendment No. 1153, all three by Senator ASHCROFT; amendment No. 1154 by Senator CRAIG; amendment No. 1148 by Senator GRASSLEY; amendment No. 1164 by Senator CLELAND.

I ask unanimous consent those amendments no longer be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Those amendments will not be proposed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are down to a precious few.

What we are considering doing is propounding an agreement, and I am going to go on and propound it even though I know there may be some objection, but to give a sense of what the roadmap here is to completion. We believe we are down to the amendment we have been discussing all day, the Brownback amendment, as second-degreed by myself and Senator ABRAHAM regarding section 907, and the amendment we are in the process of debating, the Leahy-Dodd amendment with regard to travel restrictions to Cuba. And final passage. That is where I believe we are at this moment—with the need to wrap up the debate on the Dodd-Leahy amendment, the need to give Senator KERRY an opportunity to speak on the 907 issue and Senator TORRICELLI an opportunity to speak to the 907 issue.

Mr. DODD. I would also like to be heard on 907.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Also, Senator DODD on the 907 issue and Senator BINGAMAN for a couple of minutes on Cuba.

That is about where we are. Senator GRAHAM, obviously, is going to speak on the Cuba issue as well.

At that point we should be able to move ahead. Does my colleague from Vermont think we should go ahead and propound this unanimous consent agreement or go on with the debate and just move on through it?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Florida on the floor. I was wondering about how much time does he think he will need?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will need 15 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. That will make it impossible to get the unanimous consent agreement that might get us out of here at a decent hour.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAHAM of Florida be allowed 15 minutes to speak to the Dodd-Leahy amendment; Senator BINGAMAN, 3 minutes on the Cuba amendment; Senator KERRY, 5 minutes on the 907 amendment; Senator TORRICELLI on the 907 amendment, 5 minutes; Senator DODD, 2 minutes on the 907 amendment; Senator BROWNBACK, 3 minutes to wrap up on 907; myself 3 minutes to yield on 907.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Maryland would have an objection on a time agreement. Maybe we should start on our debate and urge people to be as brief as we can because I still think we could and should vote on all these.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The objection of the Senator from Maryland is to the Brownback amendment, I gather?

Mr. LEAHY. That is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Why don't we proceed to complete debate on the Dodd-Leahy matter and see if we can dispose of that? Let's proceed on it.

Mr. DODD. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 1157

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I want all to know that there is no disagreement with the objectives, the end goals being sought by the advocates of this amendment and those of us who oppose it. I believe we are all Americans of good conscience and we seek for the Cuban people what we seek for ourselves. We seek a nation that lives with the freedoms associated with democracy. We seek a nation that respects the basic human rights of its people. We seek a nation which will encourage an economy that offers hope to the people of Cuba.

We have had a long association with Cuba. It is an association which runs almost to the first Spanish exploration of our two nations. We were a major participant in the freedom of Cuba in 1898. In fact, we had celebrations within the last few months of our participation in the independence of Cuba.

So our goals for those people, our feeling for the people of Cuba, is a shared one. The question is, What is the appropriate course of U.S. policy to achieve those goals? I believe, as with every other question of what U.S. foreign policy should be, it should be a mixture of a consideration of our national interests and a consideration of the universal values for which America has stood since those words in the Declaration of Independence that declared that we saw that all men—not just American men, not just men, but women—that all persons had certain inalienable rights. Those have been an important factor in our relationships with other peoples of other nations.

On the specific issue of the use of travel restrictions as a part of that U.S. foreign policy, Senator TORRICELLI has talked about the way in which travel restrictions were imposed on Libya and the fact that those restrictions had certain objectives and have had certain consequences.

The Presiding Officer and I have been interested in the issue of Lebanon for a long time. The United States had travel restrictions on Americans visiting Lebanon. The purpose of those travel restrictions was to encourage changes that would create a greater sense of security. While there are still tense days, as we have seen in the very recent past, it is now considered appropriate to allow Americans to begin again to visit Lebanon.

We have used travel restrictions as a means of achieving goals that were considered to be important to the United States in the past.

Yes, we are using a restriction on travel to Cuba as part of the larger, comprehensive restriction on relationships with the Government of Cuba while we attempt to achieve increased contacts with the people of Cuba.

There is an assumption that if the United States does not open up its travel restrictions, the Cuban people are going to walk down sidewalks that are barren of foreign travelers and the Cuban people will not have contact with the outside world. In fact, almost 100,000 Americans visited Cuba last year under the various provisions of our existing law. In addition to that, some of the major nations of the world, nations with which we have the closest relationship, such as Spain and Canada, have an open policy, in terms of travel to Cuba, for their citizens.

When you ask Spaniards or Canadians, what effect has your open policy towards Cuba had? what effect have the relationships you have had in these instances for decades with the Castro regime had? have you seen a change in the commitment to democracy? have you seen, as a result of your openness towards Cuba, a greater degree of respect for human rights? the answer is a sad no. These democracies, these nations which share our values and which have taken the course of action that is being advocated by the proponents of this amendment, have seen no effect in achieving the goals we share for Cuba—democracy, human rights, and an open economy.

What gives us reason to believe that adopting an unconsidered, undebated—other than the words we speak this afternoon—major change in our policy toward Cuba would have any different result? Recent events, in fact, are to the contrary.

In January of last year, 1998, a significant, what many hoped would be a historic, turning point event occurred in Cuba. The Pope visited that island. Many hoped, prayed, believed that it would lead to fundamental change in Cuba.

We reinforced the momentum of the papal visit by a number of initiatives towards Cuba. On March 20, 1998, just a few weeks after the Pope had departed, in an attempt to build goodwill towards Cuba, President Clinton announced the resumption of licensing for direct humanitarian flights to Cuba.

The President announced the resumption of cash remittances to Cuba.

The President asked for the development of licensing procedures to

streamline and expedite the commercial sale of medicine, medical supplies, and medical equipment to Cuba.

Continuing in that vein, on January 9 of this year the President authorized additional steps to reach out to the Cuban people. The new measures expanded remittances by allowing any United States citizens, not just family members, to send limited funds to the people of Cuba. The President expanded people-to-people contacts. The President allowed charter passenger flights to cities other than Havana and to initiate from cities other than Miami.

The measures also permitted an effort to establish direct mail service to Cuba. The measures also authorized the sale of food and agricultural inputs to independent, nongovernmental entities, including religious groups, family restaurants, and farmers.

All of those are initiatives which the United States has taken since January of 1998 in hopes that it would result in a reciprocal response of some loosening of the police state that is Cuba today.

What happened to all of those initiatives the United States took? What happened to the initiatives that were hoped to flow from the papal visit?

The Cuban Government responded to our United States initiatives by calling these actions acts of aggression. That is what the Cuban Government labeled the opening of additional flights, of direct mail, of allowing greater remittances to the people of Cuba. Fidel Castro called all of those actions acts of aggression.

What did Fidel Castro do in the context of the visit by the Pope? Almost exactly a year after the Pope departed Cuba, the Cuban Government passed a new security law. That law criminalized any form of cooperation or participation in prodemocracy efforts. That law imposed penalties ranging from 20 to 30 years for those who were found to be cooperating with the U.S. Government. Those are the responses of Fidel Castro to the papal visit.

On March 1, four prominent human rights dissidents were tried in secrecy for their peaceful criticism of the Communist Party. Diplomats were barred from attendance at the trial. These four human rights and prodemocracy dissidents were held for over 1 year without charges. They were found guilty. They were sentenced to jail terms, for advocating human rights and democracy, of 3½ to 5 years.

This did not happen 40 years ago. This happened in March of 1999. The Cuban Government ignored calls from the Vatican and the international community for release. Canada, the European Union, and several Latin American countries criticized the Cuban Government and stated their intention to reassess their relationship with the Government. The King of Spain had a scheduled visit to Cuba which he has deferred, in large part because of the treatment of these four dissidents.

Cuba's human rights record in 1999 reflects a continued policy of repression, a policy which has been recognized not just by the United States, not just by the people of Cuba who suffer under the yoke of oppression, but by the international community.

In its annual report on human rights, which was released earlier this year, Amnesty International states that at least 350 political prisoners remained imprisoned in Cuban cells in 1998. Amnesty International reports that 10 unarmed civilians were shot, executed by Cuban authorities, in 1998.

As we know, the Senate passed a resolution by a vote of 98–0 on March 25 of this year stating that the United States would make all efforts necessary to pass a resolution criticizing Cuba for its human rights records before the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. We were very pleased when the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, with support of nations which just in the last 2 years had opposed such a resolution, passed a resolution on April 23 condemning Cuba for its human rights abuses.

Finally, the State Department country report on human rights practices detailed the same human rights abuses as last year and the year before.

We have made an effort to reach out to Cuba. We have made an effort to send a signal that we were looking for some reciprocity, some demonstration of a wavering in the steel-hard police state which has been Cuba for 40 years.

One is hard pressed to see even the faintest breeze of a positive response to our efforts. The examples of human rights violations in all of these reports are numerous, brutal, and startling. Human rights activists are beaten in their homes. People are arbitrarily detained and arrested. Political prisoners are denied food and medicine brought by their own families. Children are made to stand in the rain chanting slogans against democracy.

In the United States, on May 7 of this year, the U.S. Government revised indictments against 14 Cuban spies captured in Miami last fall while attempting to penetrate the U.S. Southern Command, the United States Naval Air Station at Boca Chica Key near Key West, and planning terrorist acts against military installations. The revised indictments also charge 2 of the 14 with conspiracy to commit murder in the 1996 shoot down of the Brothers to the Rescue fliers.

It is at this point that I must become personal. I know the families of the four fliers who were shot down over international waters, now we know, at the direct command of the highest officials of the Cuban Government. If homicide is defined as the intentional taking of a human life, four acts of homicide occurred over the Straits of Florida against three U.S. citizens and one U.S. resident.

This is the nature of the response that Fidel Castro has given to the efforts by the Pope, by the international community, and by the United States to try to ask, to plead for some relief for the people of Cuba.

As these examples show, as the continuing reign of repression flows from week to week, from day to day in Cuba this is not the time for lifting any of the sanctions on Cuba. This is the time for us to hold the line on our policy, to continue to reach out to the people of Cuba in hopes that someday they will breathe the free air of democracy but to give no quarter to the oppressive Government of Fidel Castro.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I congratulate the Senator from Florida on his statement and his extraordinary leadership on this issue through the years and simply inquire of him, through this decade, American policy towards Cuba has largely been defined by the Cuban Democracy Act that the Senator from Florida joined with me in writing, the Helms–Burton Act that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Senator HELMS, wrote, and now under the leadership of President Clinton.

This amendment would largely undermine the policies outlined in that legislation and by President Clinton. Indeed, the President recently has redefined his own policy of travel towards Cuba. But by a sweep of the pen, that bipartisan policy that the Senators and the President of the United States have written would largely be undermined, in my estimation.

Is that the Senator's conclusion?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would certainly be one of the consequences. Another consequence, I say to my friend and colleague, would be that we would send a signal to Fidel Castro that we are prepared to do virtually anything without expecting anything in response; that the same thing that has happened to the Canadians, the Spaniards, to other European and Latin American countries—attempts to reach out to Castro, which are rebuffed in terms of those things that are most important to the people of Cuba—that now we would become complicitous in that same process of unrequited love.

The last thing we have to play, the last policy option that is available to us as we try to influence Castro is exactly the embargo which, by this casual act tonight, we are being asked to begin to dismantle.

Mr. TORRICELLI. If the Senator would continue to yield, I think what is important about your statement is you recognize this policy isn't about travel; it is about money. It is about giving Fidel Castro millions of dollars of American tourist money to support his regime, his dictatorship, his armed forces, his security forces. That is what we are denying.

But the frustration that the Senator from Florida may have—and you probably know more about the Cuban economic experience and the travel experience than anyone in this institution by virtue of your constituency—and to

rely upon your expertise for a moment, it is my understanding, contrary to what the Senate may be led to believe today, that when tourists go to Cuba from European countries, they are put into tourist compounds. Cubans are not allowed to visit those hotels. They cannot talk to people in those hotels. So the notion that hundreds of thousands of American tourists are going to walk the streets of Cuba and democratize the island, spread the message of human rights—in fact, the average Cuban cannot get inside those compounds. They are walled off.

The Senator knows more about this, by far, than I do, but is that not the story of many of these beach-front hotels?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the story. Unfortunately, the people who those tourists will come in contact with will be the virtual serfs of the Castro regime because the hotels are required to purchase their employees through the Cuban Government, not by direct negotiation with the individual or through some organization representing those individuals. So by that walled-off enclave in which they are enjoying themselves, on an island of prosperity in a sea of despair—which is Cuba today—they are contributing to the maintenance of a system of economic slavery that virtually has left the face of the Earth for the past century and a half.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TORRICELLI. A final question. And I am very pleased the distinguished minority whip, Senator REID of Nevada, is going to join with us on a motion to table.

But before I yield back, Senator KERRY of Massachusetts left a very appealing notion of the example of President Havel, that this exchange of visiting and talking to people about democratic ideas would somehow change the Cuban political reality.

Again, you know more about this than I do. It is my impression that under Cuban law, as Fidel Castro has now changed the law, if a would-be Havel walked up, in Havana, to an American tourist and talked to that tourist about democracy, he would be rewarded—not with information, a growth of knowledge—but he would go to jail because talking about democracy in Cuba to an American tourist will guarantee one thing—you will be arrested, you will be indicted, and you will go to jail.

Is that the reality of what a conversation about democracy with an American tourist is?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. And under the law which I alluded to, which was passed just in February of this year, that Cuban citizen who was found to be engaging in that friendly discussion about democracy and the graces that liberty brings to the human spirit will be subject to spending 20 to 30 years, without his freedom, in a Cuban cell precisely because he engaged in that conversation.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. DODD. Will my colleague yield?

Just very quickly, I want to raise the point—I do not know if my colleagues from New Jersey and Florida have been to Cuba at all recently.

Has my colleague traveled to Cuba in the last several years?

Mr. GRAHAM. Other than Guantanamo, I have not been to Cuba.

Mr. DODD. I appreciate that. Just as a point of reference, I spent a week in Cuba in December, in fact, all over the area, all over Havana, and Varadero as well for a day. I point out to my colleague that I saw Americans all over the streets of Havana. The idea you are confined to Varadero Beach is just not the case. There are people literally everywhere, right in the marketplaces, in the streets, in the restaurants, places they could go. The idea that you are restricted only to go to Varadero Beach is not the case.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Cubans are restricted.

Mr. DODD. To Cuban Americans who want to travel to Cuba—many do—this is, in a sense, saying you can only go back to the country of your birth once during a year, unless you have a sick relative, and then you have to apply to some bureaucrat in the Treasury Department to go down and see your family. That is wrong.

But the idea that Cuban Americans would be restricted to Varadero Beach is just not the case. You can talk with Cuban Americans who have been back to Cuba. They are not restrained on where they can travel in Cuba.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the point the Senator from New Jersey was raising in his question to me was that for many of those Europeans, Latin Americans, and Americans who go to Cuba, the nature of the hotel arrangements in which they live does not lend itself to the sort of interplay that, for instance, some of us experienced in places such as Prague and Budapest prior to the fall of the Berlin Wall.

It also is the case that Cuban citizens who, in those rare instances, might have an opportunity to relate with an American, since February of this year, face the prospect of being charged with a criminal act of collaborating with a United States citizen and face the prospect of spending 20 to 30 years in a 17th century cell.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Will the Senator allow me to respond to the point? Will the Senator allow me to respond?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. TORRICELLI. The point is, Americans clearly do in Cuba have the freedom to leave the hotels and wander around the island. As Senator GRAHAM has pointed out, nearly 100,000 Americans went to Cuba last year. So this is not a question that many Americans cannot go. It has simply been the Clinton administration's view to restrict the number so as not to give Castro great financial rewards. One hundred thousand Americans go.

The point I was making with Senator GRAHAM was not to give people the illusion that Americans in a hotel on the beaches near Havana are going to receive Cuban visitors. The average Cuban is not allowed on the hotel grounds on these compounds. This is not going to be people visiting President Havel in his office. They are not allowed to go there. They can't spend money there. They can't be guests there. They are foreign compounds. You might as well be on a beach somewhere on a desert island in the Pacific. They are restricted.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding.

Mr. DODD. As someone who has been there and spent the time and wandered without restraint and had conversations with people—I had a long conversation, as someone who speaks the language, speaks Spanish; I was able to have lengthy conversations with people. I wasn't being followed around. I had long discussions with people in marketplaces where they were highly critical of the Cuban Government.

I had a lengthy discussion with a family down there about their objections and opposition to Fidel Castro with a group of people around. In my personal experience and that of others, just on the point of 100,000 U.S. citizens going, most of them are going illegally. It is not as if they have licenses to go. We all know what they do. They go to Montreal or Quebec or Cancun, and then they go in, because they don't stamp their visas. You can meet them all in the airports down there.

We are making them illegal, illegal activities of U.S. citizens. That is not something we ought to be condoning. But this isn't licenses they receive; this is because they are using other means to go down and spend time there. But this is not permissible, visa-stamped approved travel by these people.

Mr. KERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. KERRY. I just make the point to the Senator that, having spoken with a lot of people who have gone down there and made some of those trips, the families aren't restricted in that way. They meet with relations. They tell people what is going on in the United States. They talk about their feelings about Fidel Castro.

What is amazing about this debate, what is absolutely stupefying, is that what the Senators seem to be defending is completely contrary now to the experience since 1959. We went through the whole 1960s, went through the Bay of Pigs, went through the 1970s. We went through the height of the Reagan opposition to the Iron Curtain and through all of the changes in Russia, the former Soviet Union, the former east bloc countries. We have seen the dynamics of that change.

The one place where our policy remains the same as it has throughout all of those years is the place where

there has been the least change. One of the reasons they had the power to shoot down those four planes is that there is no movement in the relationship, because they are as isolated.

If you look at the experience of Cubans, restricted, who go back to Cuba to visit their families, limited by the United States of America to one visit a year with their own family, you find that they are the ones saying to us today, we would like to have the right to travel to visit our families as frequently as we can. I am confident that the same kinds of changes that swept over the rest of the world will sweep over that tiny island.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will conclude by saying that I ask those who think the United States changing its policy towards Cuba will have these miraculous effects in terms of breaking waves of freedom to the people that will crush what is an East German police state today—I only ask them to tell us what is the evidence, based on the outreach which has been made by countries such as Canada and Spain and European and Latin American countries, which largely share our values, which have been for 40 years in a continuous relationship with Cuba?

I think the answer to the question is, there are no such evidences that that outreach has had a positive effect on Cuba. We are dealing with a sui generis anachronism in Cuba. That degree of singularity requires the kind of singularity of foreign policy that we are directing towards it, with our hopes that soon the people of Cuba will be released from that hold and that our policy will have contributed to that release and will help to establish a basis for a transition to a Cuba that will be respectful of its people and with which the United States can have normal and peaceful and prosperous relationships.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Would the Senator like an answer to the question?

• Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I oppose this travel amendment in the strongest possible terms. This is the wrong language at the wrong time. It represents a fundamental change in our Cuba policy—a change without proper consideration.

The Foreign Relations Committee has not considered this language; in fact, nobody has seen this language until it was introduced this afternoon. We should not rush this language through.

We should not do this. This is a half-baked approach, which makes for weak policy; it is not a mature effort to craft serious policy.

Fidel responds to our positive gestures with arrests, oppression, and crackdown. This effort is misguided and must be tabled.•

Mr. McCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the underlying Dodd amendment No. 1157, and 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 majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following this rollcall vote about to begin, the Senate immediately proceed to executive session and vote en bloc on the confirmation of the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: Nos. 104 through 108. I further ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote, the President be notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I also ask unanimous consent that it now be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on the nominations en bloc.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I don't have any objection, but I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may proceed in this way. A tabling motion has been made, and there is no debate on a tabling motion.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to do this, even though the vote has been ordered on the tabling amendment, so that we can have this vote in this sequence. It is to have a vote on the confirmation of five judicial nominations. Both have been requested, but it will be one vote, and it will count as only one vote on all five nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I thank Senator BYRD for that correction.

I ask consent then that it now be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. 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 clerk will call the roll on the motion to table.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the tabling motion——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, is it out of order to ask for unanimous consent?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no debate following a motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the rules that there be no debate, the Senator be allowed to make a unanimous consent.

Mr. LEAHY. That is what I was asking.

Mr. BYRD. The Chair should have the advice from the Parliamentarian to call this to the Senate's attention.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia was making the exact same request that I was making. Let's just vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 1157. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, House Members may not be in the Well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The well will be cleared.

The well will be cleared.

The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative assistant resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask for order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD. Now, Mr. President, I ask that House Members stay out of the well and stop lobbying Senators. I have had a number of Senators come to me and tell me that House Members are in the well lobbying them. The other Members didn't speak up, but I shall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD. I hope the Sergeant at Arms will see to it that House Members, who are our guests, will get out of the well. There are places in the back of the Chamber for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative assistant resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) and the Senate from Florida (Mr. MACK), are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 189 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Abraham	Crapo	Inhofe
Allard	DeWine	Kohl
Ashcroft	Domenici	Kyl
Bayh	Edwards	Lieberman
Bennett	Fitzgerald	Lott
Breaux	Frist	McCain
Brownback	Gorton	McConnell
Bryan	Graham	Murkowski
Bunning	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Reid
Byrd	Gregg	Robb
Campbell	Hatch	Roth
Cochran	Helms	Santorum
Collins	Hollings	Sessions
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Shelby
Craig	Hutchison	Smith (NH)

Smith (OR)
Snowe
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Torricelli

NAYS—43

Akaka
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Bond
Boxer
Chafee
Cleland
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan
Durbin
Enzi
Feingold
Feinstein
Grams
Hagel
Harkin
Inouye
Jeffords
Johnson
Kennedy
Kerrey
Kerry
Landrieu
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lincoln
Lugar
Mikulski
Moynihan
Murray
Reed
Roberts
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Schumer
Specter
Warner
Wellstone
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Mack
Voinovich

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF Keith P. Ellison, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

NOMINATION OF Gary Allen Feess, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

NOMINATION OF Stefan R. Underhill, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

NOMINATION OF W. Allen Pepper, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

NOMINATION OF Karen E. Schreier, of South Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Abraham
Akaka
Allard
Ashcroft
Baucus
Bayh
Bennett
Biden
Bingaman
Bond
Boxer
Breaux
Brownback
Bryan
Bunning
Byrd
Campbell
Chafee
Cleland
Cochran
Collins
Conrad
Coverdell
Craig
Crapo
Daschle
DeWine
Dodd
Domenici
Dorgan
Durbin
Edwards
Feingold
Feinstein
Fitzgerald
Frist
Gorton
Graham
Gramm
Grams
Grassley
Gregg
Hagel
Harkin
Hatch
Hollings
Hutchinson
Hutchison
Inhofe
Inouye
Jeffords
Johnson
Kennedy
Kerrey
Kerry
Kohl
Kyl
Landrieu
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Lincoln
Lott
Lugar
McCain
McConnell
Mikulski
Moynihan
Murkowski
Murray
Nickles
Reed
Reid
Robb
Roberts
Rockefeller
Roth
Santorum
Sarbanes
Schumer
Sessions
Shelby
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Torricelli
Warner
Wellstone
Wyden

NAYS—4

Burns
Enzi
Helms
Smith (NH)

NOT VOTING—2

Mack
Voinovich

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the ayes are 94, the nays are 4. The Senate does hereby advise and consent to the nominations of Keith B. Ellison of Texas, Gary Allen Feess of California, Stefan R. Underhill of Connecticut, W. Allen Pepper, Jr. of Mississippi, and Karen E. Schreier of South Dakota.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am encouraged that the Senate confirmed five of the judicial nominees from the 45 pending before us. I am glad that the District Courts in Mississippi, South Dakota, Texas, Connecticut, and California will soon have additional judicial resources. I only wish that were true for the 69 other vacancies around the country.

In particular, I look forward to the Committee finally approving the nomination of Marsha Berzon to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals this week and would ask the Majority Leader to take up that long-delayed nomination with the same expedition that is being. Fully one-quarter of the active judgeships authorized for that Court remain vacant, as they have been for several years. The Judicial Conference recently requested that Ninth Circuit judgeships be increased in light of its workload by an additional five judges. That means that while Ms. Berzon's nomination has been pending, and five other nominations are pending to the Ninth Circuit, that Court has been forced to struggle through its extraordinary workload with 12 fewer judges than it needs.

Marsha Berzon is an outstanding nominee. By all accounts, she is an exceptional lawyer with extensive appellate experience, including a number of cases heard by the Supreme Court. She has the strong support of both California Senators and a well-qualified rating from the American Bar Association.

She was initially nominated in January 1998, almost 17 months ago. She participated in an extensive two-part confirmation hearing before the Committee back on July 30, 1998. Thereafter she received a number of sets of written questions from a number of Senators and responded in August. A second round of written questions was sent and she responded by the middle of September. Despite the efforts of Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator KENNEDY, Senator SPECTER and myself to have her considered by the Committee, she was not included on an agenda and not voted on during all of 1998. Her nomination was returned to the President without action by this Committee or the Senate in late October.

This year the President renominated Ms. Berzon in January. She participated in her second confirmation hearing two weeks ago, was sent additional sets of written questions, responded and got and answered another question. I do not know why these questions were not asked last year. I do hope that the Committee will vote to report her nomination to the Senate on Thursday and that the Senate will finally, at long last, take the opportunity to confirm her to the federal bench.

The saga of this brilliant lawyer and good person is a long one, but it is not an isolated story. Hers is not even the longest pending nomination. That distinction belongs to Judge Richard Paez who was initially nominated in January 1996—over three and one half years ago—favorably reported by this Committee last year but not voted upon by the Senate. He was renominated in January, as well. His nomination is in limbo before the Senate Judiciary Committee, more than three years after this fine Hispanic judge was first nominated by the President.

In addition, there is the nomination of Justice Ronnie L. White to the federal court in Missouri, a nomination I spoke to the Senate about earlier this week. This past weekend marked the 2-year anniversary of the nomination of this outstanding jurist to what is now a judicial emergency vacancy on the U.S. District Court in the Eastern District of Missouri. He is currently a member of the Missouri Supreme Court.

He was nominated by President Clinton in June of 1997, 2 years ago. It took 11 months before the Senate would even allow him to have a confirmation hearing. His nomination was then reported favorably on a 13 to 3 vote by the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 21, 1998. Senators HATCH, THURMOND, GRASSLEY, SPECTER, KYL, and DEWINE were the Republican members of the Committee who voted for him along with the Democratic members. Senators ASHCROFT, ABRAHAM and SESSIONS voted against him.

Even though he had been voted out overwhelmingly, he sat on the calendar, and the nomination was returned to the President after 16 months with no action.

The President has again renominated him. I have called again upon the Senate Judiciary Committee to act on this qualified nomination. Justice White deserves better than benign neglect. The people in Missouri deserve a fully qualified and fully staffed Federal bench.

Justice White has one of the finest records—and the experience and standing—of any lawyer that has come before the Judiciary Committee. He has served in the Missouri legislature, the office of the city counselor for the City of St. Louis, and he was a judge in the Missouri Court of Appeals for the Eastern District of Missouri before his current service as the first African American ever to serve on the Missouri Supreme Court.

Having been voted out of Committee by a 4–1 margin, having waited for 2 years, this distinguished African American at least deserves a vote, up or down. Senators can stand up and say they will vote for or against him, but let this man have his vote.

Twenty-four months after being nominated and after being renominated five months ago, the nomination remains pending without action before the Senate Judiciary Committee. People like Justice Ronnie L. White deserve to have their nominations treated with dignity and dispatch. Twenty-four months is far too long to have to wait for Senate action.

The Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court wrote in his Year-End Report in 1997: ''Some current nominees have been waiting a considerable time for a Senate Judiciary Committee vote or a final floor vote. The Senate confirmed only 17 judges in 1996 and 36 in 1997, well under the 101 judges it confirmed in 1994.'' He went on to note: ''The Senate is surely under no obligation to confirm any particular nominee, but after the necessary time for inquiry it should vote him up or vote him down.''

For the last several years I have been urging the Judiciary Committee and the Senate to proceed to consider and confirm judicial nominees more promptly and without the years of delay that now accompany so many nominations. I hope the Committee will not delay any longer in reporting the nomination of Justice Ronnie L. White to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri and that the Senate will finally act on the nomination of this fine African-American jurist.

In explaining why he chose to withdraw from consideration after waiting 15 months for Senate consideration, another minority nominee, Jorge Rangel, wrote to the President and explained:

''Our judicial system depends on men and women of good will who agree to serve when asked to do so. But public service asks too much when those of us who answer the call to service are subjected to a confirmation process dominated by interminable delays and inaction. Patience has its virtues, but it also has its limits''.

Justice White has been exceedingly patient. He remains one of the 10 longest-pending judicial nominations before the Senate, along with Judge Richard Paez and Marsha Berzon.

Acting to fill judicial vacancies is a constitutional duty that the Senate—and all of its members—are obligated to fulfill. In its unprecedented slowdown in the handling of nominees since the 104th Congress, the Senate is shirking its duty. That is wrong and should end.

As the Senate recesses for the Independence Day holiday, I am glad to see that the Senate is taking a few small steps toward responsible action by confirming five qualified District Court nominees. I will continue to work to see that the scores of remaining nominees be treated fairly.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all of our colleagues, Senator LEAHY and I have a couple of housekeeping measures to attend to, which we will do now. Then there will be a vote on the McConnell-Abraham second-degree amendment. If that amendment is successful, we will move to final passage. If that amendment is not successful, it is my understanding Senator SARBANES wishes to address the Senate further on the underlying Brownback amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1159, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification of amendment No. 1159.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as further modified, is as follows:

On page 21, line 22, before the period insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available for grants to nongovernmental organizations that work with orphans who are transitioning out of institutions to teach life skills and job skills'': *Provided further*, that of the amount available under the heading 'ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES' for Romania, $4,400,000 shall be provided solely to the Romanian Department of Child Protection for activities of such Department to provide emergency aid for the child victims of the present economic crisis in Romania, including activities relating to supplemental food support and maintenance, support for in-home foster case, and supplemental support for special needs residential care''.

AMENDMENT NOS. 1184 AND 1185

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment on behalf of Senator BYRD and an amendment on behalf of Senator NICKLES to the desk. They have been cleared. I ask unanimous consent they be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 1184 and 1185) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1184

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding assistance under the Camp David Accords)

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ASSISTANCE UNDER THE CAMP DAVID ACCORDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Egypt and Israel together negotiated the Camp David Accords, an historic breakthrough in beginning the process of bringing peace to the Middle East.

(2) As part of the Camp David Accords, a concept was reached regarding the ratio of United States foreign assistance between Egypt and Israel, a formula which has been followed since the signing of the Accords.

(3) The United States is reducing economic assistance to Egypt and Israel, with the agreement of those nations.

(4) The United States is committed to maintaining proportionality between Egypt and Israel in United States foreign assistance programs.

(5) Egypt has consistently fulfilled an historic role of peacemaker in the context of the Arab-Israeli disputes.

(6) The recent elections in Israel offer fresh hope of resolving the remaining issues of dispute in the region.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the United States should provide Egypt access to an interest bearing account as part of the United States foreign assistance program pursuant to the principles of proportionality which underlie the Camp David Accords.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my views on foreign assistance are well known. I don't like it. I understand there are circumstances in which the United States needs to extend a helping hand to other nations facing political and economic strains that we thankfully do not have to endure. I simply think that the United States spends too much of its citizens' hard-earned tax dollars overseas, and that is why I traditionally vote against the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

My reluctance to send U.S. tax dollars overseas leads me to scrutinize closely those programs that we do fund. One of the largest recipients of U.S. foreign assistance is the Middle East, and in particular Israel, and to a lesser extent, Egypt. These nations are our strongest allies in a troubled region, and I firmly believe that maintaining a strong relationship with them is in the best strategic interests of the United States. We cannot forget that it was Egypt and Israel that negotiated the Camp David Accords, an historic breakthrough in the efforts to

bring peace to the Middle East. As part of the Camp David Accords, a concept was reached regarding the ratio of United States foreign assistance between Egypt and Israel. This formula has been followed since the signing of the Accords.

I have believed for many years that the United States is spending too much on foreign assistance to Egypt and Israel. I have tried in the past, to no avail, to reduce the level of assistance being sent to Israel. I am pleased that the United States has finally embarked on a program of reducing economic assistance to both nations, with the agreement of those nations. However, maintaining proportionality between Egypt and Israel as the level of foreign assistance is reduced is vitally important, and never more so than now, when the recent elections in Israel offer fresh hope of restarting the peace process.

Unfortunately, the mechanism by which United States foreign assistance is currently being provided to Egypt and Israel has resulted in an imbalance to that program in that Israel has the unique advantage of having immediate access to an interest bearing account while Egypt has not been accorded the same treatment. This, I believe, is a procedure which can be interpreted as a departure from the standard of fairness that is central to United States assistance under the Camp David Accords.

Mr. President, this is an injustice that should be corrected. Speaking frankly, it is my opinion that neither Israel nor Egypt should be earning interest on United States foreign assistance. But, under the principles of parity that underlie the Camp David Accords, both nations should receive the same treatment. Egypt and Israel are pivotal allies in the Middle East, and the United States should accord them equal treatment in disbursing its foreign assistance.

AMENDMENT NO. 1185

(Purpose: Regarding availability of United States assistance for the Palestian Authority)

Strike section 577, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 577. UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

(1) GAO CERTIFICATION.—NOT MORE THAN 30 DAYS PRIOR TO THE OBLIGATION OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE TO THIS ACT FOR ASSISTANCE FOR THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES SHALL CERTIFY THAT THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY—

(A) has adopted an acceptable accounting system to ensure that such funds will be used for their intended assistance purposes; and

(B) has cooperated with the Comptroller General in the certification process under this paragraph.

(2) GAO AUDITS.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—Six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit to determine the extent to which the Palestinian Authority is implementing an acceptable accounting system in tracking the use of funds made available by the Act for assistance for the Palestinian Authority.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes all action on S. 1234, it not be engrossed and be held at the desk. I further ask that when the House of Representatives' companion measure is received in the Senate, the Senate immediately proceed to its consideration, all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken and the text of S. 1234, as passed, be inserted in lieu thereof, the House bill, as amended, be read for the third time and passed, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, and the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate.

I further ask unanimous consent that upon passage by the Senate of the House companion measure, as amended, the passage of S. 1234 be vitiated, and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1186, 1187, AND 1188, EN BLOC

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three amendments that have been cleared on the other side on behalf of the Senator from Vermont be considered en bloc and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] proposes en bloc amendments numbered 1186, 1187, and 1188.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 1186, 1187, and 1188) were agreed to, en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1186

At the appropriate place, insert:

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. . The Secretary of the Treasury may, to fulfill commitments of the United States, (1) effect the United States participation in the fifth general capital increase of the African Development Bank, the first general capital increase of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, and the first general capital increase of the Inter-American Investment Corporation; (2) contribute on behalf of the United States to the eighth replenishment of the resources of the African Development Fund, the twelfth replenishment of the International Development Association. The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury: $40,847,011 for paid-in capital, and $639,932,485 for callable capital, of the African Development Bank; $29,870,087 for paid-in capital, and $139,365,533 for callable capital, of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency; $125,180,000 for paid-in capital of the Inter-American Investment Corporation; $300,000,000 for the African Development Fund; $2,410,000,000 for the International Development Association; and $50,000,000 for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development's HIPC Trust Fund.

AMENDMENT NO. 1187

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

SEC. . Section 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2395) is amended by adding a new subsection (l) as follows:

''(1) There is hereby established a working capital fund for the United States Agency for International Development which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for the expenses of personal and non-personal services, equipment and supplies for: (A) International Cooperative Administrative Support Services; (B) central information technology, library, audiovisual and administrative support services; (C) medical and health care of participants and others; and (D) such other functions which the Administrator of such agency, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, determines may be provided more advantageously and economically as central services.

''(2) The capital of the fund shall consist of the fair and reasonable value of such supplies, equipment and other assets pertaining to the functions of the fund as the Administrator determines and any appropriations made available for the purpose of providing capital, less related liabilities.

''(3) The fund shall be reimbursed or credited with advance payments for services, equipment or supplies provided from the fund from applicable appropriations and funds of the agency, other federal agencies and other sources authorized by section 607 of this Act at rates that will recover total expenses of operation, including accrual of annual leave and depreciations Receipts from the disposal of, or payments for the loss or damage to, property held in the fund, rebates, reimbursements, refunds and other credits applicable to the operation of the fund may be deposited in the fund.

''(4) the agency shall transfer to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts as of the close of the fiscal year such amounts which the Administrator determines to be in excess of the needs of the fund.

''(5) The fund may be charged with the current value of supplies and equipment returned to the working capital of the fund by a post, activity or agency and the proceeds shall be credited to current applicable appropriations.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1188

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

DEVELOPMENT CREDIT AUTHORITY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees, up to $7,500,000 to be derived by transfer from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and funds appropriated by this Act under the heading, ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', to remain available until expanded, as authorized by section 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; Provided further, That for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, up to $500,000 of this amount may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development''; Provided further, That the provisions of section 107A(d) (relating to general provisions applicable to the Development Credit Authority) of the foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as contained in section 306 of H.R. 1486 as reported by the House Committee on International Relations on May 9, 1997, shall be

applicable to direct loans and loan guarantees provided under this heading.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask that the amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1119

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the McConnell amendment. All those in favor—

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, are the yeas and nays not ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the McConnell amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to McConnell amendment No. 1119. 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 Florida (Mr. MACK) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. ALLARD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nasy 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 191 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Durbin	Kohl
Akaka	Edwards	Leahy
Baucus	Enzi	Levin
Bayh	Feingold	McConnell
Bennett	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Fitzgerald	Moynihan
Bond	Gorton	Reed
Boxer	Graham	Reid
Breaux	Grassley	Robb
Bryan	Gregg	Rockefeller
Bunning	Harkin	Santorum
Burns	Hatch	Sarbanes
Campbell	Hollings	Schumer
Cleland	Inouye	Specter
Collins	Johnson	Stevens
Craig	Kennedy	Torricelli
Daschle	Kerrey	Wellstone
DeWine	Kerry	

NAYS—45

Allard	Grams	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Hagel	Murray
Bingaman	Helms	Nickles
Brownback	Hutchinson	Roberts
Byrd	Hutchison	Roth
Chafee	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Jeffords	Shelby
Conrad	Kyl	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Landrieu	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Lautenberg	Snowe
Dodd	Lieberman	Thomas
Domenici	Lincoln	Thompson
Dorgan	Lott	Thurmond
Frist	Lugar	Warner
Gramm	McCain	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Mack	Voinovich

The amendment (No. 1119) was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SARBANES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1118

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first-degree amendment, as amended.

The amendment (No. 1118) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COVERDELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are ready for final passage.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, this will be the last recorded vote for tonight. We will then go to the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill, and, hopefully, good progress, or all progress, can be completed on that tonight, with the possibility of stacked votes on or in relation to the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill in the morning.

The next recorded vote, though, will be at 10:30 in the morning on a cloture motion with regard to Social Security lockbox. Hopefully, there will be other stacked votes in that sequence. For now, that is the only one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering S. 1234, the foreign operations and export financing appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

The Senate bill provides $12.7 billion in budget authority and $4.7 billion in new outlays to operate the programs of the Department of State, Export and Military Assistance, Bilateral and Multilateral Economic Assistance, and Related Agencies for Fiscal Year 2000.

When outlays from prior year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the bill totals $12.7 billion in budget authority and $13.2 billion in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

The subcommittee is below its Section 302(B) allocation for budget authority and outlays.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1234, FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 2000—SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars]

	General purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:				
Budget authority	12,700	.....	44	12,744
Outlays	13,139	.....	44	13,183
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	12,701	.....	44	12,745
Outlays	13,150	.....	44	13,194
1999 level:				
Budget authority	13,266	.....	45	13,311
Outlays	12,740	.....	45	12,785
President's request:				
Budget authority	14,070	.....	44	14,114
Outlays	14,104	.....	44	14,148
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	.....	.....	44	.....
Outlays	8,456	.....	44	.....
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	(1)	.....	.....	(1)
Outlays	(11)	.....	.....	(11)
1999 level:				
Budget authority	(566)	.....	(1)	(567)
Outlays	399	.....	(1)	398
President's request:				
Budget authority	(1,370)	.....	.....	(1,370)
Outlays	(965)	.....	.....	(965)
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	12,700	.....	.....	12,700
Outlays	4,683	.....	.....	4,683

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues an issue which I believe is of importance in the FY 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill: U.S. assistance to Egypt. Before I begin, however, I thank the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee for their expert and sound guidance on this bill. They deserve our commendation for working with such tight 302(b) allocations.

Egypt is a country that many in the Senate hold in high regard. Egypt is a dependable and steady ally in the Middle East. This year marks the twentieth anniversary of peace between Israel and Egypt, a peace which has served and continues to serve as a benchmark of the end of hostilities between Arabs and Israelis. Since peace between Egypt and Israel was established in 1979, Congress has recognized that in America's relations with these two allies that fair treatment of both Israel and Egypt in the provision of foreign assistance is a key feature in preserving peace and stability in the region.

The administration requested as part of its FY 2000 budget that a portion of Egypt's military assistance held in reserve to pay for the potential termination of contracts accrue interest. This proposal, known as an interest bearing account (IBA), would allow interest to accrue on approximately $470 million in the termination liability account for Egypt. Israel's military assistance has been treated in this way for some time, treatment that I and many others here support. The net impact of granting Egypt this treatment would be about $20 million in interest to Egypt, without any additional cost or outlay by the U.S. taxpayer.

Like many of my colleagues, I support the administration's request for an IBA for Egypt, and I feel very strongly that Egypt should have the

same terms as Israel. The Department of State has made a commitment to Egypt on this issue, and I think it is important that this commitment be kept.

Despite our support for an IBA, the Congressional Budget Office has told us that the IBA would be scored as a $470 million outlay—despite the fact that it actually costs nothing—and would thus break the Senate's tight outlay ceiling for this bill. Although support for an IBA for Egypt is strong—I am confident that on the merits an Amendment proposing an IBA would have the support of the vast majority of my colleagues—the Senate is confined at this time in our actions by budgetary pressures.

I am hopeful that we might still be able to resolve this scoring issue and perhaps address the question of an IBA for Egypt in Conference.

Again, I thank the subcommittee chairman and ranking member for their work on this bill. I look forward to continuing to work with them on this issue.

BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators STEVENS, MCCONNELL, COVERDELL, DEWINE, and I may enter into a colloquy on funding for the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement and the State Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I say to Senator STEVENS, Senators COVERDELL, DEWINE, and I have afforded an amendment No. 1148 to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill regarding increased funding for the State Department's counterdrug efforts.

Mr. STEVENS. I am aware of the amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. As the Senator knows, we have been working on this bill and on others to ensure adequate funding for our Nation's counter narcotics efforts. And I appreciate the committee's past support in this regard. I am aware that we face tough budget decisions and we need to balance many program needs within a balanced budget.

Mr. STEVENS. We have had to make a lot of tough decisions in this bill while trying to ensure that we meet the needs of many critical programs. I know that Senator MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY and the subcommittee have worked shared to be fair, and they have had to make tough choices.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I appreciate their efforts. Our amendment asks for more funding for INL, although it is still below the President's request. Senators COVERDELL, DEWINE, and I have worked with the committee in the past on this issue. It is my understanding that the House is working to provide a higher level.

Mr. STEVENS. I believe that is the case but the House has not yet made a final decision on appropriation levels for the State Department's counter narcotics programs.

Mr. GRASSLEY. If there is a difference between the House and Senate levels, that will mean that the final appropriation levels will be conferencable, is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. That is the case.

Mr. GRASSLEY. It is my understanding that if the numbers in House and Senate bills are different that it is your intention to work during the conference to ensure that we see a higher level of funding for this program?

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct. I will work on trying to see a higher level of funding. But let me point out that there is a difference between the House and Senate allocation levels and that we will have a lot of reconciling to do.

Mr. COVERDELL. I ask the distinguished Senator from Alaska if that effort will preclude increased funding for INL?

Mr. STEVENS. It does not preclude it, and I will work to ensure that we try to get more funding.

Mr. COVERDELL. I know that Senator GRASSLEY and Senator DEWINE share my concern that we ensure that our international counter drug programs here and elsewhere receive the support they need to keep drugs off our streets and out of our homes. We had a press conference today on just his point. We have been fighting a battle the last few years to raise the visibility of the need for serious counter drug efforts and the need to fund those adequately. The State Department program is an important part of that effort.

Mr. DEWINE. If I might add something to the comments of my distinguished colleague from Georgia. Last year, the Congress added significant new money into our international and interdiction efforts. This was in part a down payment on the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, that I introduced in the 105th Congress. It is important that we ensure that the effort begun then is sustained. Having seen first hand the positive benefits of this program in this region. I strongly believe that increased funding for INL should be strongly considered in conference.

Mr. STEVENS. I share the Senators' concerns for the need for sustained and adequate funding.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I too share this concern. The Foreign Operations bill is an effort to address that concern and the many other programs that need attention in our foreign policy.

Mr. GRASSLEY. It is my understanding that every effort will be made in conference to ensure that there will be increased funding for the State Department's counter narcotics programs. If that is the case, then I am prepared to withdraw my amendment and I thank Senator STEVENS and Senator MCCONNELL for their consideration in this matter.

Mr. COVERDELL. I join Senator GRASSLEY in thanking the committee.

Mr. DEWINE. I also thank the committee.

IMF GOLD SALE

Mr. ALLARD. Will the distinguished Senator from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. As the chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, is the Senator aware of a proposal by the Administration to support the sale of some ten million ounces of gold by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) from its gold reserves in order to provide debt relief for countries under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC)?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes, I am aware of this proposal. Let me say to the Senator from Colorado that the proposal to have the IMF sell its gold in order to provide debt relief to the HIPC nations is a matter of significant concern to me.

Mr. ALLARD. I share the chairman's concern. The sale of IMF gold would have the effect of depressing gold prices well beyond the twenty year low to which the price of gold has already plunged. As I think the Senator from Kentucky well knows, a further drop in the price of gold will not only hurt American industry but cost thousands of U.S. workers their jobs. Equally important, falling gold prices will directly impact 36 of the 41 nations that are slated to benefit from the HIPC program. This is because those 36 nations are in fact gold producers, and their economies would suffer to such a degree that the damage done to their economies resulting from depressed gold prices would be greater than any debt relief they might receive. Does the Senator agree with that analysis?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator from Colorado is exactly right. Considering the fact that barely 40 percent of the interest to be derived from the investment of the proceeds from the sale of the IMF gold would actually be available to the HIPC nations for debt relief, it seems to me that this amounts to a cruel hoax. Of particular concern to me is the fact that the sale of the IMF gold would reduce gold prices to such an extent that the harm done to HIPC nations' economies will likely exceed any benefit from this debt relief effort. I believe the issue of debt relief for the HIPC nations is important and must be dealt with, but such a program must be designed to reduce the economic burden on these countries not compound them.

Mr. ALLARD. I ask the chairman, is it the case that in order for this proposed IMF gold sale to go forward, that the Congress must specifically authorize the U.S. representative to the IMF to cast a vote in favor of such a sale?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator from Colorado is exactly correct. Existing law 22 U.S.C. 286c specifically requires Congress, by law, to authorize such action. I would point out to the Senator,

as I am sure he is already aware, that absent an act of Congress, the statute makes it clear that neither the President nor any person or agency acting on behalf of the United States can vote to approve the sale of IMF gold.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the chairman for that clarification. Would it be fair to conclude, I say to my friend from Kentucky, that you are not in a position to support legislation that would seek to have this Congress authorize U.S. approval of the sale of IMF gold?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator from Colorado is absolutely correct. For the reasons I have outlined, I believe the proposal to sell IMF gold as part of the HIPC Initiative is misguided and just plain bad policy. I could not support legislation authorizing such a sale as part of this or any bill. And, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, that when I take this bill to conference with the House, we will include a Statement of Manager's language that will reiterate that the sale of IMF gold cannot go forward unless we in Congress specifically provide authorization.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the chairman.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concern about the proposed reduction of funding for the Peace Corps in this foreign operations appropriations bill—a reduction that is contrary to the will of Congress as expressed by the overwhelming, bipartisan support for the Peace Corps Reauthorization Act, which passed unanimously this session in both Houses of Congress.

I am mindful of the constraints imposed by the lower allocations to the appropriators. But Congress has spoken affirmatively on the issue of increased funding for the Peace Corps. The authorizing committee and, then, this body, supported the bill by unanimous consent. A few months earlier, the House passed the measure by a vote of 326–90. President Clinton immediately signed the bill in May.

Mr. President, as chairman of the authorizing committee for the Peace Corps, I worked with the committees' ranking Member and former Peace Corps Volunteer, Senator DODD, to sponsor the Peace Corps Act. The Act authorizes a 12 percent increase for Fiscal Year 2000 and is part of a multiyear plan to enable the Peace Corps to reach its goal of 10,000 Volunteers by 2003. Reaching this mark has been a long-standing goal of Congress—a goal set into law in 1985.

Despite the consistent endorsement of the growth plan, the Appropriations Committee has recommended a $50 million reduction in funding from the authorized amount (and $20 million less than the Peace Corps current budget of $240 million). This appropriation is ill-advised. If enacted, it would deny the Peace Corps the opportunity to reach its goal of 10,000 Volunteers serving abroad. And, even worse, it would force the Agency to cut the current level of Volunteers by over 1,000 (That is, from 6,700 to 5,700) Volunteers).

I recognize the constraints under which the Peace Corps and all federal programs must operate. For that reason, I have been a close observer of the Peace Corps activities, as has Senator DODD, in exercising our oversight responsibilities. I remain confident that the Peace Corps remains the best foreign assistance program of its kind, and that it has systems in place to continue fielding Volunteers responsibly and efficiently. Part of the genius of the Peace Corps is its ability to use a relatively small amount of money to do big things. Even if the Peace Corps received full funding at $270 million, the amount would be about 1 percent of our foreign aid budget.

Mr. President, I believe that the Peace Corps is well prepared to begin implementation of the multi-year plan. I urge the appropriators to join the Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle and in both Houses who have overwhelmingly endorsed this worthy goal.

U.S.-HAITI POLICY

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I have a long standing interest in Haiti. I have made seven trips to this island nation in the past four years. I have spoken often about the developments in that country here on the Senate floor. I am here today because I am extremely concerned about the tumultuous conditions in Haiti. And, I feel the United States must understand the immediacy and vast importance of the present situation in order to act in an appropriate way.

Mr. President, the serious political and financial circumstances leave Haiti at a crossroads. In order to survive, Haiti must act decisively, and the global community must respond accordingly.

It is of vital importance that Haiti holds Parliamentary elections this year, and that we respond with our technical and security resources to support and strengthen this process. In addition, the U.S. Governments' policy on limiting financial assistance, which in the past I have whole heartedly embraced and which has been effective, should now be re-thought.

Haiti has a heritage of political turmoil and unrest. To understand the present situation, one must first comprehend the series of events in the two years which have led to this unfortunate circumstance.

The seriously flawed April 6, 1997 elections, which attracted less than 5 percent of the Haitian electorate, provoked the resignation in June 1997 of Prime Minister Rosney Smarth. For twenty months, a political deadlock existed between President Rene Preval and the majority party in Parliament over the contested April 1997 elections and over President Preval's nominee for Prime Minister, Jacques Edouard Alexis. The political crisis virtually paralyzed the government and delayed millions of dollars in international aid to Haiti.

Mr. President, in January of this year, Haiti's drawn out crisis took a very troubling turn when President Preval announced that the Haitian National Assembly's term had expired and that he would proceed to install a government by ''executive order.'' What happened in essence, of course, was that President Preval chose to ignore Haiti's Parliament and rule by decree. Tragically, President Preval effectively disbanded the Parliament and stripped them of their power.

Even though Prime Minister Alexis was approved by both Houses before the Parliament was dissolved, the new Prime Minister does not yet have any authority to govern because his cabinet has not been approved by the Parliament. And since there is no functioning Parliament, there can be no confirmation of the Prime Minister's cabinet. We have gone from a long period without a Prime Minister in Haiti to a period now without a governing Parliament.

While the political crisis in Haiti deepens, there has been some progress made. In March of this year, President Preval and the opposition political parties agreed on a Provisional Electoral Council, charge with establishing fair and equal elections. And the Council has been effective. Specifically, the Council recently made a brave and bold move by announcing the annulment of the April 1997 elections. Mr. President, I applaud this recent action. We need to support this recent overture and take it to the next level. We must urge the Haitians to have parliamentary elections.

We know that the present political vacuum must be filled with a credible government or else, we may risk it being filled by a de facto dictatorship. The global community has the responsibility to take action now.

First, the Haitians must have Parliamentary elections before the end of this year. A balance of power is fundamental to an effective democracy. The election of a new Parliament prior to Presidential elections in December 2000, begins establishing this foundational balance, which is in the best interest of Haiti.

The United States and the international community have the ability and resources to help in two specific ways, through technical assistance and security reinforcement. In order to ensure that the Haitians hold free, fair, open, and credible elections , the United States, in partnership with the international community, must leverage all available assets in a coordinated effort to support the election process.

The United States should provide resources in support of the election process to include the encouragement of political coalition building. The technical assistance can be coordinated by the other countries who are involved in Haiti that can also provide substantial financial help.

In addition to the technical assistance, Haiti's security must be

strengthened in order for the elections to be held in a safe environment. We must increase support to the Haitian National Police. In addition, provisions should be made so that United Nations Civilian Police—known as the CIVPOL—can continue it's important mission through this election period. There should also be a large and significant presence of international observers during the six to eight weeks prior of the elections. These basic actions taken quickly and with authority will demonstrate that the United States is committed to democracy in Haiti.

Second, we need to re-assess U.S. policy on financial assistance to Haiti.

For the past several years, the U.S. Government has conditioned assistance to the Haiti due to the Haitian Government's ineptness. While the United States has tried to help Haiti sustain democracy, unfortunately, the Haitian Government has lacked political will. The Haitian Government has not taken action to resolve a number of extrajudicial and political killings in Haiti and there have been numerous human rights violations. The Government has also been extremely slow in privatization of its government owned enterprises, and it has not been accountable in maintaining government institutions through their constitutional and electoral processes.

Let me be clear when I say that the objective in our conditioning of assistance to Haiti was to urge the Haitian Government to take the necessary steps to overcome these concerns and challenges. Our conditioning of assistance has produced some positive change in Haiti. With the upcoming Parliamentarian elections in Haiti, however, it is important that we provide flexibility in our assistance to assure that these very important and needed elections are transparent.

Today, Mr. President, I am suggesting that the U.S. Government focus its appropriation policy on accountability. While the Congress is not losing the opportunity to review and perform oversight of our appropriated funds to Haiti, this new language sets congressional priorities. Specifically, the top areas include: First, aggressive action to support the institution of the Haitian National Police; second, steps to ensure that any elections undertaken in Haiti with U.S. assistance are full, free, fair and transparent; third, a program designed to develop the indigenous human rights monitoring capacity; fourth, steps to facilitate the continued privatization of state-owned enterprises; and fifth, a sustained agriculture development program.

We have also incorporated reporting requirement language so that the Administration can give U.S. a detailed assessment of each benchmark. This new language was drafted by several Senators including myself and Senators HELMS, DODD, and GRAHAM.

The ideological and financial crossway that is before Haiti is of national and global importance. The U.S. national interest is served by a stable, democratic, prospering Haiti that cooperates with U.S. counter-drug efforts. We can help ensure this end through our technical and physical support of immediate Parliamentary elections and through lifting the limitations on financial assistance. Our Nation's eyes have been so focused across the Atlantic that I fear we may have forgotten our responsibility in our own hemisphere. But, now is the time to act in order that democracy may take her proper place in this hemisphere.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the managers of this bill for their work on this legislation. This is not an easy bill.

I certainly commend their efforts to keep this bill within the budget caps. I regret that in trying to balance our many important priorities, international affairs spending may have suffered disproportionately.

Mr. President, national security can not be viewed solely through a defense lens, but also must comprise all the critical preventive measures offered through an active foreign affairs program. This means continuing to fight the spread of disease and drugs, providing adequate nutrition for children and families, and pursuing U.S. goals in arms reduction. We also should continue to make our full contributions to the multilateral institutions, in particular the United Nations, on which the United States relies.

I will, however, support this legislation.

However, I do wish to comment on one area of funding in particular which has suffered cuts in this legislation, and that is international peacekeeping. This bill appropriates funds for America's voluntary peacekeeping activities, which includes such things as our contributions to the Israel-Lebanon Monitoring Group, to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and to the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) in the Middle East. The voluntary peacekeeping account also funds our contributions to important peacekeeping initiatives in Africa, including through an Africa regional fund and through the Africa Crisis Response Initiative.

But Mr. President, this bill would cut the voluntary peacekeeping account by $50 million off the President's request; that's 40% below the request. While the bill would support a slight increase from last year's appropriation for this account, I am afraid that this level is inadequate to support our peacekeeping efforts in Africa.

This voluntary peacekeeping fund is designed to support peacekeeping efforts other than assessed missions by the United Nations, which are funded separately through an account in another appropriations bill. The account funded in this bill is designed to try to anticipate needs in the peacekeeping arena, but also to be flexible and prepared to deal with unanticipated contingencies.

This morning, the chairman of the Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, made the assertion that the administration's request regarding peacekeeping was, in his words, ''redundant,'' because there is more than one account that provides funds for peacekeeping in Africa.

But, Mr. President, I would respectfully disagree with this characterization and note that the requirements for peacekeeping in Africa are such that a distinct account may be required.

At a recent hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Africa, Chairman FRIST and I heard testimony regarding the conflict raging in Central Africa, in which there are currently as many as nine countries involved. These wars don't get much press attention in the United States, but it is likely that more people are dying there right now than we have seen killed in Kosovo in recent months and in a number of other well publicized conflicts outside Africa.

Mr. President, it is easy to make generalizations about the causes of conflict in Africa, but I think its roots are not well understood.

At that hearing, I posed some important questions which I would like to repeat here on the floor.

First, what is the basis for U.S. policy in Africa? Is it to support democracy and respect for human rights? Is it to avoid genocide? Is it to encourage stability and economic development? These are some of the things I hear administration officials saying, but sometimes I am not sure our actions are consistent with these lofty goals. For example, some would question how the United States government hopes to prevent genocide, when it is often hesitant to condemn atrocities that fall short of genocide. Some also question our commitment to preventing genocide in the future when our government has so far declined to examine in any detail our own weak response during the 1994 crisis.

Second, if there were to be another ''genocide''—assuming there is consensus as to the meaning of that word—what steps is the United States prepared to take to stop it? Is NATO going to start launching air strikes against the offending powers? We all know that is unrealistic, yet the crisis in Kosovo is causing a lot of people—including Members of Congress and including myself—to ask: ''Why Kosovo and not Rwanda?'' Why is it that the United States can spend billions of dollars trying to stop ethnic cleansing in one place, but yet wouldn't even use the word ''genocide'' in the Rwanda case until two months after the killing started, and thousands had been killed?

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, the Senator from Kentucky, also noted the Committee's intent to have Serbia designated as a terrorist state, which is mandated in the legislation. I support this designation, and I agree with my colleague that it is hard to understand

the difference, as he said this morning on the floor, ''between thugs blowing up a village with a car bomb or thugs shelling and burning a village to the ground. The intent and impact are the same. In both instances, innocent civilians are the targets and the victims.''

Mr. President, this is precisely my point. Only I would make this point with respect to Africa and say this: I do not understand the difference between the terror and violence that is going on in Sierra Leone and what is going on in Kosovo! In both instances, innocent civilians are the targets and the victims. Yet the bill before us today provides millions of dollars to support peacekeeping and other activities for Kosovo, and barely anything for similar activities in Africa.

I do not understand how the decision to intervene in Kosovo fits in with an overall post-Cold War American foreign policy strategy. Obviously, the tragedies and the horrors that have been perpetrated in Kosovo demand a response and that response must include a role for the United States. But as the world's only superpower, I do not believe the United States is able to act effectively only in Europe or only in our own region. We have shown our ability to project overwhelming power throughout the world. Is an accident of geography sufficient to allow inaction in Africa, while Kosovo requires a huge commitment? This question needs to be answered not so much for me but for the American people, and to some extent for the people of Africa. They do not understand, and I do not understand, why one tragedy demands our attention and our action, and another one simply does not.

Mr. President, my point here is that, given the overwhelming response to the events in the Balkans, the very least we can do in response to conflict in Africa is to support regional peacekeeping efforts, as well as do all we can on the preventive side.

The United States has been a significant contributor to existing regional efforts such as the actions of the Economic Community of West African States, or ECOWAS, and its peacekeeping force, ECOMOG in both Liberia and in the ongoing conflict in Sierra Leone. There is no doubt that ECOMOG has had its share of problems, but nevertheless, it is solely through the efforts of this regional peacekeeping force that there is even the hope of a peaceful resolution in the Sierra Leone situation.

Mr. President, we can never truly anticipate the extent of needs such as this, and I would hope we could allow the administration some flexibility in this account. We should ensure the availability of funding to provide resources to support what I hope will be a peace agreement in Sierra Leone and maybe a cease-fire agreement in the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea. If these positive developments take place, the United States should be poised to provide some support. This is no time to send a signal that we are not concerned with these crises.

Finally, just a quick word about the two Africa-related portions of this voluntary account. As I understand his remarks, the Senator from Kentucky believes it is ''redundant'' to have both an Africa Regional fund and monies for the Africa Crisis Response Initiative. But in my view, these two funds serve two separate purposes. The first, the Africa regional fund, represents our traditional peacekeeping functions. This is the account that has been used to provide logistical assistance to ECOMOG in both the Liberia and Sierra Leone cases. The other, the Africa Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI), is different. ACRI seeks to assist African militaries to build their own capacities to conduct peacekeeping operations. It is hoped that countries which now receive training under ACRI would agree to participate in future peacekeeping operations. In this regard, ACRI represents a forward-leaning approach; call it ''preventive diplomacy.''

Mr. President, ACRI has been in operation for just a short while and can still be considered in its early stage. Most of the militaries that have received training through ACRI have been trained at the company or, in a few cases, battalion levels, but an important aspect of the program is also to conduct brigade level training. As envisioned, the brigade level training is key to the whole ACRI program because it would expand joint training exercises between and among participating countries and would help ensure interoperability between and among the forces of contributing nations.

Mr. President, just as the ACRI program is getting underway, I do not think we should be cutting support for it. Our efforts to build peacekeeping capacity in Africa will fail if we can not assist in preparing our partners to actually participate and conduct peacekeeping operations.

In summary, Mr. President, I believe the voluntary peacekeeping account represents an important part of our international affairs funding, and of America's ability to lead in the world, and I am concerned that the cuts to this account will have an inordinate impact on Africa.

Mr. LAUTENBERG Mr. President, I rise today first of all to thank and commend the Chairman and the ranking member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee for their efforts to develop a bill to meet priority foreign affairs needs within the limits of the subcommittee allocation.

Mr. President, the Budget Resolution did not allocate sufficient resources for Foreign Affairs and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee frankly did not receive a sufficient allocation to maintain America's world leadership role We need to recognize that neither isolationism nor limited engagement is an option if we want to maintain America's security and prosperity.

We need to realize that we cannot conduct effective foreign policy solely by having a strong military In fact, by limiting funding for other tools of diplomacy we increase our reliance on threats and use of military force.

This bill fails to fulfill the President's request in numerous areas.

I am deeply concerned that the Wye aid package for Israel, the Palestinians, and Jordan requested by the President has not been fully funded The fact that it could not be accommodated within the subcommittee allocation without drastically cutting important programs around the world merely reinforces my previous point.

In the near future, we are going to have to step up to the responsibility of funding aid to help implement the Wye River Memorandum I hope the Chairman will agree that we will need to find a way to fund this aid outside the confines of this bill This is a small price to pay for continued and renewed efforts to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East.

The bill does not include the $60 million I sought for tuberculosis prevention programs We need much stronger programs to combat tuberculosis now Tuberculosis kills more people worldwide than AIDS and malaria combined, yet receives substantially fewer aid dollars.

TB is spread easily and each active case leads to many more, so concerted global action to bring TB under control, now estimated to require $1 billion, becomes more expensive the longer we wait We need to find more resources to begin to confront the challenge of TB this year.

I hope we will also be able to find an additional $20 million for the United Nations Development Program UNDP has made great strides in cutting costs and improving coordination among UN agencies in the field to more effectively deliver essential assistance and promote sustainable economic development.

Unfortunately, we're penalizing the poor in many countries by following the Administration's lead and failing to restore funding for UNDP to $100 million.

I am also concerned that the bill significantly underfunds debt relief for the poorest countries.

Funding for the Peace Corps is reduced from the requested level, when it should have been increased to make progress toward the President's goal of fielding ten thousand Peace Corps Volunteers.

Even counter terrorism programs have not been adequately funded.

Having raised these concerns, let me reiterate my commendation to the subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Member for making a real effort to achieve a balanced bill while remaining within an allocation nearly $2 billion below the President's request.

I would also like to thank the subcommittee chairman and ranking member for including many important programs. In particular, Seeds of Peace contributes to reconciliation in the

Middle East by bringing together young people from throughout the region, including Israelis and Palestinians and other Arabs.

Carelift International, which is largely funded by the private sector, improves health care in transition and developing countries at low cost by sharing refurbished American medical equipment.

Senator MCCONNELL has also put some real dollars behind the rhetoric supporting regional integration in Southeast Europe. We need to aid the Kosovars to rebuild their shattered lives and help the countries and peoples of this troubled region to overcome their differences and their history and truly become a part of the new Europe.

I do hope we will be able to restore funding requested by the Administration for regional programs under the SEED Act, including programs to combat trans-national crime.

I am not offering amendments to increase allocations to unfunded or underfunded programs because I think it would be very difficult to do so without reducing funding for other priorities.

I voted for this bill in the subcommittee and committee because I think Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY have done a good job with the limited resources available to them. I will likely vote for the bill in the Senate as well, but not without deep reservations about the overall funding level and priorities which have not been funded adequately.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, United States national security and economic well-being is closely tied to our ability to formulate and execute foreign policies that both protect our interests and reflect our ideals. It is the responsibility of the Congress to pass legislation on foreign policy consistent with those interests and ideals. We may differ about the means, but we seldom disagree about the goal: political stability and economic prosperity in every region of the globe. Sometimes we employ political and economic sanctions in pursuit of our objectives; sometimes we resort to the use of military force. These responsibilities are considerable, and they are real. And we owe it to the American public to handle them responsibly.

I do not wish to exaggerate the implications of the questionable spending that is included in the bill before us. Clearly, the wasteful and unnecessary spending provisions, as well as the numerous earmarks, threaten neither our national interest nor our economic well-being. They do, however, detract from the integrity of the process by which the federal budget is put together, and they do undermine our credibility with the public. The net result is to diminish our ability to contribute substantially to this nation's national security and economic policies. Frivolous items placed in major spending bills for parochial or personal reasons is a serious disservice to the institution to which we belong, and to the public that we serve.

It is for this reason that is so discouraging to read the foreign operations appropriations bill and find that, once again, it includes $5 million to establish an International Law Enforcement Academy in Roswell, New Mexico. To see that provision once again placed in the bill is to reaffirm the notion that fiscal prudence and operational requirements are alien concepts to some members of this body. Similarly, language in the report accompanying the bill recommending that the Agency for International Development spend as much as necessary on such worthwhile projects as research on pond dynamics strikes me as representing a seriously misplaced sense of priorities. And should we really be earmarking more than $1 million in additional funds so that a Minnesota job training program can shift its dependence to private sector funding? In a foreign aid bill? I have to question the wisdom of provisions like these.

Mr. President, as United States military forces take up positions in Kosovo while others continue their peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and soldiers serve unaccompanied hardship tours on the demilitarized zone of the Korean peninsula, what kind of message are we sending about our role in the foreign policy process when we pass a bill that directs the Agency for International Development to study and, almost certainly, fund research on protea germplasm in South Africa? With all the problems around the world demanding our attention, do we really need to focus on the future welfare of the Waboom tree? I think not. And, of course, the bill provides the usual absurd amount—specified as ''at least'' $4 million—for that oldie but goodie, the International Fertilizer Center in Alabama. I have to believe, Mr. President, that if the Department of State or the Agency for International Development agreed with the need to spend so much annually out of the foreign operations budget for research on fertilizer, it would probably include such an item in its budget request.

Israel and Hawaii collaborating on research regarding the competitiveness of the tropical fish and plant global market sounds contrived, but I'll allow for the possibility that there's more to that program than meets the eye. When viewed alongside the report's language ''urging'' AID to allocate $500,000 for the Pacific International Center for High Technology Research, a pattern begins to form, but I won't elaborate further.

As usual, the foreign operations appropriations bill includes a long list of earmarks for specific American universities, the very kind of budgeting that ensures the American taxpayers get the least value for their dollar. A competitive process wherein funding is allocated according to which project, if any, is the most meritorious is a preferred process for allocating financial resources, but this bill goes far in the opposite direction. As a leader in the effort at developing normal economic relations with Vietnam, I applaud projects designed to facilitate the establishment of a market economy in that country; whether Boise State University deserves a $3 million earmark to establish a business school there, however, strains credulity.

There is much that is good in this bill in terms of genuine efforts at improving health care in less developed countries. I continue to be troubled, however, by the Committee's tendency to specify precisely which organizations it believes should be the recipient of foreign aid dollars. That is a practice that deserves closer scrutiny than heretofore has been the case. I would like to think that such determinations are solely merit based following a competitive process and that parochial considerations play no part. Skepticism, though, is warranted.

In closing, I am a strong supporter of maintaining an active U.S. role in global affairs. United States foreign aid programs are an essential instrument of our national security policy. Even with the vast number of troubling items in this bill, I will support its passage. But I would be remiss in my responsibilities were I to ignore what I firmly believe is an imprudent budgeting process that has a self-defeating tendency to squander foreign aid dollars that we can ill-afford to waste. I will continue to hope for improvements in the process by which these bills are assembled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 (S. 1234)—DIRECTIVE LANGUAGE AND EARMARKS

REPORT LANGUAGE PROVISIONS

Overseas Private Investment Corporation: Directs the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) to support establishment of a new $200 million Maritime Fund using United States commercial maritime expertise. Earmark is included as Section 539 in the bill text.

University Development Assistance Programs: The Committee annually earmarks or ''recommends'' funding for specific universities around the United States without benefit of competitive analytical processes to determine the value of the activity and whether it can best be done in an alternate manner. The following universities are expected to continue to receive such funds:

University of Hawaii, to train health care and social workers;

University of Northern Iowa, to incorporate democratic concepts and practices into schools and teachers education programs;

Washington State University, for water research in the Middle East;

Purdue University, for water research in the Middle East;

South Carolina University, for water research in the Middle East;

Mississippi State University, at least $500,000 for water research in Turkey;

George Mason University, for health care in developing countries;

San Diego University Foundation Middle East Development Program, to promote dialogue among Middle Eastern experts on water planning;

Boise State University, $3 million to establish a business school in Vietnam;

University of Idaho, $300,000, to train engineers in Guatemala in water management;

Utah State University, to establish, with $2.1 million, a World Irrigation Training Center;

University of South Alabama, $1 million to monitor birth defects in Ukraine;

Auburn University, $450,000 to continue its relationship with Osmania University in India;

University of Louisville, Spalding University, University of Indiana/Purdue, University of Wisconsin, University of Maine and Notre Dame, to continue to support the establishment of an American University in Jordan;

St. Thomas University, Miami, Florida, $5 million to continue to encourage and promote democratic principles in Africa;

University of Idaho, at least $485,000 for the university's Post Harvest Institute for Perishables under the Collaborative Agribusiness Support Program;

Montana State University-Bozeman, $1 million for soil management, recommended to be conducted at MSU-Bozeman; and

Washington State University, AID is expected to work with WSU to establish small business development centers in Romania and Russia.

Maintenance of Protea Germplasm: Directs AID to consider and fund if meritorious a joint proposal from the South Africa and United States protea industries.

Tropical Plant and Animal Research Initiative: AID is urged to consider a joint application from Israel and Hawaii to collaborate on research regarding the competitiveness of the tropical fish and plant global market.

International Fertilizer Development Center: ''at least'' $4 million is earmarked for the center.

Pacific Islands Renewable Energy Demonstration: AID is urged to allocate $500,000 for the Pacific International Center for High Technology Research.

Soils Management Collaborative Research Support Program: The Committee recommends that AID fund the program for as much as is necessary for the achievement of the goals of all approved projects.

Opportunities Industrialization Centers, International: at least $1 million is earmarked to enable OIC International in Minnesota to continue its transition to private sector funding.

U.S. Telecommunications Training Institute: earmarks $500,000 for the USTTI.

Mitch McConnell Conservation Fund: earmarks $500,000 for the Charles Darwin Research Station and the Charles Darwin Foundation to support research on the Galapagos Islands.

Johns Hopkins University's centers in Bologna, Italy, and Nanjing, China [the Committee directs that at least $600,000 be provided the Nanjing center, noting its disappointment with AID for not being sufficiently attentive to that institution's funding.]

Medical Relief: $7 million is earmarked for Carelift International, Philadelphia, to continue and expand its operations in needy countries.

Orphanages: $4 million is recommended for improving orphanage facilities in Russia, the funding to be provided through Rotary International, the Anchorage Interfaith Council, and the Municipality of Anchorage.

BILL LANGUAGE

International Law Enforcement Academy for the Western Hemisphere, Roswell, New Mexico: The bill earmarks $5 million for establishment of an International Law Enforcement Academy for the Western Hemisphere, to be located at the deBremmond Training Center in Roswell, NM.

Global Environment Facility: the bill earmarks $25 million as the U.S. contribution to the Global Environment Facility.

Bilateral Economic Assistance: Note: The report accompanying S. 1234 uses the influence of the Appropriations Committee to ensure that funds go to specified organizations without regard for alternative means of accomplishing desired objectives, which in most cases are inarguably worthwhile:

Tuberculosis: Specifies the American Lung Association and the American Thoracic Society as nongovernmental organizations that should be supported.

Maternal Health: Encourages AID to provide $4 million to Maternal Life International to reduce maternal mortality and provide health care for HIV in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Iodine Deficiency: Recommends that AID provide $2 million in Child Survival funds to Kiwanis International via UNICEF.

Polio Eradication: Provides $25 million and encourages the provision by AID of funds for Rotary International.

Vitamins for At-Risk Women, Infants and Children: Encourages provision by AID of $2.8 million to Magee Womancare International to develop a program for children in orphanages.

Hepatitis: Encourages AID to support the Ramses Foundation in its work in Egypt.

Orphans, Displaced, and Blind Children: Recommends AID provide at least $1 million through Helen Keller International for its work with displaced children and orphans.

American Schools and Hospitals Abroad: The Appropriations Committee regularly allocates funds for specific institutions, usually the same institutions every year, under the American Schools and Hospitals Abroad program. The following are specified as deserving of further support:

American University in Beirut;

The Lebanese American University (formerly Beirut University College)

Hadassah Medical Organization

Feinberg Graduate School of the Weizmann Institute of Science, Israel

University College Dublin: AID is requested to consider funding the establishment of a Center of American Studies at the Dublin center.

Lebanon: earmarks minimum of $4 million for the American University of Beirut, Lebanese American University and International College and recognizes the ''commendable efforts'' of the YMCA of Lebanon.

India: $250,000 for healthcare in the Sringeri region of India should be administered by the Sharada Dhanvantari Charitable Hospital.

Tibet: AID is urged to support development projects sponsored by the Bridge Fund.

Promoting Economic Growth: Supports $9 million to fund the International Center for Economic Growth's Global Stability Project to implement a ''third generation'' macroeconomic model.

Patrick Leahy War Victims Fund: Recommends that $10 million be allocated for activities carried out by the Patrick Leahy Fund.

Palestinian-Israeli Cooperation Program: The Committee recommends $600,000 for the program, which seeks to facilitate the establishment of cooperative projects in medicine, science, the arts, and children's activities.

Distance Learning Technology: AID is urged to maintain funding for programs oriented toward legal reform in Central and Eastern Europe, including through the Central and Eastern European Law Institute.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, the foreign operations appropriation bill is a crucial bill. It is integral to all of our assistance programs overseas. The bill's importance to American foreign policy cannot be over emphasized. This bill provides funding for development aid to poor countries, funds to combat terrorism and proliferation of nuclear weapons overseas, and monies for all of the multilateral financial institutions which lend to needy countries.

As I see it, the bill before the Senate has two major problems. First, the bill as a whole is significantly under-funded. The amount dedicated to our nation's foreign operations is almost $2 billion below the President's request for funding.

I understand that some of this is due to the caps placed on expenditures as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; however, we in the Senate cannot hide behind that piece of legislation every time we want an excuse for why the administration's appropriations requests are under funded. I am not saying that this is not a legitimate reason for not granting the President's entire request, but $2 billion is an enormous shortfall.

In addition to inadequate funding overall, there are particular programs and foreign policy initiatives which are either funded at a level which is drastically reduced from the President's request, or which have not been funded at all.

Mr. President, the administration in its statement of policy with respect to this bill has clearly stated that ''A bill funded at this level would be grossly inadequate to maintain America's leadership around the world. It would inevitably require severe reductions from previously enacted levels for programs managed by the Departments of State and Treasury, the Agency for International Development and other agencies.''

The statement quite clearly states that if the significant funding and language problems in this bill as reported are not resolved that ''the President's senior advisors have no choice but to recommend that he veto the bill.''

I wish to speak to several very important aspects of this bill that must be addressed in conference. First, the bill fails to provide the $500 million requested by the President to support the Middle East Wye River Agreement.

Second, it fails to fund the administration's Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative, so important to our ability to reduce the proliferation threat and continue the elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

Third, this bill imposes new onerous conditions on U.S. funding for the 1994 Agreed Framework, the cornerstone of our North Korea policy.

I also have very strong concerns with respect to two provisions in the bill relating to Kosovo and our ongoing relationship with Russia.

Unfortunately, by withholding critical support for Jordan, Israel, and the Palestinian Authority, this bill would have us renege on the commitments that made the Wye River agreement possible. The leaders of Jordan, the Palestinian Authority, and Israel have taken great risks for peace. We pledged to stand with them as they took these risks.

In the months ahead, we will undoubtedly be called upon to play a lead role in the peace talks. But by refusing to fund one penny of the President's request for the Wye River agreement, this bill calls into question our commitment to Middle East peace just as there is renewed hope for accelerated progress.

Some may argue that the Middle East gets enough assistance as it is. Relative to other accounts that may be true, but the levels of assistance to the Middle East are a reflection of the strategic and moral issues at stake.

The funds requested by the administration are in keeping with our commitment to Israel's security. They will help wage battle in Palestinian areas against the greatest enemy of peace—namely, the poverty and despair that provides a fertile breeding ground for extremism. They will help bolster Jordan—a close ally whose peace with Israel should serve as a model for others in the region.

I am convinced that the sums requested by the administration to support peace pale in comparison to the costs we would incur if conflict and turmoil returned to the Middle East.

One of the most disturbing elements of this bill is its failure to fund the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative that helps reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction. Technically the cuts are to the larger budget lines for aid to the Newly Independent States and for Nonproliferation and related programs. But report language calls the funding of Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative programs ''ill advised,'' and they will bear the brunt of these cuts.

Weapons of mass destruction dwarf the other threats to our national security. If we fail to help Russian experts find nonmilitary employment, we may foster Iran's nuclear weapons, or Iraq's biological weapons, or Libyan missiles. Even a single use of such weapons against the United States, U.S. forces, or our allies would be a terrible tragedy—especially if we failed to prevent it.

The failure to fund the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiatives means no funds—not even the levels appropriated last year—for helping Russian biological weapons experts find new careers. This is a vital program that has enabled biological weapons experts to resist offers from Iran and other rogue states. We should be expanding this program, rather than cutting it.

The Threat Reduction cut means no funds for the International Science and Technology Centers in Russia and Ukraine that have helped over 24,000 former weapons scientists since 1994. The Science Center program has been very successful. It has been praised for its tight management, under board chairman Ron Lehman, a former official in Republican administrations whom we all know to be a true patriot. Science Center support for Russian scientists is exempt from Russian taxes. We should be expanding this program, too, rather than cutting it.

The Threat Reduction cut means no funds—not even last year's levels—for the Civilian Research and Development Foundation, which gives vital training to Russian former weapons scientists who are trying to form viable businesses. We tell Russian weapons experts to adapt to a market economy. But they will never achieve that, if we don't give them the training. And if they fail, they will be ripe for the plucking by rogue states who would buy their weapons expertise.

The Threat Reduction cut means no funds—not even last year's levels—to assist customs officials in Russia and the rest of the former Soviet Union. The customs officials whom we assist are our most reliable allies in stopping the flow of nuclear and weapons of mass destruction materials.

For example, it was customs officials in Azerbaijan who stopped a shipment of specialty steel to Iran that would have been used for missiles. This bill also contains only $5 million—out of $15 million requested—for world-wide assistance to customs services. This is the program that aids border control agencies in the Baltic states, where we have seen Russian nuclear smuggling efforts in the past. It makes no sense to provide only $5 million for this vital function.

These cuts even wipe out the border security assistance to Georgia that Senator MCCONNELL instituted last year.

The Threat Reduction cut means no funds to assist in removing Russian troops from Moldova—a longstanding objective of the United States and of the Congress. Do we suddenly want the Russian troops to stay longer in a country that does not want them? Do we no longer care whether this exacerbates ethnic conflict in Moldova?

The Foreign Operations Subcommittee made these cuts without prejudice. But it makes no sense to let us guard our national security only by cutting important programs to support democracy, free media, and the rule of law in the former Soviet Union.

I am very pleased that the managers have accepted a sense of the Senate amendment I offered urging that the Threat Reduction funds be restored in conference to the level requested by the President.

I urge the managers of this bill to do their utmost to achieve this, and I wish them complete success in that important effort.

On the eve of South Korean President Kim Dae Jung's visit to Washington, and just as former Secretary of Defense Bill Perry is completing his comprehensive Korea policy review, this bill places the Agreed Framework in grave jeopardy.

The bill not only provides inadequate funding for heavy fuel oil deliveries to North Korea—deliveries the United States is obligated to arrange under the 1994 Agreed Framework—it also effectively prevents the appropriated funds from being expended by requiring the President to certify the uncertifiable with respect to North Korea's conduct.

Under existing law, the President must already certify that North Korea is in full compliance with the Agreed Framework and its confidential minute in order to expend monies appropriated for heavy fuel oil deliveries to the North. This a reasonable requirement. But if the North is fulfilling its side of the bargain, we should fulfill ours rather than dream up new requirements on the North.

Do we have other serious concerns about North Korea, in addition to its nuclear ambitions? Of course we do. But these other concerns—missile development and export, narcotics trafficking, armed provocations along the DMZ—cannot be addressed successfully if we abandon the Agreed Framework.

For all of its imperfections, the Agreed Framework has served our national interest well, reducing the risk of war and capping the North's ability to produce fissile material for nuclear bombs. Five years ago, North Korea was on the verge of withdrawing from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and acquiring the capacity to build dozens of nuclear weapons every year. Today, with the Agreed Framework intact, the North's nuclear facilities stand idle.

The spent fuel from its research reactor has been canned and placed under round-the-clock monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Agreed Framework has also given us unprecedented access to North Korea, even to sensitive military sites, as demonstrated by the recent successful U.S. visit to the Kumchangni undergound facility.

These are not insignificant accomplishments, and we should think twice before we risk turning back the clock.

By underfunding the Korean Energy Development Organization and unilaterally imposing new obligations on North Korea, this bill could precipitate a crisis on the Peninsula and distance us from our key ally, South Korea.

In addition, I have two serious problems with sections of the bill relating to Kosovo. First, $20 million shall be available ''for training and equipping a Kosova security force.'' Mr. President, this language conveys the impression that we want to train something like a national guard or an army. In the real world, most people would see this as our training and equipping a KLA Army.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999), which gives international sanction to KFOR, is not specific about the future status of Kosovo. Any future Kosovo national guard or army presupposes an independent Kosovo.

Aside from that being counter to United States policy, it is completely irrelevant to this bill. For the duration of fiscal year 2000, security in Kosovo will be guaranteed by the heavily armed, NATO-led KFOR. There is absolutely no need for any kind of an indigenous ''security force'' other than a civilian police force.

The final legislation should make it crystal-clear that the appropriation will be used to train and equip a police force, not an army.

My second Kosovo-related objection concerns the requirement that the Secretary of State certify that the Russians have not established a ''separate zone of operational control'' and are ''fully integrated under NATO unified command and control arrangements.''

This requirement has been overtaken by events. The Military-Technical Agreement between NATO and Russia found a formula to include Russian peacekeepers in KFOR. This formula has been accepted by our government, by all other 18 NATO members, and by the United Nations.

I have no doubt that Secretary Albright could broadly construe words like ''operational control'' and ''fully integrated'' and thereby make the required certification.

But what would we get by retaining this language and forcing her to do so? I'll tell my colleagues. We would be gratuitously sticking our finger in the Russians' eye at the precise moment we are trying to involve them in KFOR and in the entire reconstruction effort in Kosovo.

To sanitize a phrase used by an esteemed former President of the United States, I would rather have the Russians inside our tent looking out, than outside our tent looking in.

I would like to remind my friend Senator MCCONNELL that when the two of us recently appeared on the Sunday Fox Television News talk-show he said with regard to the Russians in Kosovo—and I quote; ''I don't know that we need to threaten foreign assistance.''

Apparently he has changed his mind. I agreed with Senator MCCONNELL that day on television. I wish he had held to his position.

It is important that these problems be addressed in conference, and that a way be found to increase the overall funding levels.

At this time I will reluctantly vote to send this legislation to conference. However, I reserve the right to vote against it should these problems not be addressed in the final conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 192 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Feingold	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	McCain
Allard	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Mikulski
Baucus	Gorton	Moynihan
Bayh	Graham	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Murray
Biden	Grams	Nickles
Bingaman	Grassley	Reed
Bond	Gregg	Reid
Boxer	Hagel	Robb
Breaux	Harkin	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Helms	Roth
Bunning	Hollings	Santorum
Burns	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Campbell	Hutchison	Schumer
Chafee	Inhofe	Sessions
Cleland	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Collins	Johnson	Snowe
Conrad	Kennedy	Specter
Coverdell	Kerrey	Stevens
Craig	Kerry	Thomas
Crapo	Kohl	Thompson
Daschle	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Edwards	Lincoln	
Enzi	Lott	

NAYS—2

Byrd	Smith (NH)

NOT VOTING—1

Mack

The bill (S. 1234), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. President, I commend first the occupant of the Chair for an extraordinarily effective debate on the issue that dominated today's discussion in the foreign operations appropriations bill. I think the Senator from Kansas did an outstanding job.

I also want to thank my staff. Robin Cleveland has done work on foreign policy matters for some 15 years now, and I thank Robin for, as usual, outstanding work; and Billy Piper, with whom I have worked 5 or 6 years, has done an absolutely superb job; and his assistant, Jon Meek, from my personal staff; as well as Jennifer Chartrand, a new member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. All of those folks are on the majority side; and of course Tim Rieser and Cara Thanassi from the minority staff, with whom we always enjoy working, and Steve Cortese and Jay Kimmitt from the full committee.

I say to my friend, PAT LEAHY, I enjoy our annual collaboration on this bill, and I look forward to working with the Senator in conference.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky for the alacrity with which he moved this bill. Those who have reached that level of knowledge know we Senators are constitutional impediments to our staffs.

I compliment Robin Cleveland, who has worked so hard at trying to balance the competing interests of so many Senators on both sides of the aisle, as well as Billy Piper and Jennifer Chartrand; and on my side, the indefatigable Tim Rieser, a man who has not slept since it was announced we might go to this bill a month or so ago. He has, again, maintained the remarkable Rieser filing cabinet, which is primarily in his head, knowing all the ins and outs of this bill and handling it so well.

He was ably assisted by Cara Thanassi. Ms. Thanassi began a few years ago on our staff. She has grown enormously in talent and ability and was absolutely essential in this work.

In working with the Senator from Kentucky, we have tried to accommodate each other on issues, even though on some issues we obviously have a different philosophy. We have respected each other and accommodated each other and tried to make sure a bipartisan piece of legislation came through. I think the resulting vote today shows that bipartisanship on foreign policy was maintained.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR JIM SASSER

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Ambassador James Sasser, our former colleague from Tennessee, who served in this body as a distinguished chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. He is returning from his post in the People's Republic of China where he has been the U.S. Ambassador since 1995. He has done an outstanding job during a challenging period in our relations with China.

Having had the honor to serve with Jim for 18 years in the Senate, I know him to be a man of great insight, intellect, and integrity, a highly respected public servant. While he served in the Senate, his interests and work covered a broad range of domestic and foreign policy issues. As Senate Budget Committee chairman, his keen grasp of financial and budgeting issues enabled him to handle that assignment with tremendous skill under very difficult circumstances. Jim constantly showed great resolve in addressing measures to reduce our deficit. He was instrumental in helping lead our country on to a path which is reflected in today's budget surplus.

This dedication and commitment has characterized Jim's lifetime devotion to our country. His interests in public service began long before he was elected to the Senate. Jim's father, a public servant himself, instilled in Jim the principles of public service at an early

age. He served as a role model for Jim and set him on a course which he has followed with great distinction.

Throughout his career, Jim Sasser has demonstrated, both in spirit and in deed, his adherence to the ideals most important to this Nation. He is a shining example of how much one individual can contribute to our Nation's well-being. Jim's leadership has always been highly regarded and broadly respected.

Throughout his tenure as Ambassador to China, Jim has been confronted with many difficult aspects of the relationship. Jim's work has emphasized the importance of keeping the lines of communication open by regularizing our contacts with the current Chinese leadership and ensuring that we remain engaged in our bilateral relationship. Jim's longstanding commitment to the promotion of democratic principles and values has played an important role in helping shape his service to our country.

Jim Sasser has done a terrific job as our Ambassador to China, and I wish him well in all his future endeavors.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to my esteemed former colleague, Ambassador Jim Sasser. He will soon be stepping down from his post as the longest serving American Ambassador to China. But it does not seem long ago that he and I were working together on the Budget Committee where he served as the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. In fact, as we talk today of the great state of the economy, it should be former Senator Sasser that we thank for having the leadership to push through the deficit reduction package that has led to today's unprecedented economic growth and prosperity. As a former Budget Committee Chairman myself, it was with great pride that I worked side-by-side with the former Senator in the Budget Committee because I understood the great challenges that the job entailed. He did a superb job in his duties here in the Senate, and it is with the same dedication and fairness that he represented this nation so admirably in his post as the U.S. Ambassador to China.

I still remember vividly the front page of the newspaper a few months ago which showed Ambassador Sasser looking through the shattered window of the American Embassy. Suffice to say that Ambassador Sasser has served during some very difficult times in China-U.S. relations. Few relationships are as difficult to define and put in perspective and I think that Ambassador Sasser would agree that there is still much work to be done. But during his tenure, Ambassador Sasser was able to build consensus and to find common ground between the two nations that has allowed the relationship to prosper. Ambassador Sasser should be commended for his dedication as a gifted emissary between the world's largest developed country and the world's largest developing country. He has served the United States admirably and I commend him for his dutiful service.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate Calendar No. 169, the fiscal year 2000 Treasury and general government appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1282) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask unanimous consent the following individuals have floor privileges for the duration of the consideration of S. 1282, the Treasury and government appropriations bill for the fiscal year 2000: Tammy Perrin, Lula Edwards, Dylan Pressman, and Liz Blevins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I am now pleased to lay before the Senate the committee recommendation for the Treasury Department, the Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and various independent agencies. The bill was crafted by the Subcommittee on Treasury and General Government and contains a total of $27,737,971,000 in new budget authority. Of that, $14,533,811,000 is for mandatory accounts.

The committee recommendation is within the 302(b) allocations and strikes a delicate balance between congressional priorities, administration initiatives, and agency requirements. This would not have been possible without the hard work and cooperation of the new ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator DORGAN, and his staff.

This bill consists of mostly salaries and expenses accounts and the majority of the increases for agencies is to simply allow them to maintain current levels. There are very few new initiatives in this bill.

Title I provides a total of $12,213,529,000 for the Department of the Treasury. This is $162,601,000 less than the administration request. The committee has again placed a priority on Treasury's law enforcement needs as well as support for efforts by State and local law enforcement.

Here are a few highlights from Title I:

$312,400,000 to the Customs Service to retain 5,000 current Customs employees since the user fee proposed by the administration has not been enacted.

Emphasis on the need for the Gang Resistance Education and Training program—called GREAT—by including $3 million more than the administration request for grants to State and local law enforcement.

Expansion of the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative into 10 additional cities, bringing the total to 37 cities. This will allow ATF to track and prosecute those who supply guns to our youth.

Funding for the Integrated Violence Reduction Strategy to allow AFT to more comprehensively investigate NICS denials in order to make sure that felons do not possess guns.

Full funding to the IRS for customer service training and to implement the IRS Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998.

Title II provides $93,436,000 for the United States Postal Service, and continues to require free mailing for overseas voters and the blind as well as six-day delivery, and prohibit the closing or consolidation of small and rural post offices.

Title III recommends a total of $553,128,000 for the Executive Office of the President, $86,370,000 less than the administration request. This includes the Office of Management and Budget, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Federal drug control programs, and funding for the national anti-drug media campaign.

Of special note, the committee:

Recommends establishing a separate account for the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center, and has provided $31,100,000 for that program to transfer much needed technology to State and local law enforcement.

Provides $188,277,000 for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program which will allow continuation of existing HIDTA programs at their current levels. These programs highly acclaimed by local law enforcement.

Recommends a total of $145,500,000 for the national anti-drug media campaign.

Title IV is independent agencies such as the Federal Election Commission, the General Services Administration, and the National Archives, as well as agencies involved in Federal employment such as the Federal Labor Relations Authority, the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Office of Government Ethics, the Office of Special Counsel, and the Office of Personnel Management. Also included in this title are mandatory accounts to provide for Federal retirees, health benefits, and life insurance. The committee recommends a total of $14,877,878,000 for this title.

For the third year in a row, the administration has not requested funding for courthouse construction. Unfortunately, due to the very limited funding available to the committee, we have not included any new courthouse construction projects in this bill.

In order to stay within our 302(b) allocations, the subcommittee was forced

to make very difficult decisions, as were all Appropriations subcommittees. As a result, this bill is very tightly crafted to allow the agencies to continue their vital work. Very few new initiatives were recommended and we were not able to accommodate all of our colleagues' requests due to funding constraints. I remind my colleagues that any funding amendments must be offset and, frankly, there is very little fat in this bill. If amendments are offered, we would ask the sponsor to identify the accounts we should be reducing to accomplish their goal.

Finally, I would like to again thank the ranking member, Senator DORGAN, for his hard work and support. This bill would not have been possible without his assistance, and that of his staff Barbara Retzlaff and Elizabeth Blevins. I also thank my staff: Pat Raymond, Tammy Perrin and Lula Edwards for their tireless and invaluable work on this bill. This bill has been a collaborative effort and it deserves the support of the Senate.

I yield the floor to Senator DORGAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, in light of the hour and especially in light of the statement made by my colleague from Colorado, the chairman of this subcommittee, I will be mercifully brief. But I do want to say this bill, the fiscal year 2000 Treasury and general government bill, is one that we have worked hard to bring to the floor of the Senate in a manner that we think is fair and relates to the limits that were imposed upon us. The chairman and I believe the allocation level, obviously, could have been greater in order to allow us to have provided some additional funding to some areas of the bill, but we are restricted by budget rules and by the allocation that was given us.

I would like to say working with Chairman CAMPBELL has been a pleasure. He is easy to work with. His staff, Pat Raymond, Tammy Perrin, and Lula Edwards have worked hard to ensure this bill has been well crafted, as has been the work of Barbara Retzlaff and Chip Waldren, who have been working with me on this legislation.

Senator CAMPBELL has described the major highlights of this bill, so I will not repeat that at this hour of the evening, but I do want to address a couple of brief issues.

One, the issue of courthouse construction. Members of the subcommittee are well aware of the judiciary's continuing need to have some court space available to conduct their business and to move cases to settlement. We know that. Regrettably, there was not enough money in the allocation to this subcommittee to provide for courthouse construction. The President did not request courthouse construction nor was it funded in this bill. Budgetary constraints were the major factor with respect to that but not the only factor. Another reason we believe it would be somewhat precipitous to approve funding for the design and construction of many new courthouses prior to the AOC's completion of its comprehensive review of judiciary space is we think that review ought to be done first.

The committee was pleased to receive the Administrative Office of the Court's May 28 letter confirming the award of a contract to a consulting firm to analyze and evaluate the judiciary's long-range planning process, their courthouse design guidelines, their program policies and practices, and the funding mechanisms and responsibilities. But the committee is concerned that the completion date for that report will be well after the date by which the administration must complete action on their 2001 fiscal year budget request. We anticipate having that report before we would complete action on fiscal year 2001 budget decisions and appropriations decisions here in the Congress. I believe that is important because we have received information which indicates that 11 of the 16 courthouses for which the AOC requested funding in the year 2000 deviated from the Judicial Conference of the United States Court Design Guide.

For example, magistrate and bankruptcy courtrooms were increased from 1,800 usable square feet to 2,400 usable square feet, a 33-percent increase. Total courthouse circulation space increased from 20 percent to 30 percent. Individual courtrooms were routinely being provided for individual senior district judges for more than 10 years, and the list goes on.

I believe some of those excesses in the construction program resulted in some of the past funding delays. None of us believe a funding moratorium is the best way to maintain an important Federal asset program, so I hope the construction review will be completed and we can proceed in the future with a construction program.

Second, I want to discuss very briefly the issue of the Office of National Drug Control Policy National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. That is a long way of talking about the media campaign that has been going on in this country on the issue of drugs. This is the third year of that funding, funding of over one-half of a billion dollars that has been provided for this initiative.

I would like to say I support this initiative. I think the power of advertising is well recognized. Appropriate advertising and advertising that is well done dealing with a message to our young people in this country, ''do not take drugs,'' is an appropriate way to send that message.

I worked with the subcommittee to ensure that adequate funds were provided this year for that campaign to be effective. I do not believe that halfway through the campaign it is time to dilute the message.

I know there will perhaps be an amendment offered dealing with alcohol. No one is more concerned about the issue of alcohol consumption, drunk driving, and alcohol abuse in this country than I. But I do not want to dilute what we are doing on the antidrug campaign with this alcohol issue at this point. There are other venues, other ways, other programs with which we can confront the drunk driving and alcohol abuse issue, and we will.

This year we were not able to fully fund the television campaign dealing with the antidrug message. We have had to cut that some. We would have liked to have funded all of these issues in a manner that fully funds the budget request, but we did not have the money to do that. There simply were not the available resources to accomplish that. We have been forced to make certain cuts.

My hope is perhaps some of these can be in conference, perhaps some additional budget allocation will be made available as we proceed through this process.

Again, the work done by Senator CAMPBELL, his staff, and our staff has produced a good piece of legislation. I hope we can move through it rather quickly tomorrow and preserve the bulk of what we have done to fund these very important programs.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1189, 1190, AND 1191

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MOYNIHAN, I send three amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for Mr. MOYNIHAN, proposes amendments numbered 1189, 1190, and 1191.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1189

(Purpose: To ensure the expeditious construction of a new United States Mission to the United Nations)

On page 56, line 3, after ''and'', insert the following: ''$44,300,000 shall be available for demolition of the United States Mission to the United Nations at 755 United Nations Plaza (First Avenue and 45th Street), New York, New York, and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1190

(Purpose: To ensure that the General Services Administration has adequate funds available for programmatic needs)

Beginning on page 52, line 25, strike the colon and all that follows through ''rescinded'' on page 53, line 2.

AMENDMENT NO. 1191

(Purpose: To ensure that health and safety concerns at the Federal Courthouse at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York are alleviated)

On page 56, line 6, after '';'', insert the following: ''$5,870,000 shall be made available for the repairs and alterations of the Federal Courthouse at 40 Centre Street, New York, New York;''.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1192

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of myself and Senator DORGAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], for himself and Mr. DORGAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1192.

Mr. CAMPBELL. 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 amendment is as follows:

On page 51, line 15 and on page 57, line 14 strike ''5,140,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$5,261,478,000''.

On page 53 line 2 after ''are rescinded'' insert ''and shall remain in the Fund''.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, this amendment is a technical correction to the GSA Federal buildings fund.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all first-degree amendments to the Treasury and general government appropriations bill must be offered by 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, July 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, my understanding is that has been cleared with our side and Members of the Senate have been notified this evening that will be the case on this bill. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I just asked unanimous consent that all first-degree amendments to the Treasury and general government appropriations bill be offered by 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, July 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That has been agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for the next 30 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLOMBIA'S FOUR WARS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, we have just concluded the foreign operations bill, and I congratulate Senator MCCONNELL, Senator LEAHY, and others who have worked so very diligently on this difficult and tough bill. Contained in the bill we just passed, among other things, was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. This sense-of-the-Senate resolution was proposed and offered by myself and by my colleague from Georgia, Senator COVERDELL. It deals with the situation in Colombia and the United States relationship to that troubled country.

I want to talk this evening about that sense-of-the-Senate resolution and about the situation in Colombia.

For the past several months, United States foreign policy has really been dominated by the crisis in Kosovo. Certainly we have to continue to work with the NATO alliance and Russia to help bring the Albanian Kosovars back to their homeland and to bring a stable peace to the region. But tonight I want to discuss another compelling and very serious foreign policy crisis that is taking place right in our own hemisphere.

Like Kosovo, it is a crisis that has displaced hundreds of thousands of people, more than 800,000 since 1995, and instead of a small province being ethnically cleansed by its own government, this democratic country is fighting multiple conflicts—a war against two threatening and competing guerrilla groups, a war against paramilitary organizations, and, finally, a war against drug lords who traffic in deadly cocaine and in heroin.

I am, of course, talking about the four wars that are taking place tonight in Colombia. While a 19-nation NATO alliance struggles to prevent the disintegration of a small province, the disintegration of an entire nation is going practically unnoticed by our own Government in Washington. The decade-long struggle in the Balkans is being duplicated in Colombia, which is fracturing into politically and socially unstable ministates and is posing a significant threat to our own hemisphere. Colombia is shaping up to be the Balkan problem of the Americas.

More than 35,000 Colombians have been killed in the last decade. More than 308,000 Colombians were internally displaced in 1998 alone. In Kosovo, 230,000 people were displaced during this same period of time before NATO took action. And like the Albanian Kosovars, Colombians are fleeing their country today in large numbers. More than 2,000 crossed into Venezuela in a matter of a few days recently. A Miami Herald article recently reported a growing number of Colombians leaving for south Florida.

Our Nation has a clear national interest in the future of the stability of our neighbor to the south, Colombia. In 1998, legitimate two-way trade between the United States and Colombia was more than $11 billion, making the United States Colombia's No. 1 trading partner, and Colombia is our fifth-largest trading partner in the region.

In spite of this mutually beneficial partnership, the United States simply has not devoted the level of time nor resources nor attention needed to assist this important democratic partner as it struggles with drug problems, with violent criminal and paramilitary organizations, and guerrilla insurgents. In fact, in December 1998, a White House official told the Washington Post that Colombia, quote, ''poses a greater immediate threat to us than Bosnia did, yet it receives almost no attention.''

Attention is needed—now more than ever. According to the State Department, Colombia is the third most dangerous country in the world in terms of political violence, and accounts for 34 percent of all terrorist acts committed worldwide. The Colombian National Police reported that Colombian rebels carried out 1,726 terrorist strikes in 1998—that's 12 percent more than in the previous year.

Kidnapping is also a significant problem. Approximately 2,609 people were kidnapped in 1998, and there have been 513 reported kidnappings in the first three months of this year. Guerrillas are responsible for a high percentage of these incidents.

The wholesale acts of violence that have infected this country are symptoms of four wars that are going on in Colombia. Any single one of them would pose a significant threat to any country. Together, these wars represent a threat beyond the borders of Colombia. Let me describe them in detail.

For more than three decades, the guerrilla groups known as Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces—the FARC—and the National Liberation Army—the ELN—have waged the longest-running anti-government insurgency in Latin America.

Determining the size of these guerrilla organizations is an inexact science. Most open sources range their combat strength from about 10,000 to 20,000 full-time guerrillas. However, irregular militias, part-time guerrillas, and political sympathizers also play a role that is hard to quantify.

The insurgents have their own armament capabilities and are manufacturing high-quality improvised mortars. Organized crime links also have long been suspected. The Chief of the Colombian National Police, General Jose Serrano, has reported in the past that the FARC has completed guns-and-cash-for-drugs deals with organized crime groups in Russia, Ukraine, Chechnya and Uzbekistan. A Colombian army study recently stated that the two main leftist guerrilla groups had raised at least $5.3 billion from 1991 to 1998 from the drug trade, abductions, and extortions to fund their long-running uprising against the state.

According to the State Department's 1998 Human Rights Report, the FARC and ELN, along with other, smaller groups, initiated armed action in nearly 700 of the country's 1073 municipalities, and control or influence 60 percent of rural Colombia. Although these

groups have had no history of major urban operations, a number of recent guerrilla-sponsored hostage takings recently have taken place.

Colombian President Pastrana is trying to make peace at all costs with FARC rebels, who have little incentive to agree to any peace deal. Throughout these negotiations, the FARC has continued to assault and kill dozens of Colombian military and police.

The current prospects for peace are dismal. If Pastrana were to accept the demands of the FARC and ELN for political and territorial autonomy, he would have to splinter his country into Balkan-type factions. The effects of this would be increased paramilitary violence and increased regional instability.

In fact, one of the FARC conditions already agreed to by President Pastrana was the creation of a temporary, demilitarized zone the size of Switzerland. All Colombian Armed Forces and Police were ordered out of the area. Despite this enormous concession on the part of the Colombian government, the FARC has not agreed to any cease-fire and has made no concessions. In fact, they made it clear to the Colombian Government that they should expect continued guerrilla operations and attacks.

''Farclandia'' is the name some local residents have given to this odd state-within-a-state. The area has over 90,000 residents. Despite its creation as a temporary demilitarized zone, the FARC appear to be cementing control and taking steps to ensure that expulsion from the zone would be extremely difficult, particularly if the talks break down.

According to the Catholic Bishop residing in the DMZ area, residents are required to feed the FARC, which is simply a form of taxation. The FARC has attempted to expel a Catholic priest for being an ''enemy of peace.'' The priest argued the FARC is violating human rights, usurping the locally elected government, interfering with economic activity, imposing labor duty, and recruiting minors, teenagers, and married men. The bottom line is that FARC fighters are using their armed stranglehold on the zone to abuse Colombian citizens.

In April, FARC leaders asked Pastrana to extend rebel control over another zone in southern Colombia—approximately 7,600 square miles—that is allegedly the home to some of the most concentrated cocaine-production facilities in the world. The Pastrana Government agreed to place the request on the negotiating table. While the additional zone was not approved, Pastrana agreed to allow FARC rebels to have continued control over the DMZ. This is the second time, since November 1998, that President Pastrana has extended the DMZ to the FARC during the talks.

This decision provoked outrage within Colombian military ranks, particularly since military officers had been humiliated by the creation of the original zone. That earlier decision required the withdrawal of hundreds of police and army troops. By the end of May, Colombian Defense Minister Ricardo Lloreda announced his resignation.

Following his announcement, dozens of military officers resigned in solidarity with Lloreda. Of the total of 30 Colombian army generals, reports indicate that between 10 and 17 resigned in solidarity with Lloreda. With the exception of Lloreda's resignation, Pastrana did not accept any other resignations. However, as a result of this mass protest, Pastrana agreed that the FARC zone would be demilitarized for only six more months and that a retired general would be included in the negotiating team for the talks.

In another important development, the Colombian Congress too is beginning to express its doubt in the peace process. Earlier this month, the Congress rejected a bill that would have given Pastrana sweeping powers to grant political concessions—including an amnesty for convicted guerrillas.

Lloreda's resignation was truly unfortunate. I met Defense Minister Lloreda in Colombia last November. Lloreda, described by his peers as someone who could help bring about needed reform in the military, was just beginning to gain some ground. He had already begun rebuilding the army, a difficult task given its record of human rights violations. In fact, he had forced the resignation of Colombian military officers suspected of human rights violations and had others arrested.

Lloreda had also lifted the morale among the military, having suffered significant defeats by the FARC forces. According to the Economist magazine, the defense budget has doubled this year to $1.2 billion. In March, the army even managed a successful offensive, which left 50 guerrillas dead.

The resignation, however, threw Pastrana's 10-month-old government into crisis and placed the future of the nation's fragile process in doubt. It has also left open important questions about the future of the Colombian military.

Mr. President, Colombian military operational mobility is widely acknowledged to be a shortcoming. Colombia is a very large country. One of their departments is as large as the nation of El Salvador. In fighting an insurgency, the state has to defend many critical areas, but also has to have the capability to mass and economize forces to attack guerrilla formations when they present themselves. Colombia's army has barely 40 helicopters for a territory the size of Texas and Mexico combined. El Salvador, 1/50th the size of Colombia, had 80—twice as many—during its civil war.

Although the Army has 122,000 soldiers, most of them are 1-year conscripts. Approximately 35–40% are high school graduates not assigned to combat duties by law. At any time, about 30% are undergoing basic training. A large portion of the remaining force (50–60%) is assigned to static defense of key economic or isolated municipal outposts. That leaves approximately 20,000 soldiers remaining for offensive combat operations. These are the veterans or volunteers that constitute—apart from the officer corps—the only true repository of combat experience in their army. Now consider that the active guerrilla combatants alone number between 11,000 and 20,000. You do the math. It doesn't look good. It is conceivably a one to one ''fighting'' ratio. How can a military, with limited resources, fight two guerrilla movements which have virtually unlimited resources from drug trafficking, kidnappings, extortion and arms trafficking?

The Colombian Army has already suffered a string of military defeats. In 1998, the Colombian Armed Forces suffered three major blows in March, August, and November. In fact, the FARC executed one of its major blows against the military just as President Pastrana was meeting with FARC leaders on the peace talks.

The FARC currently holds over 300 military and police POW's. And according to Jane's Intelligence Review, Colombian guerrillas killed 445 soldiers during 1998. If you include Colombian National Police, the figure would rise to 600. The CNP too has experienced significant losses. Over 4,000 policemen have been killed in Colombia in the past decade.

As if the FARC weren't enough of a problem, let me complicate this situation further by discussing the war with the ELN. The ELN has been envious of the attention the FARC has been getting, particularly at the negotiating table. As a result, the ELN has resorted to a series of recent hostage takings. Shortly after Pastrana and the FARC announced in April that formal negotiations would take place in the summer, the ELN hijacked a Colombian commercial airliner in mid-April, kidnapping 41 passengers and crew.

Then, shortly after Defense Minister Lloreda's resignation, about 30 ELN guerrillas invaded a church service in an upper-class neighborhood in Cali and abducted over 140 worshipers. In response, the Government deployed more than 3,000 soldiers and policemen to locate them. While some hostages have been released from the hijacking and church incidents, approximately 50 are still being held including two Americans.

I have outlined, Mr. President, the two main guerrilla groups which are a significant threat to Colombia. Unfortunately, however, I have not yet spoken of another ongoing war which poses an additional and substantial threat—the Colombian paramilitaries. In fact, the Colombian paramilitaries are also seeking a role at the negotiations table.

The Colombian paramilitaries are an umbrella organization of about 5,000 armed combatants. Their mission has

been to counter the grip of leftist guerrillas. Carlos Castano, the powerful leader of the paramilitary umbrella organization United Self-Defense Groups of Colombia, has been quoted defending the strategy of killing villagers who are guerrilla supporters and sympathizers.

The paramilitaries are funded by wealthy landowners and, in some cases, cocaine traffickers. They exercised increasing influence during 1998, extending their presence into areas previously under guerrilla control.

The presence of paramilitary groups have driven a wedge in the peace talks because the FARC leadership refuses to negotiate until the government effectively clamps down on the right wing gunmen. The problem is that the government also has a problem in trying to control the paramilitaries.

In an attempt to become a player at the negotiating table, Castano's organization kidnapped a Colombian Senator last month. In fact, Castano said shortly after the abduction that his aim was to gain political recognition and a place at the negotiating table for his movement. The Senator was freed after being held for two weeks. The Senator later commented that Pastrana should eventually include Colombia's paramilitary forces in negotiations to end the 35 year civil war. Since the leftist rebels vehemently oppose their participation in the peace talks, prospects for the peace negotiations are complicated even further.

Before I talk about the increasing drug threat from Colombia, let me spend a few minutes on the general violence in Colombia.

According to the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Colombia led the world in kidnappings in 1998, and may be the most likely place in the world to be abducted. The country averages five people a day snatched by guerrillas or other criminals. Guerrillas from the FAR, ELN and the smaller Popular Liberation Army accounted for approximately 1,600 kidnappings of the 2,609 reported in 1998.

A report issued by the Colombian Government's anti-kidnapping office in May calculated that at least 4,925 people have been abducted since January 1996, with the largest total coming in 1998. The problem with this statistic is that many families and businesses prefer to deal directly with kidnappers and not report abductions to the police. Hence, this figure is only the official one. It is understandably difficult to count how many kidnappings truly occur in Colombia.

Imagine, if you will, living in a country where you can't send your child on school field trip; where you can't decide to go out of Bogota for the weekend to visit relatives in a nearby city. In fact, the situation is so grave that you think twice about going to the grocery store or even to a movie.

A recent New York Times article described the lives of Colombians and the precautions they must take on a daily basis. The article stated that Colombians are refusing to fly on any airplane that is not a jet. They cite the example of ELN hijacking of a prop plane. The Colombian quoted in the article commented that it is almost impossible for guerrillas to take over a big jet and make it land at some little airstrip out in the jungle.

In the week before Easter, a traditional vacation time throughout Latin America, travel within Colombia was down 40% over last year, according to a Colombian civic group. With increasing regularity, the five million residents of Bogota are canceling trips to towns that are barely a two hour drive away, while traffic on highways to the Caribbean coast has also dropped significantly.

Kidnapping is such a significant threat that a Colombian government study made public estimates that the country's three main guerrilla groups have obtained more than $1.2 billion in kidnapping ransoms in recent years.

Mr. President, the situation in Colombia has gotten so bad that the State Department recently issued a warning, advising Americans to not travel to Colombia. You see, Colombians are not the only targets in their country. There have been U.S. casualties as well.

In late 1997, the State Department added the FARC to its list of terrorist organizations.

In January 1999, guerrillas announced that all U.S. military and law enforcement personnel in Colombia would be considered legitimate targets to be killed or captured. In late February, the FARC viciously murdered three U.S. human rights workers. This horrific execution met with no reaction from the Clinton Administration. A resolution was recently introduced in the House, calling on the Colombian government to pursue the killers, members of the FARC and extradite them to the U.S.

Colombian terrorists continue to target Americans, kidnapping over a dozen U.S. citizens in 1999 so far—this is double the total amount for 1998. The 1998 State Department Terrorism Report also suggests that terrorists also continued to bomb U.S. commercial interests, such as oil pipelines and small businesses.

There has also been much concern that the civil war in Colombia could spill over into neighboring countries—including Venezuela, where President Chavez is alleged to have had contacts in the past with the ELN. A spill-over into Venezuela would be disastrous for the United States, given that Venezuela is our number one—let me repeat this—number one supplier of foreign oil. The situation is so grave that Venezuela has sent 30,000 troops to the border with Colombia.

There has been a recent exodus of Colombians into Venezuela. In a two day period recently, over 2,000 Colombians began their exodus to Venezuela after death squads massacred about 80 people near a border town. Many of the Colombians were said to be coca farmers.

At first, Venezuelan President Chavez said Venezuela was prepared to offer the Colombians temporary refuge until they could return safely to their homes. However, only one day after the recent cross-over began, Venezuela had already started repatriating Colombians back to Colombia. And within a few days, all Colombians have been repatriated.

Colombian-Venezuelan relations have been tense. For example, while Chavez has agreed to play a role in the negotiations, in mid-May Chavez announced he was seeking a direct meeting with FARC commander Manuel Marulanda. In fact, two months earlier, he angered President Pastrana by suggesting that the FARC's armed struggle was legitimate and declaring that Venezuela remained ''neutral'' in the conflict.

There has also been some concern of a spillover of the conflict into Ecuador, another nation bordering Colombia. In fact, Ecuadoran government officials indicate that rebel forces have crossed over to their nation, primarily for rest and relaxation. With the end of its border dispute with Peru, Ecuador is in the process of relocating 10,000 troops to the Colombian border. In addition, Ecuadoran intelligence has reportedly periodically taken down some guerrilla supply routes.

Colombia also borders Panama, which should be of significant concern to our nation. It is a known fact that Colombian rebels have been infiltrating the Darien province in Panama for quite some time in search of supplies.

In late May, hundreds of Panamanians fled their homes near the border with Colombia, fearing a violent clash between Colombian guerrillas and paramilitary bounty hunters. Witnesses claim that there were about 500 FARC rebels in Panama.

Mr. President, this rebel crossing is occurring just 250 miles southeast of the Panama Canal. And let me remind you that U.S. military forces are departing from Panama.

The United States should be extremely concerned. The departure of U.S. forces could encourage Colombian rebel groups to become more active in the deep, inaccessible rainforests of Panama's Darien region. And while Panama has increased a border police force to 1,500, they are no match to the Colombian rebels. Panama has no military, and our total U.S. troop presence is scheduled to depart Panama by the end of this year. We just closed down operations out of Howard Air Force Base in May, and we are about to turn over the Panama Canal and remaining military facilities at the end of this century.

Mr. President, while the United States is complying with the Panama Canal Treaties, in terms of giving Panama the Canal at the end of this year, the treaties state that the United

States has the continued responsibility to protect and defend the Panama Canal. And the duration of this treaty is indefinite. In the event that something happens to the Panama Canal, just a few hundred miles from Colombia, how would the United States respond then?

I have spent most of my time talking about the worsening civil strife in Colombia. But I cannot end this speech without talking about the final war in Colombia. It's the war Americans probably have heard the most about—the war prompted by the fact that Colombia is the world's most important cocaine producer and a leading producer of heroin.

According to our State Department, over 75% of the world's cocaine HCL is processed in Colombia. 1998 marked the third consecutive year of significant increase in Colombia coca crop size; recent statistics indicate that about 75% of the heroin seized in the northeast United States is of Colombian origin. Colombian heroin is so pure—roughly 80% to 90%—that in 1998, the number of heroin overdose cases in the United States went up significantly. In fact, in 1998, the number of heroin overdoses in Orlando surpassed the number of homicides.

Drug trafficking is profitable, and provides the FARC with the largest share of its income. Sixty percent of FARC fronts are involved in the drug trade. About 30% of ELN war fronts are likewise engaged in drug trafficking. This includes extortion/taxation of coca fields and yields, precursor chemicals and security of labs and clandestine air strips. The insurgents control the southern rural terrain of Colombia where the largest density of cocaine fields and production is found.

Mr. President, I have outlined a deteriorating situation in Colombia. I have spoken to you about Colombia's ongoing and escalating four wars. These are significant issues that have a direct impact on our hemisphere and our Nation. The future of Colombia as a unified country, and the stability of an entire hemisphere is at risk. The sad reality is that our country is not yet making an adequate response to this crucial foreign policy challenge. We are simply not paying attention, nor are we adequately responding.

U.S. leadership in this Colombian crisis is needed. This is no time to keep our backs turned. Continued inattention will only contribute to continued instability. Like Kosovo, the U.S. should mobilize the international community to play a role in resolving the Colombian conflict. Certainly we should pledge our support to the democratically elected Government. We should also be ready to provide other types of support such as training, equipment, and professional development to help Colombia overcome these threats to democracy and freedom.

Finally, we must continue to work to disrupt and dismantle the drug trafficking organizations and to reduce their financial control of antidemocratic elements in Colombia.

We are doing some things in Colombia. I had the opportunity to see those myself when I traveled there a few months ago. But we simply have to do more. We have to become more engaged.

I remember President Ronald Reagan's profound wisdom in negotiating from a position of strength in his efforts to strengthen our military. This strategic vision led to the crumbling ultimately of our adversaries. Unfortunately, this dynamic has not yet taken hold in Colombia.

Because of the Colombian Government's weakness, no incentive appears to exist for its multiple adversaries to respect and to adhere to any agreements. Their only incentive is to extract further concessions from the Government and to further attempt to weaken the Colombian Government.

Before I close, let me quote a passage from a report in Time magazine. I quote:

> The six members of the presidential peace commission did not know where they were headed when their Bell 212 helicopter took off from Bogota at dawn. The pilot had been given the top-secret coordinates minutes before takeoff, but not even he was sure of the destination. Suddenly, the flag of the FARC, the oldest, largest and bloodiest of the country's numerous anti-government guerrilla groups, was sighted in the jungle below. This time, however, the flag signified the making of history, not war. In a small clearing in the Alto de la Mesa rain forest, FARC guerrillas and the government's representatives met to sign a momentous eleven-point cease-fire agreement.

While this article seems to depict the present situation in Colombia in terms of peace talks, the fact is that it does not. The main reason is that there has not yet been a cease-fire agreement as a result of this latest round of talks.

Let me repeat that. There has not yet, to this day, been a cease-fire agreement as a result of this latest round of talks.

The article I quoted appeared in Time magazine's issue dated April 16, 1984.

In April 1984, the then-Colombian President triumphantly announced on national television his Government's formal acceptance of that pact with the FARC guerrillas. He thought that he had negotiated an end to the guerrilla conflict with the FARC leadership.

Let me note that there have been numerous other accounts by other Colombian Presidents throughout the years to negotiate a resolution to the guerrilla wars in Colombia. Each time the peace talks have failed, and each time the guerrilla groups have been further strengthened.

While the current President of Colombia is negotiating with the very same FARC leader, a few things have changed over the last 15 years. Back in 1984, the Time article reported that the FARC consisted of 2,050 guerrillas backed by an additional 5,000 people in ''civil defense cadres'' spread mainly throughout the countryside. But today the FARC has about 10,000 to 15,000 active combatants—quite a change.

In 1994, the ELN had roughly 200 men and the Popular Liberation Army had about 275. The ELN today has between 5,000 and 7,000 troops.

It is simply amazing to me what a difference 15 years has made in Colombia, a difference, unfortunately and tragically, for the worse. We have gone from seeing Colombia's combat-ready guerrilla number in the 2,000 range—2,000 is what it was—to a situation today where there is likely a guerrilla combatant rebel for every Colombian military combatant person available, a 1-to-1 ratio.

My question to this Congress and to this administration is, How can we expect Colombia to overcome these multiple wars? The rebel personnel resources have significantly increased since the mid-1980s and are one of the main reasons behind this rise in the alliance between the guerrillas and the drug traffickers.

This strategic alliance, in which each party benefits from the other's involvement, makes it very clear that it is extremely difficult to separate the drug war from guerrilla and paramilitary wars. That is why the United States must play a role to help Colombia overcome all of its wars—not just the drug dealers. We must understand that our drug consumption only further exacerbates the Colombian crisis. And we must be involved in helping them resolve the four wars I have described.

In the 1980s, the United States made a major investment in the struggle for democracy and human rights in Latin America. We pretty much succeeded. We basically went from a situation a generation or two ago where half the countries were democratic to a situation today where every country save one is democratic, or is at least moving rapidly towards democracy. We have succeeded.

But if we want Latin America to continue to evolve into a stable and peaceful trading partner and a friend of the United States, we will have to make a more serious commitment to Colombia. No one wants to see Colombia devolve into a criminal narcostate. But unless we act soon in partnership with the democratically elected Government of Colombia, unless we act soon to reverse this democratic death spiral, it is only a matter of time before Colombia ceases to exist as a sovereign nation with democratic principles.

President Ronald Reagan showed profound wisdom in leading this hemisphere toward democracy and toward free markets. We must do all we can to make sure that this positive tide is not rolled back for our neighbors to the south.

I thank the Chair for his indulgence.

RETIREMENT OF DR. KENT WYATT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to Dr. Kent Wyatt who is

retiring today after serving as the President of Delta State University for the past 24 years. During his tenure at Delta State, Dr. Wyatt has repeatedly been recognized as one of America's premier higher education administrators.

Kent was born in Berea, Kentucky and later moved to Cleveland, Mississippi. He earned an undergraduate degree in education from Delta State and a Masters degree in education from the University of Southern Mississippi. Kent topped off his formal education at the University of Mississippi where he received a Doctorate in Education.

After completing his doctoral studies at Ole Miss, Kent commenced his teaching career back home in Cleveland, Mississippi where he served as a mathematics teacher, a coach, and then as a principal for the School District. Kent soon followed in his father's footsteps, Forest E. Wyatt, who served as a teacher and the head football coach at Delta State University.

In 1964, Kent's alma mater, Delta State University, hired him as its Alumni Secretary. But, he quickly shifted over to the university's management. Recognizing his leadership and vision, Kent was named Delta State's fifth President in 1975 after serving six years as assistant to the president.

During the last quarter century, Kent has amassed an impressive record. He continuously emulated ''quality without compromise.'' As a result of his stewardship, Delta State's faculty has grown from 202 to 328, with all academic programs receiving national accreditation, and 18 new facilities were built. Since 1975, Delta State's enrollment has grown by 32%. Equally astounding, Kent increased the university's financial assets by a factor of ten since 1975. A most impressive record for Dr. Wyatt and Delta State University.

Kent's peers in Mississippi and across the nation have repeatedly drawn on his academic leadership. For example, Kent recently served on the Search Committee for the Executive Director of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and on the NCAA's President's Commission.

Running a large university would challenge many, but Kent also managed to serve those off campus too. Kent also served his community for over three decades. He was the President of the Cleveland Lions Club as well as the President of the Chamber of Commerce. He also served on the boards of the United Way, Mississippi Economic Council, Grenada Banking System, Union Planters Bank of Northwest Mississippi, and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Kent currently serves as a Deacon at the First Baptist Church.

Kent's wife Janice, their children Tara and Elizabeth, as well as their grandchildren Kent Wyatt Mounger and Collins Hartfield Mounger, have good reasons to be proud of his many accomplishments.

As Congress addresses the many challenges facing higher education in America today, my colleagues and I can benefit from the many contributions Kent has made in Cleveland, Mississippi. Not only has he been an inspiration to the more than 15,000 college students who passed through the halls of Delta State during his tenure, Kent has helped to mold the future leaders of this great country.

Kent and Janice have chosen to stay in Bolivar County. While he will be missed at Delta State, the town of Cleveland, the County of Bolivar, the State of Mississippi, and Mississippi's Congressional delegation are thankful that Kent, a true Delta State Statesman, has chosen to remain in his hometown to serve as a continuing inspiration for public service at its best.

Mr. President, I want to express to Kent my heartfelt appreciation for everything he has done for his community, our state, and the nation. I am hopeful that Kent and Janice will enjoy the next important phase of their lives.

COMMEMORATION OF U.N. TORTURE VICTIM SUPPORT DAY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this past Saturday was the 2nd annual U.N. International Day in Support of Torture Victims and Survivors. The practice of torture is one of the most serious human rights abuses of our time. According to Amnesty International, torture conducted by government security forces, or that is condoned by other government officials occurs in at least 120 countries today. We need look no farther than today's headlines about Turkey, Iraq, Kosovo, China and Ethiopia to know that we will be dealing with the problems that torture victims face for many years.

We can and must do more to stop such horrific acts of torture, and to treat its victims. Focusing on treatment and rehabilitation for torture survivors is one of the best ways we can manifest our concern for human rights worldwide. As our recent intervention in Kosovo to stop a humanitarian crisis demonstrates, both the United States and the international community have become aware of the need to prevent these human rights abuses and to punish the perpetrators when abuses take place. Yet, too often we have failed to address the needs of the victims after their rights have been violated. The treatment of torture victims must be a central focus of our efforts to promote human rights.

This commitment to protect human rights is one shared by many around the world. In 1984 the U.N. approved the United Nations Convention Against Torture. The U.S. Senate ratified it in April of 1994. And just last year the Congress enacted the Torture Victims Relief Act which authorizes funds for treatment services for victims of torture in the United States and abroad. I was pleased to learn that last week the Senate Committee on Appropriations recommended that the funds authorized by the act be appropriated in full in the foreign operations appropriations bill. Under this recommendation, AID will provide $7.5 million to support foreign treatment centers and the U.S. will contribute $3 million to the U.N. Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture. I hope this recommendation makes it through to the final bill which goes to the President. While these are significant achievements, we must focus on what more needs to be done.

In many countries torture is routinely employed in police stations to coerce confessions or obtain information. Detainees are subjected to both physical and mental abuse. Methods include beatings with sticks and whips; kicking with boots; electric shocks; and suspension from one or both arms. Victims are also threatened, insulted and humiliated. In some cases, particularly those involving women, victims are stripped, exposed to verbal and sexual abuse. Medical treatment is often withheld, sometimes resulting in death.

The purpose of torture is intimidation and the total destruction of an individual's character. Torture impacts on humanity in profound ways. The shattering of lives, dispersing of families, and destruction of communities all result from this politically-motivated form of violence. The destruction of people's humanity, cultures, and traditions are often the result for both the torturer and the victim of torture.

Treating torture victims must be a much more central focus of our efforts as we work to promote human rights worldwide. Without active programs of healing and recovery, torture survivors often suffer continued physical pain, depression and anxiety, intense and incessant nightmares, guilt and self loathing. They often report an inability to concentrate or remember. The severity of trauma makes it difficult to hold down a job, study for a new profession, or acquire other skills needed for successful adjustment into society.

Friday morning I met with Sister Dianna Ortiz and several other torture survivors courageous enough to share their stories. They related to me horrific tales of family displacement, sexual abuse, and mental and physical humiliation. Mr. Feltavu Ebba, a survivor from Ethiopia told me his horrific tale of torture he received solely based on his ethnic identification. He said:

> I was locked up in a room 4 meters by 4 meters with more than 50 other prisoners. I was not allowed to see my family and relatives for the first six years.

Needless to say, the damage done to his relationship with his children can never be repaired. Also, every minute of his existence in prison was wrought with emotional and physical pain. He said:

> Again after three years of prison in 1982 I was physically and mentally tortured for a week . . . This time by dipping me head-

down in a barrel filled with cold, dirty water and beating under my feet with interwoven electrical wire.

Another survivor, Monica Feria, told me of her torture in Peru. Rather than attempt to speak on her behalf, I will let her words speak for themselves.

We ran for our lives through the ducts that took us to another prison where the male prisoners accused of belonging to the Shining Path were kept. On the way many of us were shot. While crawling I saw bodies that had been blown up, arms, heads, and blood. Everything was covered with that horrible colour of burnt black. As I crawled avoiding the bullets I felt under me dead bodies still warm. The horror . . .

This is only a fraction of the horrific episodes relayed to me by these courageous survivors. Just last week the New York Times quoted the Human Rights Watch organization as being distressed at the continued prevalence of torture worldwide.

In Minnesota, we began to think about the problem of torture and act on it, over ten years ago. The Center for Victims of Torture in Minneapolis is the only fully-staffed torture treatment facility in the country and was one of the first in the world; there are now over 200 centers worldwide. The center offers outpatient services which can include medical treatment, psychotherapy and help gaining economic and legal stability. Its advocacy work also helps to inform people about the problem of torture and the lingering effects it has on victims, and ways to combat torture worldwide. The Center has treated or provided services to hundreds of people over the last ten years.

Some of the often shrill public rhetoric these days seems to argue that we as a nation can no longer afford to remain engaged with the world, or to assist the poor, the elderly, the feeble, refugees, those seeking asylum—those most in need of aid who are right here in our midst. The Center for Victims of Torture stands as a repudiation of that idea. Its mission is to rescue and rehabilitate people who have been crushed by torture, and it has been accomplishing that mission admirably over the last ten years. It is a light of hope in the lives of those who have for so long seen only darkness, a darkness brought on by the brutal hand of the torturer.

I would like to thank the distinguished human rights leaders who have helped me in this fight, including those at the Center for Torture Victims in Minneapolis and others such as Sister Ortiz, the Torture Abolition and Survivors Support Committee (TASSC), the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, and those in the human rights community here in Washington and in Minnesota. Without their energy and skills as advocates for tough U.S. laws which promote respect for internationally-recognized human rights worldwide, the cause of human rights here in the U.S. would be seriously diminished. I salute them today. We recommit ourselves to the aid of torture survivors, and to building a world in which torture is relegated to the dark past, and in which torture treatment programs are made obsolete.

THE MISSING, EXPLOITED, AND RUNAWAY CHILDREN PROTECTION ACT OF 1999 S. 249

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I had planned to be giving a statement on final passage of the ''Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act of 1999.'' Unfortunately, I cannot do this, because just as there was last year, there continues to be a hold up on passing this important legislation. We could and should have passed this legislation last year. We could and should pass this legislation today.

Last year we missed that opportunity when the Republican majority in both Houses of Congress played partisan games and tried to use this noncontroversial authorization bill as a vehicle to insist on conferencing a much-criticized Republican juvenile justice bill. That procedural gimmick cost us valuable time to get this legislation enacted.

The majority was roundly criticized. The Washington Post went so far as to call the Republican Majority's short-circuit conference tactic ''faintly absurd.'' The San Francisco Chronicle used even stronger terms, calling it ''sneaky maneuvering and Byzantine procedural moves.'' The Philadelphia Inquirer's reaction to this tactic was: ''Shame on the House. And shame on the Senate if it approves this bill as is, without debate.'' The New York Times labeled this maneuver a ''stealth assault on juvenile justice.''

By contrast to last year, at least in the Senate, procedural ambushes on juvenile justice legislation have been eschewed and we were given the opportunity last month to have full and fair debate. After significant improvements through amendments, the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill passed the Senate on May 20, 1999 by a strong bipartisan vote.

Similarly, I am pleased that the Leahy-Hatch substitute to this bill, the Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act of 1999, overwhelmingly passed the Senate on April 19. In late May, the House of Representatives followed suit.

The House, however, inserted new language, not included in the Senate-passed bill. This new language includes two studies and language regarding the ''consolidated review of applications'' for grants under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

The first study mandates the Secretary of HHS to examine the percent of runaways who leave home because of sexual abuse. The study is not funded and sets an unreasonable time frame. The second instructs the Secretary of Education to commission a $2.1 million study by the National Academy of Sciences on the antecedents of school violence in urban, suburban, and rural schools, including the incidents of school violence that occurred in Pearl, Mississippi; Paducah, Kentucky; Jonesboro, Arkansas; Springfield, Oregon; Edinboro, Pennsylvania; Fayetteville, Tennessee; Littleton, Colorado; and Conyers, Georgia. The study must include the impact of cultural influences and exposure to the media, video games, and the Internet.

It is my understanding that this school violence study was slipped into the legislation after the House committee reported the bill. In essence this bill seeks to mandate funding from the Department of Education, although this authorizing legislation, and sets an unreasonable time frame for a thoughtful study to be conducted. I do not support such efforts to bypass the consideration of the Appropriations Committees.

The juvenile violence study inserted into S. 249 also duplicates numerous studies in, S. 254, the Senate-passed juvenile justice bill. The studies in S. 254 include:

Study of Marketing Practices of Motion Picture, Recording, and Video/Personal Computer Game Industries. The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice are directed to study the extent of the entertainment industry's marketing of unsuitable materials to minors and the industry's enforcement of the current rating systems.

Study. This section instructs the Comptroller General to conduct a study on (1) the incidents of school-based violence; (2) impediments to combating school-based violence; (3) promising initiatives for addressing school-based violence; and (4) crisis preparedness of school personnel and law enforcement officials.

School Violence Research. This section instructs the Attorney General to establish a research center that will serve as a clearinghouse for school violence research at the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement in Little Rock, Arkansas.

National Commission on Character Development. This section creates a National Commission on Character Development to study and make recommendations with respect to the impact of cultural influences on developing and instilling character in America's youth.

Study of Marketing Practices of the Firearms Industry. This section directs the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General to conduct a study of the marketing practices of the firearms industry to determine the extent to which the firearms industry advertises its products to juveniles.

National Media Campaign Against Violence. This section creates a $25 million national media campaign targeted to parents and youth to reduce and prevent violence by young Americans. The campaign will be operated by the National Crime Prevention Council with the consultation of national, statewide or community-based youth organizations.

Behavioral and Social Science Research on Youth Violence. This section authorizes the National Institutes of Health, acting through the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, to conduct a comprehensive study on the causes and prevention of youth violence.

National Youth Violence Commission. This subtitle establishes a Commission composed of 16 members to conduct a comprehensive factual study of incidents of youth violence in order to determine the root causes of such violence by studying the involvement of teachers and school administrators, trends in family relationships, alienation of youth from the families and peer groups, availability of firearms to youth, impact of youth violence on youth, effects on youth of depictions of violence in the media, and the availability of information regarding the construction of weapons. The Commission will make recommendations to the President and Congress to address the causes of youth violence and reduce incidents of youth violence in the form of a report which shall be submitted no later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission first meets.

The youth violence study inserted into S. 249 by the House also duplicates ongoing efforts by President Clinton. In August 1998, the Departments of Justice and Education released ''Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools.'' This guide provides schools and communities with information on how to identify the early warning signs and take action steps to prevent and respond to school violence. Every school in the nation received a copy of the guide.

In October 1998 at the White House Conference the President released the first Annual Report on School Safety. The report includes an analysis of all existing national school crime data and an overview of state and local crime reporting; examples of schools and strategies that are successfully reducing school violence, drug use and class disruption; actions that parents can take locally to combat school crime; and resources available to schools and communities to help create safe, disciplined and drug-free schools.

On April 1, 1999, a new Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative was announced by Attorney General Janet Reno, Secretary of Education Richard Riley and Surgeon General David Satcher, M.D., to provide 50 communities with up to $3 million per year for three years to link existing and new services and activities into a comprehensive community-wide approach to violence prevention and healthy child development. It is based on evidence that a comprehensive, integrated community-wide approach is an effective way to promote healthy childhood development and address the problems of school violence and drug abuse.

On June 1, 1999 the President directed the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice to conduct a joint study of the marketing practices of entertainment industries to determine whether these industries are marketing to children violent and other material that is rated for adults.

There are many more studies and activities I could list, but I think my point has been made.

I regret that the House has again, as in the last Congress, has taken a clean bill and chosen to add extraneous matters. Rather than allow this tactic to delay passage of this already long-delayed and much-needed authorization for a number of worthwhile programs, I will not insist that the House amendment be stricken at this time. I will look to reconsider it in the course of the conference on the S. 254, the Hatch-Leahy juvenile crime legislation.

The other language inserted by the House that causes me concern is the ''consolidated review of grant application.'' In the Leahy-Hatch Senate bill we were careful to make clear the continuation of current law governing the minimum grants available for small States under Basic Center grants program.

My concern about the consolidation language, however, has been abated after I received assurances from Secretary Shalala that small States will in no way be disadvantaged from receiving funding at current levels or above. If small States, like Vermont, effectively compete for national competitive grants programs, that is to their additional benefit and will not reduce the small State minimums in important programs like the Basic Center grants program.

In order to address my concern, on May 26, I sent a letter to Secretary Shalala asking that the Department guarantee that the House bill, like the Senate bill, preserves the current funding mechanism under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. On June 7, through Secretary Shalala's Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Rich Tarplin, I received such assurance and with that, I am pleased to be working to expedite the enactment of this legislation.

I thank Secretary Shalala and Assistant Secretary Rich Tarplin for making explicit that small States like Vermont will not be disadvantaged by the language added by the House. In addition, I thank Barbara Clark, of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, for her tireless work over too many years to see through the reauthorization of these programs. I hope all of our efforts are rewarded with passage of S. 249 as soon as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of my letter to Secretary Shalala and the response that I received be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am also disappointed that the House chose to scale back the authorization of these program from five years as passed by the Senate to four years.

The bottom line, however, is that the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children have gone without authorization for too long. We should pass this legislation without further delay.

I have been able to clear this bill on my side of the aisle. Unfortunately, the Republicans have not been able to do the same and are, once again, holding up enactment of this legislation. The holdup on passage of this already long-delayed and much needed authorization for a number of worthwhile programs to provide assistance to at risk children and their families must be put to an end.

The Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act of 1999 authorizes a variety of critical programs for our nation's most at risk children and youth—those who are missing or have been exploited and those who have run away or been forced from home or are homeless. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children provides extremely worthwhile and effective assistance to children and families facing crises across the U.S. and around the world. In 1998, the National Center helped law enforcement officers locate over 5,000 missing children. They also handled 132,357 telephone calls to their hotline, which included calls to report a missing child, to request information or assistance and to provide leads on missing or potentially exploited children. This figure includes 10,904 reported leads or sightings of missing children, an increase of 25 percent over such leads in 1997.

Since 1984, the National Center has helped investigate more than 80 cases involving Vermont children who have been reported missing. They have had extraordinary success in resolving these cases, some of which have taken several years and have involved out of state or international negotiations. I want to thank Ernie Allen and all of the dedicated employees and volunteers associated with the National Center for their help in these matters.

The National Center serves a critical role as a clearinghouse of resources and information for both family members and law enforcement officers. They have developed a network of hotels and restaurants which provides free services to parents in search of their children and have also developed extensive training programs. The National Center has trained 728 sheriffs and police chiefs from across the U.S. in recent years, including police chiefs from Dover, Hartford, Brattleboro and Winooski, Vermont, as well as members of the Vermont State Police. They have trained an additional 150,000 other officers in child sexual exploitation and the detection of missing children since 1984.

The National Center is also a leader in reducing the number of infant abductions by educating nurses, security staffs and hospitals. A seminar held in Vermont, trained 250 nurses and security personnel, should provide greater

peace of mind to new parents in my home State.

Most recently, they have expanded their role in combating the sexual exploitation of children by going on-line. Last year, they launched their ''CyberTipline'' which allows Internet users to report suspicious activities linked to the Internet, including child pornography and the potential enticement of children on-line. In the second half of 1998, they received over 4,000 leads from the CyberTipline which resulted in numerous arrests. I applaud the ongoing work of the Center and hope that we will promptly pass this bill so that they can proceed with their important activities with fewer funding concerns.

The National Center established an international division some time ago and has been working to fulfil the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. Last year the National Center held a conference on international concerns with child abductions and international custody battles between separated parents from different countries.

The other important piece of this legislation is the reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act which distributes funding to local community programs on the front lines assisting the approximately 1.3 million children and youth each year who are homeless or have left or been forced from their families for a variety of reasons. Those who provide services pursuant to these programs and those who are the beneficiaries of those services are far too important to be left hanging. In a Congress in which the budget and appropriations processes have given way to short-lived spending authority, they all deserve the reassurance of reauthorization and a commitment to funding. Only then will our State youth service bureaus and other shelter and service providers be able plan, design and implement the local programs necessary to make the goals of the Act a reality.

In 1974, Congress passed the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act as Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The inclusion of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act in this legislation recognized that young people who were effectively homeless were in need of shelter, guidance and supervision, rather than punishment, and should be united with their families wherever possible.

Since 1974, the programs that make up the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act have evolved to meet the complex problems faced by our young people, their families and our communities. Over the last decade, as a nation, we have witnessed an increase in teen pregnancy rates, drug and alcohol abuse beginning as early as grade school, child physical and sexual abuse, and a soaring youth suicide rate.

Since 1989, the transitional living program has been part of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. This program, which was developed by my former colleague Senator Simon, has filled a gap in the needs of older youth to help them make the transition to independent living situations.

The majority of these program in Vermont are run by the Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth. The Vermont Coalition is a community-based network comprised of member programs that provide crisis response, emergency shelter, counseling, and other services to troubled youth throughout Vermont counties.

The programs we are seeking to reauthorize include those directed at young people who have had some kind of alcohol or other drug problem. The isolation in rural areas can lead to serious substance abuse problems. It is difficult to reach young people in rural areas and it is difficult for them to find the services they need. In Vermont, these drug abuse prevention programs provide essential outreach services.

Service providers are being challenged as never before with an increasingly complex set of problems affecting young people and their families. Now is not the time to abandon them. There is consensus among services providers that young people seeking services and their families are increasingly more troubled—as evidenced by reports of family violence, substance abuse and the effects of an array of economic pressures. These services may well be the key to breaking through the isolation of street youth, their mistrust of adults, and their reluctance to get involved with public or private providers.

The programs embodied in S. 249, the Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act, are important and should not once again be held hostage to the controversial debate on juvenile crime.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 26, 1999.

Hon. DONNA SHALALA,
Secretary of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC

DEAR SECRETARY SHALALA: I am pleased that we are close to enactment of S. 249, the Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act of 1999, which will reauthorize programs under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA) and authorize funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The Senate passed the Leahy-Hatch substitute to S. 249 on April 19, by unanimous consent. Yesterday, the House passed its version of this legislation.

I am concerned about language inserted into the bill during House consideration upon which the Senate was not consulted. That language provides for a ''consolidated review of applications'' of RHYA grants. Before agreeing to the new language, I need to be assured that this could in no way be construed as consolidating any of the RHYA programs under a single formula allocation.

As you know, under the RHYA, each year each State is awarded at a minimum $100,000 for housing and crisis services under the Basic Center grant program. Effective community-based programs around the country can also apply directly for the funding available for the Transitional Living Program and the Sexual Abuse Prevention/Street Outreach grants.

I hope that you can clarify that the new language inserted by House will do noting to collapse the distinct programs authorized under the RHYA. These programs are very important and I would like to see the legislation passed without further delay.

I have been working since 1996 to enact this reauthorizing legislation. I worked to have the Senate pass this legislation during the last Congress and again earlier this year. With your assurance that Vermont and other small states will not be disadvantaged by the language inserted by the House in competing for national grant funding, I will seek to expedite enactment.

Sincerely,

PATRICK LEAHY,
Ranking Member.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 1999.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: You have asked us to consider the impact of certain language recently inserted into the House version of S. 249, the ''Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Act of 1999''. Specifically, you have asked us to consider whether proposed section 385, Consolidated Review of Applications, will adversely affect the eligibility of small States to receive Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA) funding above the minimum grant allotment of the RHYA Basic Center Grant program.

I am advised by General Counsel that currently the Secretary has wide statutory discretion to prescribe the procedures which will be used in awarding various grants under the RHYA. The Secretary presently exercises this discretion by choosing to include in a consolidated grant announcement several discrete funding opportunities with distinct application requirements. After studying the pertinent language in S. 249, General Counsel has concluded that the proposed legislation provides for a similar level of discretion with respect to procedures to be used for various grant awards under the RHYA. Therefore, since the proposed legislation does not require the Secretary to change in any way her current procedures for awarding RHYA grants, it will not require the Secretary to commingle the current separate and discrete RHYA funding opportunities so as to adversely affect the eligibility of small States to receive RHYA funding above the minimum grant allotment of the RHYA Basic Center grant program.

I hope this information is helpful to you as you proceed with final consideration of S. 249. The Department deeply appreciates all your efforts to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. TARPLIN,
Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

AN EFFORT TO RAISE THE CAFE STANDARDS

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an issue of critical importance to the families in my State. Throughout Michigan, men and women are working hard every day to produce the cars that make our economy and our Nation move. They and their families depend on the jobs produced by our automobile manufacturing industry, just as the rest of us can depend on the cars they produce.

But those jobs in Michigan's economy are jeopardized by efforts to increase the standards for Corporate Average Fuel Economy, or CAFE. I have come to the floor today because I want to make certain that my colleagues are aware of the extremely serious impact of increased CAFE standards, not just on Michigan but on every State in the Union. I also point out that these punitive measures will be ineffective and fly in the face of ongoing efforts on the part of our automakers to increase fuel economy, efforts that promise to produce fruit in the very near future.

The Federal Government currently mandates that auto manufacturers mandate a fuel economy of 27.5 miles per gallon for cars and 20.7 miles per gallon for sports utility vehicles and light trucks.

Since 1995, Congress has wisely refused to allow the Federal bureaucracy to unilaterally increase these standards. We have recognized that it is our duty as legislators to make policy in this important area of economic and environmental concern.

Now, however, I understand that a number of colleagues are calling for an end to this congressional authority. They are calling on the administration to unilaterally increase CAFE requirements for sports utility vehicles and light trucks to 27.5 miles per gallon.

This action is misguided. It will hurt the working families of Michigan. It will undermine American competitiveness. I want to put the Senate on notice that I will use every legislative means at my disposal to see that it does not happen.

CAFE requirements costs jobs with few tangible positive affects. It really is that simple.

Let me explain what I mean.

To meet increased CAFE requirements, SUVs and light trucks would have to be dramatically reengineered. Auto makers would be forced to implement and design radically new engine and autobody changes. Such changes would be enormously challenging, and would be reflected in decreased power and carrying capacity, coupled with an increase in price. The result would be a less desirable automobile. It would spell the doom of the line vehicles which are largely responsible for the resurgence and continued success of American automobile industry.

Of course, this is precisely the goal of CAFE advocates: reduced public demand and consumption of this line of vehicle, but it is an unwise course.

A government engineered campaign to steer the public away from the sport utility market, one which the U.S. producers dominate, will also be of enormous benefit to overseas competitors.

The fact is, the U.S. dominates the light truck market because sky-high gasoline prices in countries such as Japan have forced foreign auto makers to make smaller, lighter cars.

This matters because CAFE requirements are averaged over a producers entire fleet of vehicles. Since the Japanese auto producers produce relatively few light truck models, these producers will have to make no changes in vehicle capacity or production in order to meet U.S. CAFE requirements.

Thus, foreign producers would avoid the cost and challenge of modifying their fleet fuel economy averages. And that means the government, not the market, will have placed an uneven burden on American workers.

Consumers also suffer when their choices are narrowed. And auto makers and their employees suffer when they are forced to make cars the public simply does not want.

In a statement before the Consumer Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, Dr. Marina Whitman of General Motors notes that in 1982: ''we were forced to close two assembly plants which had been fully converted to produce our new, highly fuel-efficient compact and mid-size cars. The cost of these conversions was $130 million, but the plants were closed because demand for those cars did not develop during a period of sharply declining gasoline prices.''

This story could be repeated for every major American automaker, Mr. President. And the effects on our overall economy have been devastating.

During this time of economic prosperity, it is easy for some people to forget the massive dislocation of workers which occurred during the 1970's and 1980's.

But we should keep in mind, not only the thousands of jobs in the auto manufacturing industry that were lost during this period, but also the massive impact this downturn in a key industry had on our economy as a whole.

The story of plant closings were devastating for domestic automakers back in the 1970s and 1980s.

It is unfortunately the case, sometimes when we are in a period of economic prosperity, as we are now, it is easy to forget the massive dislocation of workers which did occur back at that time.

We should keep in mind not only the thousands of jobs in the auto manufacturing industry that were lost during that period, but also the massive impact that downturn in a key industry had on our economy.

The American auto industry accounts for one in seven U.S. jobs. Steel, transportation, electronics, literally dozens of industries employing thousands upon thousands of Americans depend on the health of our auto industry.

If we do again to our auto industry what was done to it during the 1970's and 1980's, we will quickly see our current prosperity turn to an era of significant unemployment, in my judgment.

Mr. President, the last thing our economy and our people need is a repeat of those hard times.

Our automakers simply cannot afford to pay the fines imposed on them if they fail to reach CAFE standards, or to build cars that Americans will not buy. In either case the real victims are American workers and consumers.

Nor should we forget, Mr. President, that American automakers are investing almost $1 billion every year in research to develop more fuel efficient vehicles.

Indeed, we do not need to turn to the punitive, disruptive methods of CAFE standards to increase fuel economy for American vehicles. Especially since domestic manufacturers have increased passenger car fuel economy 108 percent and light truck fuel economy almost 60 percent since the mid-1970s.

And more progress will soon be realized. Since 1993, the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles has brought together government agencies and the auto industry to conduct joint research—research that is making significant progress and will bridge the gap to real world applications after 2000.

By enhancing research cooperation, PNGV will help our auto industry develop vehicles that are more easily recyclable, have lower emissions, and can achieve up to triple the fuel efficiency of today's midsize family sedans. All this while producing cars that retain performance, utility, safety and economy.

By next year, Mr. President, technologies developed in the PNGV program will be incorporated into concept vehicles. These vehicles will help the auto industry determine their functional benefits, develop production infrastructure and determine commercial viability.

By 2004 we will have production-feasible prototypes that can be brought to mass production within 3–5 years.

Direct-injection engines, new forms of fuel cells, lithium batteries, new polymers, and many other technological developments are now in the works. They are in the works thanks to a strategy that places cooperation over punitive government mandates.

We have made solid progress, Mr. President. Progress toward making vehicles that achieve greater fuel economy without sacrificing the qualities consumers demand.

And we should remember, Mr. President, that we can remain competitive and retain American jobs only if people will actually buy the vehicles our industry produces.

Cooperation will produce the results we need. New punitive mandates will produce an economic downside none of us want to see.

Again, I will use every legislative means at my disposal as a U.S. Senator to stop bills or amendments to increase CAFE standards. I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided attempt to increase the destructive CAFE requirements.

As the son of a man would worked as a UAW member on the line for about 20 years of his life, and the son-in-law of a man who did it for 39 years in the State of Michigan, my family understands, as do thousands of other families in our State, exactly what happens

when people stop buying American-made cars. People in our State and people in other States start to lose their jobs.

We don't want that to happen. We can achieve the twin goals of keeping people at work and producing more fuel-efficient vehicles if we continue the course that has been working. The development, the research, the technology, which the Federal Government has participated in is going to produce the success we want. We can do it without government-imposed mandates of people losing their jobs.

This Senator plans to fight in every way he can to make sure that is the course we follow.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL CHARLES C. KRULAK, USMC

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly distinguished officer, gentleman, and patriot: General Charles C. Krulak, Commandant, United States Marine Corps. I do so, with humility and respect, on behalf of the six members of the Senate who served in the Marine Corps. Although today marks the end of his remarkable uniformed career, his legacy will live on throughout the Corps' history as a ''guide-on'' for future marines.

Today also marks the first time in 70 years that a Krulak will not be privileged to be in the ranks of the United States Marine Corps. General Krulak's father, General V.H. ''Brute'' Krulak, himself a legendary officer, served with distinction in three wars ultimately achieving the rank of Lieutenant General. All three of General ''Brute'' Krulak's sons graduated from the United States Naval Academy, but it was his son Charles, or Chuck, that followed very closely in his father's foot steps.

Mr. President, during the past four years, I have had the distinct honor and pleasure of working very closely with General Chuck Krulak. I first met General Krulak during an inspection tour in Vietnam where, as a young Captain, he had been wounded and was being evacuated. We later reminisced about that moment, which bonded us together forever, during his first courtesy call to me as the new Commandant of the Marine Corps. Today at the Change of Command, fittingly held on the historic grounds of the 8th and I Marine Corps Barracks, General Krulak, during his final address, recognized Congress, as did his father, that it was the Congress that created the Marine Corps and then saved the Marine Corps when its very existence was threatened by a former President, so many years ago. He then proclaimed that Congress will always preserve the Corps. He is correct!

I believe General Krulak embodies the very core values that reflect the Marine Corps' deepest convictions: Honor, Courage, and Commitment. After 35 years of service, he remains passionate about his Marine Corps and his marines. In a farewell address to the Corps, General Krulak articulated his respect and understanding of the selflessness and pride of the many Marines he had known throughout his life. He spoke of the ethos of the corps and Touchstones of Valor and Values. Mr. President, I submit General Krulak's farewell address to the Corps in the record of the proceedings of the Senate as part of my tribute today.

I urge my colleagues to read his address and think about the young men and women Marines who so honorably serve everyday, everywhere around the world to protect this great nation.

General, as a former Marine myself, I salute you for a job exceedingly well done! You are a true patriot and the world is a better place because of your dedication to and belief in . . . Honor, Courage, and Commitment. Semper Fi.

[From Leatherneck Magazine, June 1999]

A FAREWELL TO THE CORPS

(By Gen. Charles C. Krulak)

From my earliest days, I was always awed by the character of the Marine Corps, by the passion and love that inspired the sacrifices of Marines like my father and his friends. As a young boy, I admired the warriors and thinkers who joined our family for a meal or a visit . . . Marines like ''Howlin' Mad'' Smith, Lemuel C. Shepherd, Gerald C. Thomas, and Keith B. McCutcheon. I wondered about the source of their pride, their selflessness, and their sense of purpose. Now, at the twilight of my career, I understand those Marines. I know that they were driven by love for the institution to which they had dedicated their lives and by the awesome responsibility they felt to the Marines who shared their devotion and sacrifice. Today, that same motivation burns deep within the heart of each of us. The ethos of our Corps, purchased so dearly by these heroes of old, reaches into our souls and challenges us to strive tirelessly for excellence in all that we do. It profoundly influences the actions of every Marine that has ever stood on the yellow footprints at our Recruit Depots or taken the oath as an Officer of Marines.

The ethos of our Corps is that of the warrior. It is defined by two simple qualities . . . our two touchstones. The first is our Touchstone of Valor. When we are summoned to battle, we don our helmets and flak jackets; we march to the sound of the guns; we fight and we win—Guaranteed. The second is our Touchstone of Values. We hold ourselves and our institution to the highest standards . . . to our core values of Honor, Courage, and Commitment. These two Touchstones are inextricably and forever linked. They form the bedrock of our success and, indeed, of our very existence.

Our Touchstone of Valor is the honor roll of our Corps' history. Bladensburg, Bull Run, Cuzco Well, Belleau Wood, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Iwo Jima, Inchon, the Chosin Reservoir, Hue City, Kuwait . . . the blood and sacrifice of Marines in these battles, and countless others, have been commemorated in gilded script and etched forever on the black granite base of the Marine Corps War Memorial. The names of these places now serve as constant reminders of our sacred responsibility to our Nation and to those whose sacrifices have earned the Marine Corps a place among the most honored of military organizations. The memory of the Marines who fought in these battles lives in us and in the core values of our precious Corps.

To Marines, Honor, Courage, and Commitment are not simply words or a bumper sticker slogan. They reflect our deepest convictions and dramatically shape everything that we do. They are central to our efforts to ''Make Marines,'' men and women of character who can be entrusted to safeguard our Nation and its ideals in the most demanding of environments. We imbue Marines with our core values from their first moments in our Corps because we know that Marines, not weapons, win battles. We also know that success on the battlefield and the support of the citizens whose interests we represent depend on our ability to make moral and ethical decisions under the extreme stress of combat . . . or in the conduct of our daily lives.

As an institution, we have had to fight hard to maintain our standards. To some, they may seem old-fashioned, out-of-step with society, or perhaps even ''extremist,'' but we know that our high standards are the lifeblood of the Corps, so we have held the line! In this regard, what individual Marines are doing everyday counts far more than anything that is done in Washington. The standards of our Corps are not simply maintained by generals, colonels, and sergeants major, but, far more importantly, by leaders throughout the Corps, at every level. The Marine conviction that Semper Fidelis is a way of life, not just a motto, speaks powerfully to the citizens that we serve. It also unites us with our fellow Marines, past and present—inspiring us to push harder, to reach further, and to reject the very notion of failure of compromise.

Sustained and strengthened by the ethos of our Corps, you have accomplished a great deal during the past four years. I have been humbled to be part of your achievements and witness to your selfless devotion. Time and again, Marines distinguished themselves in contingencies around the world, across the spectrum of conflict. Marines from across the Total Force were the first to fight, the first to help and the first to show America's flag—consistently demonstrating our resolve and readiness to win when called to action. With the involvement of the Fleet Marine Force and input from the entire Corps, the Warfighting Laboratory has looked hard at the 21st Century strategic environment. Marines ''stole a march'' on change by testing new concepts and emerging technologies, exploring new tools for developing leaders and decision makers, and experimenting in the ''Three Block War.'' Our recruiters, drill instructors, and small-unit leaders have implemented the Transformation Process and are recruiting, training, and developing the ''Strategic Corporals'' for tomorrow's conflicts. Led by Marines at the Combat Development Command, we have deepened our understanding of Operational Maneuver From The Sea (OMFTS), its enabling concepts and technologies, as well as its many challenges. The men and women serving in the many thankless billets at Headquarters Marine Corps and in the joint arena have developed and articulated our requirements for the future and have secured the resources to translate OMFTS into a reality. Our supporting establishment, at every post and station, has epitomized selflessness and dedication while providing for our readiness requirements. All these things are important—and they are the accomplishments of every Marine. None of them, however, are as significant as maintaining our hands on the twin Touchstones of our Corps.

The words of my father ring as true today as when he first wrote them over fifty years ago. ''We exist today—we flourish today—not because of what we know we are, or what we know we can do, but because of what the grassroots of our country believes we are and believes we can do . . . The American people

believe that Marines are downright good for the country; that the Marines are masters of a form of unfailing alchemy which converts unoriented youths into proud, self-reliant stable citizens—citizens into whose hands the nation's affairs may safely be entrusted . . . And, likewise, should the people ever lose that conviction—as a result of our failure to meet their high—almost spiritual—standards, the Marine Corps will quickly disappear.''

May God bless each and every one of you and may God bless our Corps!

CONFERENCE OF MAYORS ENDORSE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the United States Conference of Mayors recently gave its ringing endorsement to an increase in the minimum wage. On June 15, at their annual conference in New Orleans, the mayors unanimously adopted a resolution calling for such an increase.

The resolution was sponsored by Mayor Thomas M. Menino of Boston, who is renowned for his leadership on behalf of working families in our city, and I commend Mayor Menino for this important and constructive initiation.

Thanks to the leadership of Mayor Menino, the Conference of Mayors has highlighted the needs and concerns of America's workers. The adoption of the Mayors' resolution makes it all the more important for Congress to act, and to act this year.

Mayors are on the front lines at the local level. They know the day-to-day realities of the lives of working Americans. They have seen firsthand how the decrease in value of the minimum wage leaves workers unable to support their families. By next year, the real value of the minimum wage will have dropped by $2.50 an hour from its peak 30 years ago. For a generation, we have allowed the value of the minimum wage to decline unfairly at the expense of millions of hard working American men and women and their families.

The unfortunate reality is that in 1999, large numbers of Americans work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, yet still can't support their families. Their wages don't enable them to put food on the table or a reasonable roof over their heads. A minimum wage worker earns $10,712 a year—$3,100 below the poverty line for a family of three.

Every day, working families across the country are forced to turn to emergency food assistance to supplement their diets, and then to emergency shelters for a place to sleep. A 1998 U.S. Conference of Mayors survey found that 61% of people requesting emergency food assistance were families—parents and their children. The majority of cities also reported an increase in requests for emergency shelter by homeless parents with children. As the Mayors' survey emphasized, these are working Americans, yet they are not earning enough to make ends meet.

The majority of minimum wage workers are adults struggling to achieve a decent standard of living. Instead of enabling workers to reach this goal that all families deserve, today's minimum wage tramples on that dream for a better life.

Now is the time to raise the minimum wage. The country's economy is soaring to new heights and setting new records for growth and prosperity. The economy is the best in decades, and yet millions of America's hardest workers are not sharing in this prosperity. The Dow Jones Average is touching 11,000. The highest compensated CEO in 1998 was paid $117 million. But minimum wage workers still can't lift their families out of poverty.

Minimum wage workers deserve better. They serve our food, take care of our children, clean our office buildings, and perform countless other basic jobs. When hard working Americans put in a full day's work year round, they deserve a fair share of the nation's prosperity.

Over 11 million workers would benefit from an increase in the minimum wage. They should not have to rely on food aid or shelters.

Mayor Menino and mayors across America want action, Congress should heed their call to action and raise the minimum wage.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mayor Menino's resolution, adopted unanimously by the Conference of Mayors, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 14

(Submitted by the Honorable Thomas M. Menino, Mayor of Boston)

FEDERAL MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE RATE ADJUSTMENT

Whereas, the current federal minimum hourly wage rate is inadequate to raise families out of poverty; and

Whereas, the real value of the minimum wage continues to fall short since its highest level in 1968; and

Whereas, the purchasing power of the minimum wage continues to fall short and fails to allow families to make ends meet; and

Whereas, millions of workers paid by the hour earn at or below minimum wage and the majority of minimum wage workers are adults; and

Whereas, the poverty line for a family of four leaves many minimum wage earners unable to survive and they are the sole breadwinners for their households; and

Whereas, the majority of the average share of household income is earned by a minimum wage worker; and

Whereas, the income disparities between the races have been widening, not narrowing; and

Whereas, the minimum wage is one factor in these wide income disparities, as minorities work disproportionately in minimum wage jobs; and

Whereas, these minimum wage jobs often lack medical, sick or vacation leave, other benefits and job security; and

Whereas, these minimum wage jobs are a major factor in the decision of millions of workers who would likely drop out of the labor force because they see no future in such employment, but there are no other alternatives to raise a family; and

Whereas, many citizens who cannot survive on minimum wage seek alternatives outside the traditional job market that may, at time, be destructive to them, their families, and the total society; and

Whereas, studies have shown that raising the minimum wage does not result in job losses.

Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That the federal minimum hourly wage rate should be increased to encourage significantly greater labor force participation and enable minimum wage job holders to support themselves and their families at income levels above the nationally defined poverty level.

Projected Cost: Unknown.

SENATE INACTION ON THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is the responsibility of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to consider treaties submitted by the President as soon as possible after their submission. Normally, most treaties are considered within a year of being submitted. The President of the United States transmitted the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to the Senate on September 23, 1997.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not held a single hearing on this important Treaty in the 646 days since the President sent the CTBT to the Senate for its consideration. In comparison, the START I Treaty was ratified in 11 months, the SALT I Treaty in 3 months, the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty in 4 months, and the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 3 weeks.

As of today, 152 countries have signed the CTBT, including Russia and China, and 37 countries have ratified the Treaty. The world is waiting for the United States to lead on this issue. I hope my colleagues will urge for this Treaty's rapid consideration.

CHILD SURVIVAL AND DISEASE PROGRAMS FUND

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to express my strong support for the Child Survival and Disease Program Fund. Last year Congress, allocated $650 million plus $50 million in supplemental emergency funds to the Child Survival and Disease Program Fund for Fiscal Year 1999. As in the past, House Subcommittee Chairman Callahan has taken the lead in protecting these child survival programs and I commend him for his leadership on this issue. For FY 2000 the Clinton Administration, however, has budgeted $40 million below the $700 million allocated last year. In order to preserve the benefits of these important programs for children worldwide, as we have done in the past, we should accept in conference the House language that Chairman Callahan proposes.

It is a tragedy that millions of children die each year from disease, malnutrition, and other consequences of poverty that are both preventable and

treatable. The programs of the Child Survival Fund, which are intended to reduce infant mortality and improve the health and nutrition of children, address the various problems of young people struggling to survive in developing countries. It places a priority on the needs of the more than 100 million children worldwide who are displaced and/or have become orphans.

The Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund includes initiatives to curb the resurgence of communicable diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis. According to the World Health Organization, in 1999 alone, more children will die of tuberculosis than in any other year in history. In the underdeveloped world, the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund works towards eradicating polio as well as preventing and controlling the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Aside from addressing issues of health, the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund also supports basic education programs. An investment in education yields one of the highest social and economic rates of return—because it gives children the necessary tools to become self-sufficient adults. According to the World Bank, each additional year of primary and secondary schooling results in a 10–20% wage increase. Unfortunately, there are still 130 million primary aged children who are not attending any school, 2/3 of those children are girls.

The programs supported by the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund are effective because they save three million lives each year through immunizations, vitamin supplementation, oral rehydration therapy, and the treatment of childhood respiratory infections, which are the second largest killer of children on earth. If every child received vaccinations, an additional two million children each year would be saved from these terminal diseases. Eliminating the symptoms and causes of this poverty is not only the humane thing to do—it is also a necessary prerequisite for global stability and prosperity.

In my view, Congress needs to maintain its support for these valuable programs. It is my hope that the Senate Foreign Operations Subcommittee will accept the proposed House language. The Child Survival and Disease Programs are effective and are important. They should be continued.

I see the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Operations Subcommittee on the floor and urge his continued support for that program.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his statement. I have listened very carefully to his remarks, and I commend him for his tireless efforts in supporting children's causes, here in the United States and throughout the world. I would like to assure him that I will give every possible consideration to his request when we go to conference.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank my distinguished friend from Kentucky, and I yield the floor.

THE MILITARY AND EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I support S. 768, which was significantly improved during the Judiciary Committee mark up with a substitute amendment that I cosponsored with Senators SESSIONS and DEWINE. This important legislation will close a gap in Federal law that has existed for many years. S. 768 establishes authority for Federal jurisdiction over crimes committed by individuals accompanying our military overseas and court-martial jurisdiction over Department of Defense employees and contractors accompanying the Armed Forces on contingency missions outside the United States during times of war or national emergency declared by the President or the Congress.

Civilians accompanying the Armed Forces have been subject to court-martial jurisdiction when ''accompanying or serving with the Armies of the United States in the field'' since the Revolutionary War. See *McCune* v. *Kilpatrick*, 53 F. Supp. 80, 84 (E.D. Va. 1943). It is only since the start of the Cold War that American troops, accompanied by civilian dependents and employees, have been stationed overseas in peace time. Provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice provide for the court-martial of civilians accused of crimes while accompanying the armed forces in times of peace or war. The provisions allowing for peace time court-martial of civilians were found unconstitutional by a series of Supreme Court cases beginning with *Reid* v. *Covert*, 354 U.S. 1 (1957). With foreign nations often not interested in prosecuting crimes against Americans, particularly when committed by an American, the result is a jurisdictional ''gap'' that allows some civilians to literally get away with murder.

A report by the Overseas Jurisdiction Advisory Committee submitted to Congress in 1997, cited cases in which host countries declined to prosecute serious crimes committed by civilians accompanying our Armed Forces. These cases involved the sexual molestation of dependent girls, the stabbing of a serviceman and drug trafficking to soldiers. The individuals who committed these crimes against service men and women or their dependents were not prosecuted in the host country and were free to return to the United States and continue their lives as if the incidents had never occurred. The victims of these awful crimes are left with no redress for the suffering they endured.

This inability to exercise Federal jurisdiction over individuals accompanying our armed forces overseas has caused problems. During the Vietnam War, Federal jurisdiction over civilians was not permissible since war was never declared by the Congress. Major General George S. Prugh said, in his text on legal issues arising during the Vietnam War, that the inability to discipline civilians ''became a cause for major concern to the U.S. command.''

More recently, Operation Desert Storm involved the deployment of 4,500 Department of Defense civilians and at least 3,000 contractor employees. Similarly large deployments of civilians have been repeated in contingency operations in Somalia, Haiti, Kuwait and Rwanda. Although crime by civilians accompanying our armed forces in Operation Desert Storm was rare, the Department of Defense did report that four of its civilian employees were involved in significant criminal misconduct ranging from transportation of illegal firearms to larceny and receiving stolen property. One of these civilians was suspended without pay for 30 days while no action was taken on the remaining three.

Due to the lack of Federal jurisdiction over civilians in a foreign country, administrative remedies such as dismissal from the job, banishment from the base, suspension without pay, or returning the person to the United States are often the only remedies available to military authorities to deal with civilian offenders. The inadequacy of these remedies to address the criminal activity of civilians accompanying our Armed Forces overseas results in a lack of deterrence and an inequity due to the harsher sanctions imposed upon military personnel who committed the same crimes as civilians.

I expect the deployment of civilians in Kosovo and elsewhere will be relatively crime free, but regardless of the frequency of its use, the gap that allows individuals accompanying our military personnel overseas to go unpunished for heinous crimes must be closed. Our service men and women and those accompanying them deserve justice when they are victims of crime. That is why I introduced this provision as part of the Safe Schools, Safe Streets and Secure Borders Act with other Democratic Members, both last year as S. 2484 and again on January 19 of this year, as S. 9.

I had some concerns with certain aspects of S. 768 that were not included in my version of this legislation, and I am pleased that we were able to address those concerns in the Sessions-Leahy-DeWine substitute. For example, the original bill would have extended court-martial jurisdiction over DOD employees and contractors accompanying our Armed Forces overseas. The Supreme Court in *Reid v. Covert*, 354 U.S. 1 (1957), *Kinsella v. Singleton*, 361 U.S. 234 (1960) and *Toth v. Quarles*, 350 U.S. 11 (1955), has made clear that court-martial jurisdiction may not be constitutionally applied to crimes committed in peacetime by persons accompanying the armed forces overseas, or to crimes committed by a former member of the armed services.

The substitute makes clear that this extension of court-martial jurisdiction applies only in times when the armed forces are engaged in a ''contingency operation'' involving a war or national emergency declared by the Congress or

the President. I believe this comports with the Supreme Court rulings on this issue and cures any constitutional infirmity with the original language.

In addition, the original bill would have deemed any delay in bringing a person before a magistrate due to transporting the person back to the U.S. from overseas as ''justifiable.'' I was concerned that this provision could end up excusing lengthy and unreasonable delays in getting a civilian, who was arrested overseas, before a U.S. Magistrate, and thereby raise yet other constitutional concerns.

The Sessions-Leahy-DeWine substitute cures that potential problem by removing the problematic provision and relying instead on Rule 5 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. This rule requires that an arrested person be brought before a magistrate to answer charges without unnecessary delays, and will apply to the removal of a civilian from overseas to answer charges in the United States.

Finally, S. 768 as introduced authorized the Department of Defense to determine which foreign officials constitute the appropriate authorities to whom an arrested civilian should be delivered. In my proposal for this legislation I required that DOD make this determination in consultation with the Department of State. I felt this would help avoid international faux pax. I am pleased that the Sessions-Leahy substitute adopted my approach to this issue and requires consultation with the Department of State.

I am glad the legislation which I and other Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee originally introduced both last year and again on January 19 of this year, is finally being considered, and I urge its prompt passage.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, June 29, 1999, the federal debt stood at $5,602,716,451,360.35 (Five trillion, six hundred two billion, seven hundred sixteen million, four hundred fifty-one thousand, three hundred sixty dollars and thirty-five cents).

One year ago, June 29, 1998, the federal debt stood at $5,502,438,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred two billion, four hundred thirty-eight million).

Five years ago, June 29, 1994, the federal debt stood at $4,604,970,000,000 (Four trillion, six hundred four billion, nine hundred seventy million) which reflects a debt increase of almost $1 trillion—$997,746,451,360.35 (Nine hundred ninety-seven billion, seven hundred forty-six million, four hundred fifty-one thousand, three hundred sixty dollars and thirty-five cents) during the past 5 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, 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.)

PROCLAMATION TO MODIFY DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES RELATIVE TO GABON, MONGOLIA, AND MAURITANIA; TO THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 45

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

To the Congress of the United States:

The Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) offers duty-free treatment to specified products that are imported from designated beneficiary developing countries. The GSP is authorized by title V of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

I have determined, based on a consideration of the eligibility criteria in title V, that Gabon and Mongolia should be added to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the GSP.

I have also determined that the suspension of preferential treatment for Mauritania as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP, as reported in my letters to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of June 25, 1993, should be ended. I had determined to suspend Mauritania from the GSP because Mauritania had not taken or was not taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights. I have determined that circumstances in Mauritania have changed and that, based on a consideration of the eligibility criteria in title V, preferential treatment under the GSP for Mauritania as a least-developed beneficiary developing country should be restored.

This message is submitted in accordance with the requirements of title V of the Trade Act of 1974.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1999.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1327. An act to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 34480 Highway 101 South in Cloverdale, Oregon, as the ''Maurine B. Neuberger United States Post Office''.

H.R. 1568. An act to provide technical, financial, and procurement assistance to veteran owned small businesses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1802. An act to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide States with more funding and greater flexibility in carrying out programs designed to help children make the transition from foster care to self-sufficiency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2014. An act to prohibit a State from imposing a discriminatory commuter tax on nonresidents.

H.R. 2280. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid for service-connected disabilities, to enhance the compensation, memorial affairs, and housing programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to improve retirement authorities applicable to judges of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution congratulating and commending the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred:

H.R. 1327. An act to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 34480 Highway 101 South in Cloverdale, Oregon, as the ''Maurine B. Neuberger United States Post Office''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1568. An act to provide technical, financial, and procurement assistance to veteran owned small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 1802. An act to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide States with more funding and greater flexibility in carrying out programs designed to help children make the transition from foster care to self-sufficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2014. A act to prohibit a State from imposing a discriminatory commuter tax on nonresidents; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2280. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid for service-connected disabilities, to enhance the compensation, memorial affairs, and housing programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to improve retirement authorities applicable to judges of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution congratulating and commending the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

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–4000. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Commercial Personnel Transfer Program for Science and Engineering''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4001. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Developmental Disabilities Assistance Amendments of 1999''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4002. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13–94, ''Comprehensive Plan Technical Corrections and Response to NCPC Recomendations and Closing of a Public Alley in Square 1189, S.O. 98–150, Act of 1999''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4003. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation amending the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge Authority Act of 1995; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4004. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget and Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Accountability Report for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4005. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services in the amount of $50,000,000 or more for the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4006. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a proposed manufacturing license agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4007. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services in the amount of $50,000,000 or more for the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4008. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the resignation of the Commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics and the designation of an Acting Commissioner; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4009. A communication from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998, through March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4010. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''TRICARE Head Injury Policy and Provider Network Adequacy''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4011. 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 May 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4012. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4013. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cyfluthrin: (cyano(4-fluoro-3-phenoxyphenyl)-methyl-3-(2,2-dicholoroethenyl)-2,2-dime- thylcyclopropanecarboxylate); Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL # 6088–9), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4014. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerance; Technical Amendment'' (FRL # 6089–3), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4015. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Louisiana: Reasonable-Further-Progress Plan for the 1996–1999 period, Attainment Demonstration, Contingency Plan, Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets, and 1990 Emission Inventory for the Baton Rouge Ozone Nonattainment Area; Louisiana Point Source Banking Regulations'' (FRL # 6370–8), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4016. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Utah: Foreward and Definitions, Revision to Definition for Sole Source of Heat and Emissions Standards, Nonsubstantive Changes; General Requirements, Open Burning and Nonsubstantive Changes; and Foreword and Definitions, Addition of Definition for PM10 Nonattainment Area'' (FRL # 6368–8), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4017. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Phoenix; Arizona Ozone Nonattainment Area, Revision to the 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan'' (FRL # 6368–8), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4018. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Waste Management System; Modification of the Hazardous Waste Program; Hazardous Waste Lamps'' (FRL # 6368–8), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4019. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Final Stay of Action on Section 126 Petitions for Purposes of Reducing Interstate Ozone Transport'' (FRL # 6364–4), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4020. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sustainable Development Challenge Grant Program'' (FRL # 6370–4), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4021. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Weighted Average Interest Rate Update'' (Notice 99–33), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4022. A communication from the Acting Director, Professional Responsibility Advisory Office, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Ethical Standards for Attorneys for the Government'' (AG Order No. 2216–99), received June 25, 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4023. A communication from the Deputy Executive Secretary to the Department, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hospital Conditions of Participation: Patients' Rights—Medicare and Medicaid Programs (HFCA 3018–IFC)'' (RIN0938–AJ56), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4024. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Expiration Dates of an Emergency Interim Rule (Implements requirements of the American Fisheries Act related to the 1999 Western Alaska Community Development Quota Program)'' (RIN0648-AM77), received June 29, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4025. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 777 Series Airplanes, Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-NM-116 (6-23/6-28)'' (RIN2120-AA64)(1999-0254), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4026. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (BHTC); Docket No. 98-SW-62 (6-28/6-28)'' (RIN2120-AA64)(1999-0255), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4027. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: MT Propeller Entwicklung GMBH Model MTV-3-B-C Propellers; Docket NO. 7-ABE-36 (6-28/6-28)'' (RIN2120-AA64)(1999-0256), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4028. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Pilatus Aircraft Ld. Models PC- and PC-12/45 Airplanes; Docket NO. 7-ABE-36 (6-28/6-28)'' (RIN2120-AA64)(1999-0256), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4029. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: LET Aeronautical Works Model L33 SOLO Sailplanes; Docket NO. 98-CE-120 (6-28/6-28)'' (RIN2120-AA64)(1999-0258), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4030. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: The New Piper Aircraft, Inc., PA-23, PA-30, PA-31, PA-34, PA-39, PA-40, and PA-42 Series Aircraft; Docket No. 98-CE-77 (6-28/6-28)'' (RIN2120-AA64)(1999-0259), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4031. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747300 and -400 Series Airplanes; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-NM-45 (6-29/6-28)'' (RIN2120-AA64)(1999-0260), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4032. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Sikorsky Aircraft model S-76A Helicopters; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-SW-26 (6-24/6-28)'' (RIN2120-AA64)(1999-0261), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4033. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Robinson Helicopter Company Model 44 Helicopters; Docket No. 98-SW-71 (6-24/6-28)'' (RIN2120-AA64)(1999-0262), received June 28, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4034. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid and Butterfish Fisheries; 1999 Specifications; Inseason Adjustments of Illex Squid annual specifications'', received June 25, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. 376. A bill to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–100).

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

H.R. 1175. A bill to locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, an American citizen, and other Israeli soldiers missing in action.

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

H. Con. Res. 35. A concurrent resolution congratulating the State of Qatar and its citizens for their commitment to democratic ideals and women's suffrage on the occasion of Qatar's historic elections of a central municipal council on March 8, 1999.

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments and an amended preamble:

S. Res. 109. A resolution relating to the activities of the National Islamic Front government in Sudan.

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 119. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES–10/6.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. Res. 129. An original resolution authorizing expenditures for years October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000 and October 1, 2000 to February 28, 2001, by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Con. Res. 36. A concurrent resolution condemning Palestinian efforts to revive the original Palestine partition plan of November 29, 1947, and condemning the United Nations Commission on Human Rights for its April 27, 1999, resolution endorsing Palestinian self-determination on the basis of the original Palestine partition plan.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive report of a committee was submitted on June 29, 1999:

By Mr. CHAFEE, for the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Timothy Fields, Jr., of Virginia, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

The following executive reports of a committee were submitted on June 30, 1999:

By Mr. HELMS, for the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Melvin E. Clark, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1999.

Lawrence Harrington, of Tennessee, to be United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of three years.

Donald Lee Pressley, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

Richard Holbrooke, of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

Richard Holbrooke, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Richard C.A. Holbrooke.

Post: US Ambassador to the United Nations.

Nominated: February 10, 1999.

Contributions:

(1) Self: (see attached sheet).

(2) Spouse: Kati Marton—None.

(3) Children: Anthony Holbrooke—None; David Holbrooke—None.

(4) Parents: Trudi Kearl—None; Dan Holbrooke (deceased)—None.

(5) Grandparents (deceased)—None.

(6) Brothers and Spouses: Andrew Holbrooke—None; Vivian Holbrooke—None.

(7) Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

Richard Holbrooke Political Contributions:

June 20, 1996: $2,000.—Swett for Senate.

August 27, 1996: $1,000.—Torricelli for Senate.

September 18, 1996: $1,000.—Victory '96 (NYSDC).

September 1996: $10,000.—Victory '96 (Dem. Natl Comm.).

October 30, 1996: $1,000.—Friends of Schumer.

April 10, 1997: $1,000.—A Lot of Support for Tom Daschle.

October 10, 1997: $1,000.—Mikulski for Senate.

November 7, 1997: $1,000.—The Kerry Committee.

November 10, 1997: $1,000.—Friends of Barbara Boxer.

December 2, 1997: $2,000.—Schumer '98.

December 12, 1997: $1,000.—Chris Dodd for Senate.

January 8, 1998: $1,000.—Tom Lantos for Congress.

April 6, 1998: $1,000.—Kennedy for Senate.

April 21, 1998: $1,000.—The Moynihan Committee.

April 23, 1998: $500.—Mondale for Governor.

June 1998: $500.—Mondale for Governor.

John David Holum, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, Department of State, (New Position)

David B. Sandalow, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs.

Donald W. Keyser, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for Rank of Ambassador during tenure of service as Special Representative of the Secretary of State for Nagorno-Karabakh and New Independence States Regional Conflicts.

Larry C. Napper, of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for Rank of Ambassador during tenure of service as Coordinator of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Program.

Frank Almaguer, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Frank Almaguer.

Post: Ambassador to Honduras.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions:

1. Self Frank Almaguer: See attachment.

2. Spouse Antoinette Almaguer: None.

3. Children Names: Francisco Daniel Almaguer—None; Nina Suzanne Almaguer—None.

4. Parents, Names: Francisco Almaguer—Deceased; Eusebia Vera—None.
5. Grandparents: All deceased since the 50's or earlier.
6. Brothers and Spouses: None.
7. Sisters and Spouses, Names: Beatriz Manduley—See attachment; Octavio Manduley—See attachment; Miriam Leiva—See attachment; Fernando Leiva—See attachment.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT
ATTACHMENT

Nominee: Frank Almaguer.
Contributions amount, date, donee:
$30.00, 11/25/94, DNC.
35.00, 02/11/95, DNC.
30.00, 07/22/95, Clinton-Gore '96.
30.00, 12/16/95, DNC.
35.00, 01/28/96, DSCC.
10.00, 09/01/96, DNC.
35.00, 02/25/97, DSCC.
30.00, 02/28/97, DNC.
30.00, 10/17/97, DNC.
30.00, 12/07/97, DNC.
0.00, 1998, None.
$295.00 in Federal campaign contributions since 1/1/94.
Plus state/local: $50.00, 11/04/95, VA Demo. Victory Fund.
Sisters and spouses:
Beatriz & Octavio Manduley: Mr. & Mrs. Manduley have informed me that the Federal Electoral Commission has no record of their contributions and that they have not kept their own records. However, they estimate that they have jointly contributed between $25 and $50 to each of the re-election campaigns (94,96,98) of Congressman Howard Coble (R, NC) and, in 1996, of Senator Jesse Helms (R, NC).
Miriam & Fernando Leiva: I have requested Mr. and Mrs. Leiva to provide me with the required information. They have not been available to give me a formal response. However in a conversation last Oct. 30, they told me that they made only token contributions to political campaigns, and only on rare occasions.

John R. Hamilton, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Peru.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: John R. Hamilton.
Post: Peru.
The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.
Contributions:
1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: None.
4. Parents Names: Susan G. Hamilton (mother)—None; John P. Hamilton (father, deceased) (1992).
5. Grandparents Names: Milbrey Gordon—grandmother, deceased (1972); James Gordon—grandfather, deceased (1930); Joshua P. Hamilton—grandfather, deceased (1967); Margaret LeSuer—grandmother, deceased (1950).
6. Brother and Spouses: Joshua P. Hamilton, brother—None; Judy Jones Hamilton, spouse—None; James G. Hamilton, brother—None; Brenda Hamilton, spouse—None; Joseph L. Hamilton, brother—None; Katherin Hamilton, spouse—None.
7. Sister and Spouse: Mary Louisa Blair, sister—None; Thom W. Blair, Jr., spouse—None.

Gwen C. Clare, of South Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ecuador.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Gwen Cavanagh Clare.
Post: Sao Paulo, Brazil.
The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.
Contributions:
1. Self: None.
2. Spouse, Daniel H. Clare, III: None.
3. Children and Spouses Names: Daniel H. Clare, IV—None; Monica C. Clare—None.
4. Parents Names: Dorothy H. Southworth; Gilbert L. Southworth (stepfather); Walter J. Cavanagh (deceased). On and off over the years, my parents have made small contributions to the Republican Party—unsure of amount.
5. Grandparents Names: deceased.
6. Brother and Spouses Names: Gilbert L. Southworth, Jr.—None.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Barbara S. Southworth—None.

Oliver P. Garza, of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Nicaragua.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Oliver P. Garza.
Post: Nicaragua.
The following list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.
Contributions:
1. Oliver P. Garza: None.
2. Spouse: Yolanda D. Garza: None.
3. Children and spouses: Desiree Denise Garza Bell and spouse, David Bell—none; Melissa Jo Garza—none; Christopher Marc Garza and spouse, Virginia Garza—none; J. Gregory Garza and spouse, Margaret Garza—none.
4. Father: Mike M. Garza—Deceased; Mother: Ruth P. Garza, none.
5. Grandfather: Geronimo Pastrano, none; Grandmother: Nickolasa Pastrano, none.
6. Brother: Margarito P. Garza and spouse, Emma Jean Garza—none; Brother: Rudy P. Garza and spouse, Yolanda Garza—none.
7. Sisters: N/A.

Joyce E. Leader, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Joyce E. Leader.
Post: Republic of Guinea.
The following list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.
Contributions—amount, date, donee:
1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and spouses: None.
4. Parents: Barbara B. Worrel—deceased; Leland E. Leader—deceased; William J. Worrel (stepfather)—$100, 1987, Republican Party.
5. Grandparents: Helen and Edgar Biecher—deceased; Viola and Burleigh Leader—deceased.
6. Brothers and spouses: Stephen W. (stepbrother) and Pat Worrel—none.
7. Sisters and spouses: Susan J. Worrel (stepsister), divorced—none; Janice K. and Terrence Ahern—$25/$25, 1996/1997 Nat's Republican Committee; $150/$75, 1996/1997 Local Republican Committee.

David B. Dunn, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zambia.

Nominee: David B. Dunn.
Post: Lusaka.
The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.
Contributions—Amount, date, donee:
1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Maria-Elena Dunn, none.
3. Children: Thomas and Brian Dunn, none.
4. Parents: Elmer Dunn—$30, 10/12/94, Rep. Ntl. Comm.; $55, 12/12/95, Rep. Ntl. Comm.; $50, 1/10/97, Rep. Ntl. Comm.; $50, 12/17/97, Rep. Ntl. Comm.; $25, 6/11/96, Calif. Rep. Party; $25, 1/10/97, Calif. Rep. Party; $25, 2/11/98, Calif. Rep. Party.
5. Grandparents: Morris and Frances Dunn, deceased; Thomas and Susan Hill, deceased.
6. Brothers and spouses: Stephen and Jeannette Dunn, none.
7. Sisters and spouses, NA.

M. Michael Einik, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: M. Michael Einik.
Post: Skopje, FYROM.
The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.
Contributions—Amount, date, donee:
1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: none.
3. Children and spouses: Nurit, Daniella and Eyal Einik, none.
4. Parents: Minna Einik, none; Isaac Einik, deceased.
5. Grandparents: All deceased in WWII.
6. Brothers and spouses: N/A.
7. Sisters and spouses: Eileen Marcus—$100.00, last five years, does not recall; Zvi Marcus, none.

Mark Wylea Erwin, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mauritius, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros and as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Seychelles.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Mark Wylea Erwin.

Post: Ambassador to the Republic of Mauritius, the Republic of Seychelles, and to the Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accuarate.

Contributions:

1. Self: see attached.
2. Spouse: Joan Erwin, see attached.
3. Children: Jennifer, and Melissa, None.
4. Parents: Mark L. Erwin and Joan Berube, deceased.
5. Grandparents: C.H. and Zuba Freeman, deceased.
6. Brothers: Mallory Edgar, deceased.
7. Sisters and spouses: Pam Morrell & B.L., see attached.

Political Contributions, Mark W. Erwin

1994:
Sue Myrick for Congress, $200.00, 02/09/94.
Belk Campaign, $250,00, 02/22/94.
Sue Myrick Campaign (Joan), $800,00, 05/10/94.
David Price for Congress, $100.00, 05/26/94.
David Price Campaign, $150.00, 06/09/94.
Bill Hefner for Congress, $250.00, 06/27/94.
Burroughs for Judge, $500.00, 06/28/94.
Lancaster of Congress, $250.00, 07/21/94.
Charlie Rose for Congress, $250.00, 08/03/94.
John Spratt for Congress Committee, $200.00, 08/10/94.
Martin Nesbitt Campaign, $100.00, 08/16/94.
Judge S. Thompson Campaign, $100.00, 08/25/94.
Maggie Lauterer Campaign, $100.00, 09/20/94.
John Spratt for Congress, $500.00, 10/21/94.
Richard Moore for Congress, $250.00, 10/25/94.

1995:
Clinton Campaign, $1,000.00, 04/27/95.
Charlie Sanders for Senate, $250.00, 05/04/95.
Clinton-Gore '96 (Joan Erwin), $1,000.00, 06/00/95.
Sue Myrick for Congress, $250.00, 08/04/95.
Close for U.S. Senate, $500.00, 11/20/95.
Charlie Sanders for Senate, $750.00, 12/06/95.

1996:
Bob Etheridge Campaign, $200.00, 05/09/96.
Committee to Re-elect Sue Myrick, $1,000.00, 05/10/96.
North Carolina Democratic Committee, $1,000.00, 07/22/96.
Close for U.S. Senate, $500.00, 07/22/96.
Victory '96, $1,500.00, 08/14/96.
Close for U.S. Senate, $500.00, 09/25/96.
Bill Hefner Campaign, $250.00, 10/28/96.
John Spratt for Congress Committee, $500.00, 11/13/96.

1997:
CFANSS–PAC, $400.00, 04/02/97.
NCSC, $1,000.00, 08/25/97.
Fritz Hollings Campaign, $500.00, 08/27/97.
DCCC, $1,000.00, 10/09/97.
Committee to Elect Mike Jackson, $100.00, 10/16/97.
South Carolina Democratic Party, $250.00, 10/24/97.
D.G. Martin for U.S. Senate Committee, $1,000.00, 11/20/97.
Friends of Chris Dodd, $1,000.00, 12/02/97.
Citizens to Elect David Young, $500.00, 12/11/97.

1998:
Price for Congress, $100.00, 01/08/98.
The Committee to Reelect Loretta Sanchez, $200.00, 01/13/98.
Hayes for Congress, $500.00, 01/20/98.
Bob Bell for Judge, $50.00, 03/17/98.
Clayton for Congress Committee, $100.00, 04/06/98.
Sue Myrick for Congress, $1,000.00 04/23/98.
Robin Hays for Congress, $500.00, 04/28/98.
Gephardt in Congress Committee, $1,000.00, 06/16/98.
Bob Etheridge for Congress Committee, $500.00, 07/06/98.
Victory in North Carolina, $2,000.00, 07/28/98.
Mike Jackson for Congress, $200.00, 08/03/98
Sue Myrick for Congress, $1,000.00, 08/25/98.
Leadership '98, $5,000.00, 08/00/98.
Bob Bell for Judge, $100.00, 09/08/98.
Mel Watt for Congress, $1,000.00, 9/10/98.
John Spratt for Congress, $1,000.00, 10/14/98.
ADP/Senate Campaign, $5,000.00, 10/98.

Political Contributions, Pam Morrell (sister)

1994:
RPAC, $99.00.

1995:
Clinton-Gore '96 Primary, $1,000.00, 06/22/95.
Close for U.S. Senate, $250.00, 11/10/95.
RPAC, $208.00.

1996:
Clinton-Gore '96 Gen. Election, $1,000.00, 08/16/96.
Spratt for Congress, $500.00, 06/29/96.
DNC Serices Corp/DNC, $600.00, 09/05/96.
RPAC, $198.00.

1997:
RPAC, $250.00.

1998:
Spratt for Congress, $250.00, 03/25/98.
Spratt for Congress, $500.00, 10/03/98.
RPAC, $100.00.

Christopher E. Goldthwait, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Christopher E. Goldthwait.
Post: Chad.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and spouses: None.
4. Parents: Elizabeth and John Goldthwait—None.
5. Grandparents: None.
6. Brothers and spouses: None.
7. Sisters and spouses: None.

Joseph Limprecht, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Albania.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Joseph Limprecht.
Post: Albania.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee

1. Self—None.
2. Spouse—None.
3. Children and Spouses, Names: Alma Limprecht and Eleanor Limprecht—None.
4. Parents Names: Marjorie Limprecht—None.
5. Grandparents Names: N/A.
6. Brothers and Spouses Names: N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses Names: Jane Limprecht—$100.00—1995–98—Va. Democratic Party.

Prudence Bushnell, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee; Prudence Bushnell.
Post: Republic of Guatemala.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee

1. Self—None.
2. Spouse: Richard A. Buckley—None.
3. Children and Spouses Names: Patrick Michael Buckley—None; Kathleen Mary Buckley—None; Thomas Francis Buckley—$900—1995—Republican Party; Delia Maria Buckley—None; Eileen Marie Buckley Mannion—None.
4. Parents Names: Bernice & Gerald Bushnell—$50/year—1995–97—Democratic Party.
5. Grandparents Names: Frank & Edna Duflo—Deceased; Sherman & Ethel Bushnell—Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses Names: Peter Bushnell/Elsie Gettleman—None; Jonathan Bushnell/Judy Fortam—None.
7. Sisters and Spouses Names: Susan Bushnell/John F.X. Murphy—$150/year—1995–1998—Republican Party.

Donald Keith Bandler, of Pennsylvania, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cyprus.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Donald Keith Bandler.
Post: Ambassador to Cyprus.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee

1. Self, Donald Keith Bandler—None.
2. Spouse, Jane Goldwin Bandler—None.
3. Children and Spouses Names: Lara Goldwin Bandler—None; Jillian Goldwin Bandler—None; Jeffrey Isidor Goldwin Bandler—None.
4. Parents Names: Fred Bandler, (deceased); Estelle Cooper Bandler—None.
5. Grandparents Names: Isidor Bandler (deceased), Fanny Bandler (deceased), Samuel Cooper (deceased), Anna Cooper (deceased).
6. Brothers and Spouses Names: NA.
7. Sisters and Spouses Names: Beth Bandler—None; Amy Bandler Garfinkel—None; Donald Garfinkel—None.

Johnnie Carson, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kenya.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Johnnie Carson.
Post: Ambassador, Republic of Kenya, Nominated: December 1998.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee

1. Self—None.
2. Spouse—None.
3. Children and Spouses Names: (Elizabeth, Michael, Katherine)—None/None/None.
4. Parents Names: Dupree Carson, Deceased/None; Aretha Rhodes Carson, Deceased/None.
5. Grandparents Names: Tobby Rhodes, Deceased/None; Elizabeth Rhodes, Deceased/None.
6. Brothers and Spouses Names: Ronald Carson, Deceased; Arthur Carson, None.
7. Sisters and Spouses Names: Barbara Carson, Deceased.

Thomas J. Miller, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Thomas J. Miller.

Post: Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee

Self—None.

Spouse: Bonnie Stern Miller—None.

Children (Spouses): Julie Michelle Miller (single)—None; Eric Robert Miller (single)—None.

Parents: Louis R. Miller, Jr.—None; Barbara S. Mason—None.

Grandparents: M/M Sam Shure (deceased)—None; M/M Louis R. Miller (deceased)—None.

Brothers (Spouses): Louis R. Miller (Sherry):

1,000.00—8/96—Pete Wilson
1,000.00—1998—Janice Hahn

M/M Richard M. Miller (Kathan)—None; Bruce D. Miller (single)—None.

Sisters (Spouses): None.

Bismarck Myrick, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Liberia.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Bismarck Myrick.

Post: Liberia.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee

1. Self, Bismarck Myrick.
2. Children and Spouses: Bismarck Myrick, Jr.—None; Wesley Todd Myrick—None; Allison Elizabeth Myrick—None.
3. Parents: Elizabeth Lee Land—Deceased; Maceo Lee Myrick—Deceased.
4. Grandparents: Emmanuel Myrick—Deceased.
5. Brothers and Spouses: James M. Lee—None.
6. Sisters and Spouses: Carol Myrick Kitchen—None; Steve Kitchen—None; Emily D. Thomas—None.

Michael D. Metelits, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cape Verde.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

Nominee: Michael D. Metelits.

Post: Ambassador to Cape Verde.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee

1. Self: Michael Metelits—None.
2. Spouse: Maria Metelits—None.
3. Children and Spouses Names: Gabriella Metelits—None.
4. Parents Names: Betty and Bernard Metelits—None.
5. Grandparents Names: Deceased—N/A.
6. Brothers and Spouses Names: Stephen Arthur and Robert Joseph Metelits—N/A.
7, Sisters and Spouses Names: None.

I have requested this information and brothers (and the only spouse) declined to respond.

(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.)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably nomination lists which were printed in the Records of January 19, 1999, March 24, 1999, April 12, 1999, May 18, 1999 and May 26, 1999, at the end of the Senate proceedings, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar, that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

In the Foreign Service nomination of Peter S. Wood, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1999.

In the Foreign Service nominations beginning Brian E. Carlson, and ending Leonardo M. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1999.

In the Foreign Service nominations beginning Dale V. Slaght, and ending Eric R. Weaver, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1999.

In the Foreign Service nominations beginning Johnny E. Brown, and ending Mee Ja Yu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1999.

In the Foreign Service nomination of Stephen A. Dodson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 18, 1999.

In the Foreign Service nominations beginning Karen Aguilar, and ending Laurie M. Kassman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1999.

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. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. AKAKA, and Ms. MIKULSKI): S. 1304. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to allow employees to take school involvement leave to participate in the academic school activities of their children or to participate in literacy training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself and Mr. ENZI): S. 1305. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve the process for listing, recovery planning, and delisting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. LAUTENBERG): S. 1306. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the regulation of firearms dealers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MCCONNELL): S. 1307. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to permit participating households to use food stamp benefits to purchase nutritional supplements providing vitamins or minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. BREAUX): S. 1308. A bill to amend section 468A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to deductions for decommissioning costs of nuclear power plants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SESSIONS: S. 1309. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for the preemption of State law in certain cases relating to certain church plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. BOND, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SANTORUM, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FRIST, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. ABRAHAM): S. 1310. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the interim payment system for home health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI: S. 1311. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish an eleventh region of the Environmental Protection Agency, comprised solely of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. Res. 128. A resolution designating March 2000, as ''Arts Education Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. Res. 129. An original resolution authorizing expenditures for years October 1, 1999

to September 30, 2000 and October 1, 2000 to February 28, 2001, by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. Res. 130. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Haiti should conduct free, fair, transparent, and peaceful elections; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 131. A resolution relating to the retirement of Ron Kavulick; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. AKADA, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1304. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to allow employees to take school involvement leave to participate in the academic school activities of their children or to participate in literacy training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

TIME FOR SCHOOLS ACT OF 1999

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, in 1993, thanks to the hard work of Senator DODD and others, we passed the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). It was one of the first pieces of legislation that I was intimately involved in passing. During the last six years we've come to realize that it has been a huge success. In fact, as we come to the close of the decade we can honestly say that FMLA has been one of the more useful laws we've passed in the last ten years.

Now I want to expand upon that success and allow parents a little bit of time under the current time constraints of FMLA to participate in school activities. The ''Time for Schools Act of 1999'' will allow a parent 24 hours per year to participate in the academic activities of his or her child. This 24 hour period comes from the already available 12 weeks under FMLA.

This is something our country needs. Parents overwhelmingly want more time to support their children in school. Businesses thrive when our schools produce well-trained graduates—and parental involvement helps kids succeed.

As a parent, I know how difficult and how important it is to participate in the education of children. I have been lucky to have had the opportunity to be involved in the school lives of my children. But many parents don't have the time it takes to do those little things that will assure their child's success in school, because they can't get away from their jobs.

By adding academic school activities to one of our most successful laws, we will give parents something they need: time off to become directly involved with their children's learning.

These days we have many dual-income families and single parents struggling to work to make ends meet. All of these families know how important it is to be involved in their children's learning. However, the single largest barrier to parental involvement at schools seems to be lack of time.

Studies have shown that family involvement is more important to student success than family income or family education levels. In fact, things parents can control, such as limiting excess television watching and providing a variety of reading materials, account for almost all the differences in average student achievement across states.

All sectors of our communities want more time for young people. Students, teachers, parents and businesses feel something must be done to improve family involvement. In fact, 89 percent of company executives identified the biggest obstacle to school reform as the lack of parental involvement.

And, a 1996 post-election poll commissioned by the national PTA found that 86 percent of people favor legislation that would allow workers unpaid leave to attend parent-teacher conferences, or to take other actions to improve learning for their children.

A commitment to our children is a commitment to our nation's future. I want to make sure all young people receive the attention they need to succeed.

My legislation will allow parents time to: (1) attend a parent/teacher conference; (2) participate in classroom educational activities; or (3) research new schools.

I look at the Family and Medical Leave Act—which has helped one in six American employees take time to deal with serious family health problems, and which 90 percent of businesses had little or no cost implementing—and I see success. People in my state have been able to deal with urgent family needs, without losing their jobs.

A 1998 study by the Families and Work Institute found that 84% of employers felt that the benefits of providing family or medical leave offset or outweigh the costs. Taking time out for children not only helps parents and children, but is also beneficial to business.

My bill extends the uses of family leave to another urgent need families face—the need to help their children learn. The time is right for the ''Time for Schools Act.''

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. 1304

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 ''Time for Schools Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAVE.

(a) ENTITLEMENT TO LEAVE.—Section 102(a) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2612(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) ENTITLEMENT TO SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT LEAVE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 103(f), an eligible employee shall be entitled to a total of 24 hours of leave during any 12-month period to participate in an academic activity of a school of a son or daughter of the employee, such as a parent-teacher conference or an interview for a school, or to participate in literacy training under a family literacy program.

''(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAM.—The term 'family literacy program' means a program of services that are of sufficient intensity in terms of hours, and of sufficient duration, to make sustainable changes in a family and that integrate all of the following activities:

''(I) Interactive literacy activities between parents and their sons and daughters.

''(II) Training for parents on how to be the primary teacher for their sons and daughters and full partners in the education of their sons and daughters.

''(III) Parent literacy training.

''(IV) An age-appropriate education program for sons and daughters.

''(ii) LITERACY.—The term 'literacy', used with respect to an individual, means the ability of the individual to speak, read, and write English, and compute and solve problems, at levels of proficiency necessary—

''(I) to function on the job, in the family of the individual, and in society;

''(II) to achieve the goals of the individual; and

''(III) to develop the knowledge potential of the individual.

''(iii) SCHOOL.—The term 'school' means an elementary school or secondary school (as such terms are defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801)), a Head Start program assisted under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), and a child care facility operated by a provider who meets the applicable State or local government licensing, certification, approval, or registration requirements, if any.

''(4) LIMITATION.—No employee may take more than a total of 12 workweeks of leave under paragraphs (1) and (3) during any 12-month period.''.

(b) SCHEDULE.—Section 102(b)(1) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2612(b)(1)) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''Leave under subsection (a)(3) may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule.''.

(c) SUBSTITUTION OF PAID LEAVE.—Section 102(d)(2)(A) of such Act (29 U.S.C.

2612(d)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: '', or for leave provided under subsection (a)(3) for any part of the 24-hour period of such leave under such subsection''.

(d) NOTICE.—Section 102(e) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2612(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) NOTICE FOR SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT LEAVE.—In any case in which the necessity for leave under subsection (a)(3) is foreseeable, the employee shall provide the employer with not less than 7 days' notice, before the date the leave is to begin, of the employee's intention to take leave under such subsection. If the necessity for the leave is not foreseeable, the employee shall provide such notice as is practicable.''.

(e) CERTIFICATION.—Section 103 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2613) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) CERTIFICATION FOR SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT LEAVE.—An employer may require that a request for leave under section 102(a)(3) be supported by a certification issued at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe.''.

SEC. 3. SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT LEAVE FOR CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

(a) ENTITLEMENT TO LEAVE.—Section 6382(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) Subject to section 6383(f), an employee shall be entitled to a total of 24 hours of leave during any 12-month period to participate in an academic activity of a school of a son or daughter of the employee, such as a parent-teacher conference or an interview for a school, or to participate in literacy training under a family literacy program.

''(B) In this paragraph:

''(i) The term 'family literacy program' means a program of services that are of sufficient intensity in terms of hours, and of sufficient duration, to make sustainable changes in a family and that integrate all of the following activities:

''(I) Interactive literacy activities between parents and their sons and daughters.

''(II) Training for parents on how to be the primary teacher for their sons and daughters and full partners in the education of their sons and daughters.

''(III) Parent literacy training.

''(IV) An age-appropriate education program for sons and daughters.

''(ii) The term 'literacy', used with respect to an individual, means the ability of the individual to speak, read, and write English, and compute and solve problems, at levels of proficiency necessary—

''(I) to function on the job, in the family of the individual, and in society;

''(II) to achieve the goals of the individual; and

''(III) to develop the knowledge potential of the individual.

''(iii) The term 'school' means an elementary school or secondary school (as such terms are defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801)), a Head Start program assisted under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), and a child care facility operated by a provider who meets the applicable State or local government licensing, certification, approval, or registration requirements, if any.

''(4) No employee may take more than a total of 12 workweeks of leave under paragraphs (1) and (3) during any 12-month period.''.

(b) SCHEDULE.—Section 6382(b)(1) of such title is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''Leave under subsection (a)(3) may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule.''.

(c) SUBSTITUTION OF PAID LEAVE.—Section 6382(d) of such title is amended by inserting before '', except'' the following: '', or for leave provided under subsection (a)(3) any of the employee's accrued or accumulated annual leave under subchapter I for any part of the 24-hour period of such leave under such subsection''.

(d) NOTICE.—Section 6382(e) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In any case in which the necessity for leave under subsection (a)(3) is foreseeable, the employee shall provide the employing agency with not less than 7 days' notice, before the date the leave is to begin, of the employee's intention to take leave under such subsection. If the necessity for the leave is not foreseeable, the employee shall provide such notice as is practicable.''.

(e) CERTIFICATION.—Section 6383 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) An employing agency may require that a request for leave under section 6382(a)(3) be supported by a certification issued at such time and in such manner as the Office of Personnel Management may by regulation prescribe.''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act takes effect 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join in sponsoring The Time for Schools Act of 1999, and I commend Senator MURRAY for her impressive leadership. This legislation will provide parents with much-needed assistance as they struggle to balance the needs of their children and the demands of their jobs.

Six years ago, the Family and Medical Leave Act became the first bill signed into law by President Clinton. Workers covered by the law can take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave a year in order to care for a newborn or adopted child, or a seriously ill family member, and know that their jobs will be there when they get back.

By any measure, the Family and Medical Leave Act has been a resounding success. Over 89 million Americans—70% of the workforce—are covered by the law, and millions of workers have been able to take the time they need to care for their families. The vast majority of covered employers—over 90%—have found the law relatively easy to administer, according to the bipartisan Commission on Family and Medical Leave.

Now it is time to take another step, and extend that success to enable parents to take up to 24 hours of unpaid family leave a year to be involved in their children's academic activities at school. I am proud that, under state law, parents in Massachusetts know they can take care of their children's school needs without losing their jobs. We should give all parents across the nation that right under federal law, too.

Parents play a crucial role in their children's lives. But too often, society offers them only barriers and blame as they try to raise their children. While we hear a lot of talk about family values, the test is whether we genuinely value families. If we do, then we must adopt better policies to help working parents balance the competing demands of the workplace and their responsibility to care for their children.

We know that working parents want to be more involved in their children's lives. In a study by the PTA, two-thirds of employed parents with children under 18 felt they did not have enough time to spend with their children. Forty percent felt they weren't devoting enough time to their children's education. Almost a quarter reported that attending teacher-parent conferences created problems at work.

We know that involved parents increase the likelihood of a child's success at school. According to some studies, it may be the single most important factor in student learning. One study showed that the involvement of both parents in their child's school was significantly associated with the child's academic achievement.

The Time for Schools Act will give working parents up to 24 hours of leave a year to participate in their children's school activities, such as attending parent-teacher conferences, taking part in classroom educational activities, or selecting the right school for their children.

Responsible employers know that flexible family workplace policies mean better, more productive workers. These policies are good for families, and good for business. In 1998, survey by the Families and Work Institute reported that the overwhelming majority of employers—84%—agree that the benefits of family or medical leave offset the costs.

The advantage of this legislation to employers are clear. A mother or father worried about how a child is doing at school is a less effective employee. The 24 hours of leave granted under this Act will be counted towards the 12 weeks of leave already provided under the Family and Medical Leave Act. In addition, workers must give employers a week's notice, except in emergencies. As a result, the legislation will have only a minimal impact on employers.

The tragedies we have witnessed at schools in recent years demonstrate how important it is for parents to pay attention to how children are doing at school. When this bill becomes law, workers will know they don't have to stop being parents when they go to work. They can be good parents at school, as well as after school.

Again, I commend Senator MURRAY for her leadership on this important measure, and I look forward to working with her to enact it as soon as possible this year.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1305. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve the process for listing, recovery planning, and delisting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

LISTING AND DELISTING REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Listing and Delisting Reform Act of 1999, cosponsored by my colleague from Wyoming,

Senator ENZI. The Endangered Species Act has become one of the best examples of good intentions gone astray, and so today I am taking one small step toward injecting some common sense into what has become a regulatory nightmare. It is my intention to start making the law more effective for local landowners, public land managers, communities and state governments who truly hold the key to any successful effort to conserve species. My legislation seeks to improve the listing, recovery planning and delisting processes so that recovery, the goal of the act, is easier to achieve.

In Wyoming, we have seen first hand the need to revise the listing and delisting processes of the Endangered Species Act. Listing should be a purely scientific decision. Listing should be based on credible data that has been peer-reviewed. Recently, the Prebles Meadow Jumping Mouse was listed in the State of Wyoming. The listing process for this mouse demonstrates how the system has gone haywire devoid of good science. One of the more significant shortcomings of the Preble's Rule relates to confusion about claims regarding the ''known range'' of as opposed to the alleged ''historical range.'' Historical data and current knowledge do not support the high, short-grass, semi-arid plains for southeastern Wyoming as part of the mouse's historical habitat range. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has even admitted to uncertainties regarding taxonomic distinctions and ranges. Further, the State was not properly notified causing counties, commissioners, and landowners all to be caught off guard. Such poor practices do not foster the types of partnerships that are required if meaningful species conservation is to occur. Clearly, changes are desperately needed to the Endangered Species Act.

Not far behind the mouse in Wyoming, is the black tailed prairie dog. Petitions to list the prairie dog have been filed and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has said the petition is not only warranted but deserves further study. I have lived in Wyoming most of my life, and I have logged a lot of miles on the roads and highways in my State over the years. I can tell you from experience that there is no shortage of prairie dogs in Wyoming. Any farmer or rancher will concur with that opinion. This petition, and countless other actions throughout the country, makes it painfully clear that some folks are intent on completely eliminating activity on public lands, no matter what the cost to individuals or local communities that rely on the land for economic survival.

My legislation will require the Secretary of the Interior to use scientific or commercial data that is empirical, field tested and peer-reviewed. Right now, it is basically a ''postage stamp'' petition: any person who wants to start a listing process may petition a species with little or no scientific support. This legislation prevents this absurd practice by establishing minimum requirements for a listing petition that includes an analysis of the status of the species, its range, population trends and threats. The petition must also be peer reviewed. In order to list a species, the Secretary must determine if sufficient biological information exists in the petition to support a recovery plan. Under my proposal, states are made active participants in the process and the general public is provided a more substantial role.

This legislation requires explicit planning and forethought with regard to conservation and recovery at the time the species is listed. Let me be clear about the intent of this requirement. I do not question the basic premise that some species require the protection of the Endangered Species Act. However, listing a species can cause hardship on a community. For that reason, it is critically important and only reasonable that every listing be supported by sound science. We should be sure of the need for a listing before we ask the members of our communities and private landowners to make sacrifices.

In my State of Wyoming, I have found that with several listings, the Secretary of the Interior is unable to tell me what measures will be required to achieve species recovery. The Secretary cannot tell me what acts or omissions we can expect to face as a consequence of listing. How can this be, if the Secretary is fully apprized of the status of the species? Conversely, if the Secretary cannot clearly describe how to reverse threatening acts to a species so that we can achieve recovery, how can we be sure that the species is, in fact, threatened?

This ambiguity has caused much undue frustration to the people of Wyoming. If the Secretary believes that certain farming or ranching practices, or the diversion of a certain amount of water, or a private citizen's development of one's own property, is the cause for a listing, then the Secretary should identify those activities that have to be curtailed or changed. If the Secretary does not have enough information to indicate what activities should be restricted, then why list a species? Why open producers and others to the burden of over-zealous enforcement and even litigation without being able to achieve the goal of recovering the species?

This legislation is ultimately designed to improve the quality of information used to support a listing. If the Secretary knows enough to list a species, he should know enough to tell us what will be required for recovery. That should be the case under current law, and that is all that this provision would require.

Just as the beginning of the process needs changes, we need to revise the end of the process—the delisting procedure. Recovery and delisting are quite simply, the goals of the Endangered Species Act. Yet, it is virtually impossible to currently delist a species. There is no certainty in the process and the States—the folks who have all the responsibility for managing the species once it is off the list—are not true partners in that process. Once the recovery plan is met, the species should be delisted.

Wyoming's experience with the Grizzly Bear pinpoints some of the problems with the current delisting process. The Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee set criteria for recovery and in the Yellowstone ecosystem, those targets have been met, but the bear has still not been removed from the list. We've been battling the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for years over this one to noavail, despite tremendous effort and financial resources to meet recovery objectives. Despite rebounded populations, we keep funneling money down a black hole.

The point is something needs to be done. My constituents, rightly so, are angry and upset about this current law and the trickling effects of countless listings. Real lives are being impacted. It is time for some real changes. These are small changes but I believe they will make big impacts. The changes I have suggested will have a significant effect on the quality of science, public participation, state involvement, speed in recovery and finally the delisting of a species. Species that truly need protection will be protected, but let's not lose sight of the real goal—recovery and delisting.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1306. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the regulation of firearms dealers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TARGETED GUN DEALER ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. SCHUMER Mr. President, today I am introducing the ''Targeted Gun Dealer Enforcement Act of 1999.'' This legislation would enable law enforcement to crack down on certain gun dealers and ''straw purchasers'' responsible for funneling firearms into the hands of those who use guns in crime.

A licensed gun dealer in West Milwaukee, Wisconsin was the retail source of 1,195 guns linked to crime between 1996 and 1998 Similarly, 1,176 crime guns recovered by law enforcement authorities over those three years were traced to a single gun dealer in Riverdale, Illinois In fact, 137 gun stores account for more than 13,000 crime guns seized in 1998 Year after year, many of these 137 dealers emerge as major sources of crime guns, even though most are not located in high-crime areas.

The path a gun takes to a crime scene is often a path of rapid diversion from first retail sale at federally licensed gun dealers to an illegal market supplying juveniles and felons According to a February 1999 ATF crime gun trace analysis report, ''New guns in juvenile or criminal hands signal direct

diversion, by illegal firearms trafficking—for instance through straw purchases or off the book sales by corrupt FFLs.''

An extremely small percentage of gun dealers are disproportionately responsible for this problem of rapid diversion of guns from first retail sale to crime scenes Indeed, almost half of the guns recovered in crime and traced through ATF in 1998 are traceable to a mere 1.1 percent of the nation's licensed gun dealers Yet law enforcement's ability to prevent certain gun dealers and straw purchasers from supplying young people and felons with new guns for use in crime is constrained by current federal firearms law—which limits the records and sanctions to which law enforcement has ready access.

My legislation would give law enforcement the tools it needs to crack down on certain gun dealers and ''straw purchasers'' responsible for funneling firearms into the hands of those who use guns in crime The bill would, among other things, impose strict new reporting requirements and automatic sanctions for illegal activity upon the 0.4 percent of licensed gun dealers responsible for 25 or more crime gun traces in given year; authorize ATF to suspend the licenses of and impose civil monetary penalties upon licensed gun dealers who willfully violate federal firearms law; clearly outlaw and increase penalties for ''straw purchasing''; and enable law enforcement more readily to trace the purchase-and-sale histories of firearms used in crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1306

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 ''Targeted Gun Dealer Enforcement Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF LICENSED DEALERS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON STRAW PURCHASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 922(a)(6) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', or with respect to the identity of the person in fact purchasing or attempting to purchase such firearm or ammunition,'' before ''under the''.

(2) PENALTIES.—Section 924(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a violation in relation to section 922(a)(6) or 922(d) by a licensed dealer, licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed collector shall be subject to the penalties under paragraph (2) of this subsection.''.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF STATE LAW REGARDING CARRYING CONCEALED FIREARMS.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (y) the following:

''(z) NOTIFICATION OF STATE REQUIREMENTS.—It shall be unlawful for a licensed dealer to transfer a firearm to any person, unless the dealer notifies that person whether applicable State law requires persons to be licensed to carry concealed firearms in the State, or prohibits the carrying of concealed firearms in the State.''.

(c) REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF LICENSE; CIVIL PENALTIES.—Section 923 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following:

''(e) REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF LICENSE; CIVIL PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for hearing—

''(A) suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, if the holder of such license—

''(i) willfully violates any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter; or

''(ii) fails to have secure gun storage or safety devices available at any place in which firearms are sold under the license to persons who are not licensees (except that in any case in which a secure gun storage or safety device is temporarily unavailable because of theft, casualty loss, consumer sales, backorders from a manufacturer, or any other similar reason beyond the control of the licensee, the licensed dealer shall not be considered to be in violation of the requirement to make available such a device);

''(B) suspend or revoke the license issued under this section to a dealer who willfully transfers armor piercing ammunition; and

''(C) assess and collect a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 per violation against any holder of a license, if the Secretary is authorized to suspend or revoke the license of that holder under subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(2) LIABILITY.—The Secretary may at any time compromise, mitigate, or remit the liability with respect to any willful violation of this subsection or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this subsection.

''(3) REVIEW.—An action of the Secretary under this subsection may be reviewed only as provided in subsection (f).

''(4) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Not less than once every 6 months, the Secretary shall notify each licensed manufacturer and each licensed dealer of the name, address, and license number of each dealer whose license was suspended or revoked under this section during the preceding 6-month period.

''(f) RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS AND LICENSEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary denies an application for, or revokes or suspends a license, or assesses a civil penalty under this section, the Secretary shall provide written notice of such denial, revocation, suspension, or assessment to the affected party, stating specifically the grounds upon which the application was denied, the license was suspended or revoked, or the civil penalty was assessed. Any notice of a revocation or suspension of a license under this paragraph shall be given to the holder of such license before the effective date of the revocation or suspension, as applicable.

''(2) APPEAL PROCESS.—

''(A) HEARING.—If the Secretary denies an application for, or revokes or suspends a license, or assesses a civil penalty under this section, the Secretary shall, upon request of the aggrieved party, promptly hold a hearing to review the denial, revocation, suspension, or assessment. A hearing under this subparagraph shall be held at a location convenient to the aggrieved party.

''(B) NOTICE OF DECISION; APPEAL.—If, after a hearing held under subparagraph (A), the Secretary decides not to reverse the decision of the Secretary to deny the application, revoke or suspend the license, or assess the civil penalty, as applicable—

''(i) the Secretary shall provide notice of the decision of the Secretary to the aggrieved party;

''(ii) during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the aggrieved party receives a notice under clause (i), the aggrieved party may file a petition with the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the aggrieved party resides or has a principal place of business for a de novo judicial review of such denial, revocation, suspension, or assessment;

''(iii) in any judicial proceeding pursuant to a petition under clause (ii)—

''(I) the court may consider any evidence submitted by the parties to the proceeding, regardless of whether or not such evidence was considered at the hearing held under subparagraph (A); and

''(II) if the court decides that the Secretary was not authorized to make such denial, revocation, suspension, or assessment, the court shall order the Secretary to take such actions as may be necessary to comply with the judgment of the court.

''(3) STAY PENDING APPEAL.—If the Secretary suspends or revokes a license under this section, upon the request of the holder of the license, the Secretary shall stay the effective date of the revocation, suspension, or assessment.''.

(d) EFFECT OF CONVICTION.—Section 925(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''until any conviction pursuant to the indictment becomes final'' and inserting ''until the date of any conviction pursuant to the indictment''.

(e) REGULATION OF HIGH-VOLUME CRIME GUN DEALERS.—Section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) HIGH-VOLUME CRIME GUN DEALERS.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'high-volume crime gun dealer' means any licensed dealer with respect to which a designation under subparagraph (B)(i) is in effect, as provided in subparagraph (B)(ii).

''(B) DESIGNATION OF HIGH-VOLUME CRIME GUN DEALERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate a licensed dealer as a high-volume crime gun dealer—

''(I) as soon as practicable, if the Secretary determines that the licensed dealer sold, delivered, or otherwise transferred to 1 or more persons not licensed under this chapter not less than 25 firearms that, during the preceding calendar year, were used during the commission or attempted commission of a criminal offense under Federal, State, or local law, or were possessed in violation of Federal, State, or local law; or

''(II) immediately upon the expiration date of a suspension of the license of that dealer for a willful violation of this chapter, if such violation involved 1 or more firearms that were subsequently used during the commission or attempted commission of a criminal offense under Federal, State, or local law.

''(ii) EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF DESIGNATION.—A designation under clause (i) shall remain in effect during the period beginning on the date on which the designation is made and ending on the later of—

''(I) the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on that date; or

''(II) the date on which the license issued to that dealer under this section expires.

''(C) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Upon the designation of a licensed dealer as a high-volume crime gun dealer under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall notify the appropriate United States attorney's office, the appropriate State and local law enforcement agencies (including the district attorney's

offices and the police or sheriff's departments), and each State and local agency responsible for the issuance of business licenses in the jurisdiction in which the high-volume crime gun dealer is located of such designation.

''(D) REPORTING AND RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph—

''(i) not later than 10 days after the date on which a handgun is sold, delivered, or otherwise transferred by a high-volume crime gun dealer to a person not licensed under this chapter, the high-volume crime gun dealer shall submit to the Secretary and to the department of State police or State law enforcement agency of the State or local jurisdiction in which the sale, delivery, or transfer took place, on a form prescribed by the Secretary, a report of the sale, delivery, or transfer, which report shall include—

''(I) the manufacturer or importer of the handgun;

''(II) the model, type, caliber, gauge, and serial number of the handgun; and

''(III) the name, address, date of birth, and height and weight of the purchaser or transferee, as applicable;

''(ii) each high-volume crime gun dealer shall submit to the Secretary, on a form prescribed by the Secretary, a monthly report of each firearm received and each firearm disposed of by the dealer during that month, which report shall include only the name of the manufacturer or importer and the model, type, caliber, gauge, serial number, date of receipt, and date of disposition of each such firearm, except that the initial report submitted by a dealer under this clause shall include such information with respect to the entire inventory of the high-volume crime gun dealer; and

''(iii) a high-volume crime gun dealer may not destroy any record required to be maintained under paragraph (1)(A).

''(E) INSPECTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary may inspect or examine the inventory and records of a high-volume crime gun dealer at any time without a showing of reasonable cause or a warrant for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements of this chapter.

''(F) RECORDKEEPING BY LOCAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3)(B), a State or local law enforcement agency that receives a report under subparagraph (D)(i) may retain a copy of that record for not more than 5 years.

''(G) LICENSE RENEWAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (d)(2), the Secretary shall approve or deny an application for a license submitted by a high-volume crime gun dealer before the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date on which the application is received.

''(H) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO COMPLY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (e), the Secretary shall, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing—

''(I) suspend for not less than 90 days any license issued under this section to a high-volume crime gun dealer who willfully violates any provision of this section (including any requirement of this paragraph);

''(II) revoke any license issued under this section to a high-volume crime gun dealer who willfully violates any provision of this section (including any requirement of this paragraph) and who has committed a prior willful violation of any provision of this section (including any requirement of this paragraph); and

''(III) revoke any license issued under this section to a high-volume crime gun dealer who willfully violates any provision of section 922 or 924.

''(ii) STAY PENDING APPEAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (f)(3), the Secretary may not stay the effective date of a suspension or revocation under this subparagraph pending an appeal.''.

SEC. 3. ENHANCED ABILITY TO TRACE FIREARMS.

(a) VOLUNTARY SUBMISSION OF DEALER'S RECORDS.—Section 923(g)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(4) VOLUNTARY SUBMISSION OF DEALER'S RECORDS.—

''(A) BUSINESS DISCONTINUED.—

''(i) SUCCESSOR.—When a firearms or ammunition business is discontinued and succeeded by a new licensee, the records required to be kept by this chapter shall appropriately reflect that fact and shall be delivered to the successor. Upon receipt of those records, the successor licensee may retain the records of the discontinued business or submit the discontinued business records to the Secretary.

''(ii) NO SUCCESSOR.—When a firearms or ammunition business is discontinued without a successor, records required to be kept by this chapter shall be delivered to the Secretary within 30 days after the business is discontinued.

''(B) OLD RECORDS.—A licensee maintaining a firearms business may voluntarily submit the records required to be kept by this chapter to the Secretary if such records are at least 20 years old.

''(C) STATE OR LOCAL REQUIREMENTS.—If State law or local ordinance requires the delivery of records regulated by this paragraph to another responsible authority, the Secretary may arrange for the delivery of records to such other responsible authority.''

(b) CENTRALIZATION AND MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.—Section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) CENTRALIZATION AND MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS BY SECRETARY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary—

''(A) may receive and centralize any information or records submitted to the Secretary under this chapter and maintain such information or records in whatever manner will enable their most efficient use in law enforcement investigations; and

''(B) shall retain a record of each firearms trace conducted by the Secretary, unless the Secretary determines that there is a valid law enforcement reason not to retain the record.''.

(c) LICENSEE REPORTS OF SECONDHAND FIREARMS.—Section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(10) LICENSEE REPORTS OF SECONDHAND FIREARMS.—A licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, and licensed dealer shall submit to the Secretary, on a form prescribed by the Secretary, a monthly report of each firearm received from a person not licensed under this chapter during that month, which report shall not include any identifying information relating to the transferor or any subsequent purchaser.''.

SEC. 4. GENERAL REGULATION OF FIREARMS TRANSFERS.

(a) TRANSFERS OF CRIME GUNS.—Section 924(h) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or having reasonable cause to believe'' after ''knowing''.

(b) INCREASED PENALTIES FOR TRAFFICKING IN FIREARMS WITH OBLITERATED SERIAL NUMBERS.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''(k),''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''(k),'' after ''(j),''.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES.

The United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to reflect the amendments made by this Act.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am happy to join my colleague Senator SCHUMER in introducing the ''Targeted Gun Dealer Enforcement Act of 1999.'' This bill will give law enforcement the tools they need to prevent suspect gun dealers from supplying firearms to criminals and plaguing our communities with gun violence.

Guns kill 34,000 Americans every year—thirteen children every day. They kill more teen-agers than any natural cause.

This bill allows the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) to closely monitor those gun dealers who they should be monitoring—the dealers who have had more than 25 crime guns traced to them in the last year.

The facts in Illinois are particularly compelling on this issue. In Illinois, 26 gun dealers account for more crime guns than the remaining 3,700 Illinois federally licensed gun dealers combined.

These figures show that while most gun dealers are law abiding and responsible, some shops have become ''convenience stores'' for criminals. Twenty-six dealers were the source of more than 1,600 crime guns with each dealer responsible for selling at least 25 guns used in crimes in 1998.

This bill will help law enforcement find out why these dealers are the source of guns later used to commit crimes. The bill will require high volume crime dealers to report handgun sales to ATF and local police. Law enforcement can then use these records to more effectively trace crime guns.

The bill will also encourage gun dealers to sell guns more responsively. In the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative, ATF found that many guns used by youths to commit crimes are purchased from licensed dealers by individuals acting as ''straw'' purchasers. A ''straw purchaser'' is a person who illegally purchases a firearm for another person, such as a juvenile or a felon.

This bill seeks to address that problem by prohibiting the sale of a firearm when a seller has ''reason to know'' that such firearm will be used to commit a crime of violence or a drug crime. Current law requires actual knowledge on the part of the dealer that the buyer will use the firearm to commit a crime of violence. This change will make it easier for law enforcement to target dealers who they believe are turning a blind eye in supplying guns to buyers under questionable circumstances.

In 1998, Chicago police officers conducted ''Operation Gunsmoke,'' an investigation to target gun-sellers just outside the city limits. Seven undercover officers purchased 171 guns from 12 suburban gun stores in a three month period. Not one dealer refused to sell the agents weapons even as the agents openly violated laws needed to purchase firearms. This investigation was key to the City of Chicago's

groundbreaking lawsuit against the gun industry on the theory of public nuisance.

We must act now to keep guns from getting into the hands of criminals. I applaud Senator SCHUMER's leadership on this issue and hope my colleagues will join us in this important effort to make our communities safer. The statistics show most gun dealers are responsible, but a few unscrupulous dealers are supplying criminals with guns that plague our communities.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 1307. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to permit participating households to use food stamp benefits to purchase nutritional supplements providing vitamins or minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

FOOD STAMP VITAMIN AND MINERAL IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to be joined by Senator HATCH and Senator MCCONNELL in introducing the Food Stamp Vitamin and Mineral Improvement Act of 1999.

Mr. President, this bipartisan legislation is very simple and I believe makes just plain common sense. It would give those Americans using food stamps the ability to purchase vitamin and mineral supplements for themselves and their families.

The change called for in this legislation has been supported by a broad coalition of groups and nutrition experts. For example, it is backed by the Alliance for Aging Research, the Spina Bifida Association of America, the National Osteoporosis Foundation and the National Nutritional Foods Association. Nutrition experts such as Dr. Paul Lachance, Chair of the Department of Food Science at Rutgers University, Dr. Jeffrey Blumberg of Tufts University, Dr. Charles Butterworth, Director of Human Nutrition at the University of Alabama Birmingham, and Dr. Dennis Heldman, Chair of the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition at the University of Missouri have also called for making this common sense change to food policy.

Mr. President, I believe this legislation would contribute substantially to improving the nutrition and health of a segment of our society that too often falls below recommended levels of nutrient consumption.

Scientific evidence continues to mount showing that sound nutrition is essential for normal growth and cognitive development in children, and for improved health and the prevention of a variety of conditions and illnesses.

Studies have also shown, unfortunately, that many Americans do not have dietary intakes sufficient to meet even the conservative Recommended Daily Allowances or RDA's for a number of essential nutrients. Insufficient dietary intakes are especially critical for children, pregnant women and the elderly.

A recent study conducted by the Tufts University School of Nutrition, and based on government data, showed that millions of poor children in the United States have dietary intakes that are well below the government's Recommended Daily Allowance for a number of important nutrients. The study found that major differences exist in the intakes of poor versus non-poor children for 10 out of 16 nutrients (food energy, folate, iron, magnesium, thiamin, vitamin A, vitamin B6, vitamin C, vitamin E, and zinc). Moreover, the proportion of poor children with inadequate intakes of zinc is over 50 percent; for iron, over 40 percent; and for vitamin E, over 33 percent.

For some nutrients, such as vitamin A and magnesium, the proportion of poor children with inadequate intakes is nearly six times as large as for non-poor children.

Pregnant women also have high nutritional needs. Concerns about inadequate folate intake by pregnant women prompted the Public Health Service to issue a recommendation regarding consumption of folic acid by all women of childbearing age who are capable of becoming pregnant for the purpose of reducing the incidence of spina bifida or other neural tube defects. That is why this change has long been a priority of the Spina Bifida Association of America.

Furthermore, the percent of pregnant and nursing women who get the RDA level of calcium has dropped from just 24 percent in 1986 to a mere 16 percent in 1994. That's 84 percent of women who aren't getting enough calcium—which we know is critical to preventing the debilitating effects of osteoporosis.

And again, the evidence is that lower income women, many of whom are eligible for Food Stamps, are more likely to have inadequate intake of key nutrients. Women with income of 130 percent or less of the poverty level have higher rates of deficiencies in intake of Vitamins A, E, C, B–6 and B–12, as well as Iron, Thiamin, Riboflavin and Niacin than those with higher incomes.

Obviously, the best way to obtain sufficient nutrient intake is through eating a variety of nutritious foods, but some groups—particularly those at the greatest risk, including children, pregnant women and the elderly—may find it significantly difficult to obtain sufficient nutrient intake through foods alone. Accordingly, many people in our nation do rely on nutritional supplements to ensure that they and their families are consuming sufficient levels of key nutrients.

This legislation would enable low-income people to have greater access to nutritional supplements to improve their nutrient intake. Currently, recipients of food stamps are not allowed to use those resources to purchase nutritional supplements. This restriction clearly serves as an impediment to adequate nutrition for low-income people who may need supplements to ensure they are consuming sufficient levels of nutrients. It defies common sense.

This restriction also prevents food stamp recipients from exercising their own responsibility and choice to use food stamps for purchasing nutritional supplements that they determine are important to adequate nutrition for their children or themselves. It is a glaring inconsistency that food stamps may currently be used to purchase a variety of non-nutritious or minimally nutritious foods but not to purchase nutritional supplements. Incredibly, you can use Food Stamps to buy Twinkies, but not Vitamin C or a multivitamin.

Opponents of this legislation will argue that food stamps are most effectively used to improve nutrition through purchasing food rather than nutritional supplements, and that if food stamps may be used for nutritional supplements, households will be less able to stretch their resources to purchase sufficient quantities of food.

The available evidence indicates, however, that food stamp households actually make more careful and effective use of their resources in purchasing nutritious foods than consumers in general. Since food stamp households necessarily have a limited amount of money to spend on food—and generally already find it difficult to meet their food needs—they simply cannot afford to make unwise or unnecessary purchases of nutritional supplements using food stamps which would otherwise be used for food.

In addition, a month's worth of daily multivitamin supplements can cost as little as one can of soda. So I believe the concerns that food stamps will be wasted or unwisely used for nutritional supplements is unfounded.

Our proposal is also clearly consistent with the stated purpose of the Food Stamp program, that is to "promote the general welfare and to safeguard the health of the nation's population by raising the nutrition among low-income households."

So, Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will join us in supporting this legislation designed to improve opportunities for low-income Americans to ensure adequate nutrition for their families and themselves. Simply put, if you think it doesn't make sense that Food Stamps can be used to buy twinkies and doughnuts but not Vitamin C or a daily multi-vitamin supplement, you should support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. President, 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. 1307

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 "Food Stamp Vitamin and Mineral Improvement Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the dietary patterns of Americans do not result in nutrient intakes that fully meet recommended dietary allowances of vitamins and minerals;

(2) children in low-income families and the elderly often fail to achieve adequate nutrient intakes from diet alone;

(3) pregnant women have particularly high nutrient needs, which they often fail to meet through diet alone;

(4)(A) scientific studies show that nutritional supplements that contain folic acid (a B vitamin) can prevent as many as 60 to 80 percent of neural tube birth defects;

(B) the Public Health Service, in September 1992, recommended that all women of childbearing age who are capable of becoming pregnant should consume at least 0.4 of a milligram of folic acid per day for the purpose of reducing the risk of having a pregnancy affected with spina bifida or other neural tube birth defects; and

(C) the Food and Drug Administration has approved a health claim for folic acid to reduce the risk of neural tube birth defects;

(5) infants who do not receive adequate intakes of iron may be somewhat impaired in mental and behavioral development; and

(6) scientific evidence indicates that increasing intake of specific nutrients over an extended period of time protects against diseases or conditions such as osteoporosis, cataracts, cancer, and heart disease.

SEC. 3. USE OF FOOD STAMPS TO PURCHASE VITAMINS AND MINERALS.

Section 3(g)(1) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''or food product'' and inserting '', food product, or nutritional supplement providing a vitamin or mineral''.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1308. A bill to amend section 468A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to deductions for decommissioning costs of nuclear power plants; to the Committee on Finance.

NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am joined today by Senator JOHN BREAUX in introducing The Nuclear Decommissioning Funds Clarification Act. This change in the tax law is necessary because the electricity industry is rapidly moving from a regulatory monopoly model to the competitive marketplace.

In 1984, Congress enacted Code Section 468A which was designed to allow state public service commissions to authorize that future costs for decommissioning nuclear power plants could be charged by a utility to its customers to be dedicated to a nuclear decommissioning fund. Currently, utilities are permitted a deduction for contributions to their decommissioning funds. The amount that can be deducted is currently limited to the cost of service amount or the ruling amount. The cost of service amount is the amount of decommissioning costs included in the taxpayer's cost of service for ratemaking purposes. The ruling amount is the amount that the IRS determines to be necessary to provide for level funding of an amount equal to the taxpayer's nuclear decommissioning costs.

Since Section 468A was adopted, the electricity industry landscape has been substantially transformed. Since 1992, more than 20 states have approved plans to introduce competition and all states are considering deregulation. The Energy Committee which I chair has also held several hearings on Federal deregulation proposals and it is my hope that a federal deregulation bill will be adopted in this Congress.

Since deductible contributions made to a nuclear decommissioning fund are based on limitations reflected in cost-of-service ratemaking, companies operating in a competitive market can no longer deduct contributions to decommissioning funds. Our bill clarifies the deductibility of nuclear decommissioning costs in a market environment and codifies the definition of nuclear decommissioning costs that limit contributions.

This legislation also clarifies a number of tax issues relating to decommissioning funds to ensure that nuclear utilities can operate effectively in this new competitive environment.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

S. 1309. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for the preemption of State law in certain cases relating to certain church plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

CHURCH PLAN PARITY AND ENTANGLEMENT PREVENTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to protect the health and pension benefits of thousands of clergy and lay workers. This legislation clarifies the regulatory status of church benefit programs and allows service providers to continue contracting with church plans.

Unfortunately, state insurance statutes, in all but three states, fail to address the legal status of these benefit programs. Thus, under some interpretations of state insurance law it is possible to conclude that these employer plans are subject to regulation as insurance companies. This uncertain legal status has caused service providers to refuse to contract with church plans—leaving these programs without the necessary tools to maximize benefits and reduce costs.

Recently, the Insurance Department of South Dakota informed the church benefits community that either federal or state legislation is necessary to exempt their programs from their state's insurance laws. With the possibility that 46 more states could make the same request, I believe the only practical solution is for Congress to clarify the status of these plans. That is what my legislation does.

Mr. President, my legislation is within the spirit of the National Securities Markets Improvement Act (NSMIA) of 1996 (P.L. 104–290) which not only exempted church plans from federal securities laws—providing the same treatment secular plans had previously enjoyed—but, also preempted state securities laws. This is not a unique idea. Similarly, the Internal Revenue Code includes numerous accommodations to the special circumstances of church plans. For example, the church plans which annuitize benefits are deemed not to be commercial insurers for purposes of maintaining their tax-exempt status.

Mr. President, I have heard from ministers in my state about the urgency to move this legislation expeditiously. Indeed, Bishop Wesley Morris of the United Methodist Church visited me about this very matter. It is supported by the Church Alliance, a coalition of more than 30 denominational benefit programs, including the Presbyterian Church in America, the Rabbinical Pension Board, the Christian Brothers Service, the United Church of Christ, The United Methodist Church, the Episcopal Church, the Southern Baptist Convention and many others.

While these denominations may disagree about certain theological issues, they are united in providing sound health care and pension programs to their ministers and lay workers. Furthermore, while there are differing opinions with the Senate, and among ourselves, about health care legislation, there should be no disagreement that we need to protect benefit plans that serve ministers and lay workers. It makes no sense to leave these programs at the mercy of 47 different insurance laws. Every person active in his or her church knows the rising cost of health care is a problem.

Mr. President, I want to clarify two points with respect to preemption of State laws as provided by this legislation. The exception that allows states to enact legislation applicable to church plans is intended to permit states to regulate church plans only if a specific statute is passed by a State legislature on a stand-alone basis and the sole purpose of the statute is to regulate church plans.

Furthermore, I want to point that this legislation is intended to permit insurance companies and other service providers to contract with church plans regardless of whether such church plans would have been treated as multiple-employer welfare arrangements under State law, if this legislation had not been enacted.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to pass this measure.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. BOND, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SANTORUM, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FRIST, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

S. 1310. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the interim payment system for home health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Medicare Home

Health Equity Act of 1999, which is designed to provide a measure of financial and regulatory relief for cost-efficient home health agencies across the country. These agencies are experiencing severe financial problems that are inhibiting their ability to deliver much-needed care, particularly to chronically ill seniors with complex needs.

America's home health agencies provide invaluable services that have enabled a growing number of our most frail and vulnerable Medicare beneficiaries to avoid hospitals and nursing homes and stay just where they want to be—in the comfort and security of their own homes.

In 1996, home health was the fastest growing component of Medicare spending, consuming one out of every eleven Medicare dollars, compared with one in every forty in 1989. The program grew at an average annual rate of more than 25 percent from 1990 to 1997. As a consequence, the number of home health beneficiaries more than doubled, and Medicare home health spending soared from $2.5 billion in 1989 to $18.1 billion in 1996.

This rapid growth in home health spending understandably prompted Congress and the Administration, as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, to initiate changes that were intended to make the program more cost-effective and efficient. Therefore, there was widespread support for the provision in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 which called for the implementation of a prospective payment system for home care. Until this system can be implemented, home health agencies are being paid according to an ''interim payment system,'' or IPS.

In trying to get a handle on costs, however, Congress and the Administration created a system that penalizes efficient agencies and that may be restricting access for the very Medicare beneficiaries who need care the most—the sicker seniors with complex, chronic care needs like diabetic, wound care patients or IV therapy patients who require multiple visits.

Unfortunately, the ''interim payment system'' is critically flawed in that it effectively rewards the agencies that provided the most visits and spent the most Medicare dollars in 1994, the base year, while it penalizes low-cost, more efficient providers—and their patients. None of us should tolerate wasteful expenditures, but neither should we impede the delivery of necessary services by low-cost providers.

Home health agencies in the Northeast and the mid-West have been among those particularly hard-hit by the interim payment system. As the Wall Street Journal observed last year, ''If New England had been just a little greedier, its home health industry would be a lot better off now—Ironically, the region is getting clobbered by the system because of its tradition of non-profit community service and efficiency.''

Even more troubling, this flawed system may force our most cost-efficient providers to stop accepting Medicare patients with more serious health care needs. According to a recent survey by the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, almost 40 percent of the home health agencies surveyed indicated that there were patients whom they previously would have accepted whom they no longer accept due to the IPS. Thirty-one percent of the agencies admitted that they had discharged patients due to the IPS. These discharged patients tended to be those with chronic care needs who required a large number of visits and were expensive to serve. As a consequence, these patients caused the agencies to exceed their aggregate per-beneficiary caps.

I simply do not believe that Congress and the Administration intended to construct a payment system that inevitably discourages home health agencies from caring for those seniors who need care the most. Last year's Omnibus Appropriations bill did provide a small measure of relief for home health agencies. This proposal did not, however, go far enough to relieve the financial distress that cost-effective agencies are experiencing.

These problems are all the more pressing given the fact that the Health Care Financing Administration was unable to meet its original deadline for implementing a prospective payment system. As a result, home health agencies will be struggling under the IPS far longer than Congress envisioned when it enacted the Balanced Budget Act.

Moreover, it now appears that Congress greatly underestimated the savings stemming from the BBA. Medicare spending for home health fell by nearly 15 percent last year, and the CBO now projects that post-BBA reductions in home care spending will exceed $47 billion in FY 1998–2002. This is a whopping three times greater than the $16 billion CBO originally estimated for that time period.

I recently chaired a Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations (PSI) hearing where we heard about the financial distress and cash-flow problems cost-efficient agencies across the country are experiencing. Witnesses expressed concern that these problems are inhibiting their ability to deliver much-needed care, particularly to chronically ill patients with complex needs. More than a thousand agencies have closed in the past year because the reimbursement levels under Medicare fell so far short of their actual operating costs. Others are laying off staff or declining to accept new patients with more serious health problems.

This points to the most central and critical issue—cuts of this magnitude cannot be sustained without ultimately affecting care for our most vulnerable seniors. At the PSI hearing, Barbara Smith, a senior research staff scientist with the Center for Health Services Research and Policy at George Washington University, testified that the preliminary findings of her studies suggest significant potential effects on beneficiaries, particularly those with unstable chronic care needs. Her research shows that these patients are being displaced from home care or are experiencing significant changes in services that appear to be driven by reimbursement policies rather than by clinical considerations. In her testimony, she stated:

> ''My main concern is that we are carving out a wedge of people who are chronically ill and have intensive needs for services who are not going to have a reliable source of care in any sector. They are becoming the health care system's untouchables.''

Moreover, the financial problems that home health agencies have been experiencing have been exacerbated by a number of new regulatory requirements imposed by HCFA, including the implementation of OASIS, the new outcome and assessment information data set; new requirements for surety bonds; sequential billing; IPS overpayment recoupment; and a new 15-minute increment home health reporting requirement. Witnesses at the PSI hearing expressed particular frustration about what Maryanna Arsenault, the CEO of the Visiting Nurse Service in Saco, Maine, termed HCFA's regulatory policy of ''implement and suspend.'' They pointed to examples such as the hastily enacted requirements for surety bonds and sequential billing where no sooner had a mandate been put into an effect, than it was suspended but only after agencies had invested significant time and resources in compliance.

The legislation that my colleague from Missouri and I are introducing today, along with a bipartisan group of 16 of our colleagues, responds to these concerns. It makes needed adjustments to the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and related federal regulations to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries have access to medically-necessary home health services.

Among other provisions, the bill eliminates the automatic 15 percent reduction in Medicare home health payments now scheduled for October 1, 2000, whether or not a prospective payment system is enacted. When the Balanced Budget Act was enacted, CBO reported that the effect of the BBA would be to reduce home health expenditures by $16.1 billion between fiscal years 1998 and 2002. CBO's March 1999 revised analysis estimates those reductions to exceed $47 billion—three times the anticipated budgetary impact. A further 15 percent cut would be devastating to cost-efficient providers and would further reduce seniors' access to care. Moreover, it is unnecessary since the budget target for home health outlays will be achieved, if not exceeded, without it.

The legislation will also provide supplemental ''outlier'' payments to home health agencies on a patient-by-patient

basis, if the cost of care for an individual is considered to be significantly higher than average due to the patient's particular health and functional condition. This provision would remove the existing financial disincentive for agencies to care for patients with intensive medical needs who, according to recent reports issued by both the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC), are the individuals most at risk of losing access to home health care under the IPS.

The current IPS unfairly penalizes historically cost-efficient home health agencies that have been most prudent with their Medicare resources. Our legislation builds on reforms in last year's Omnibus Appropriations Act by gradually raising low-cost agencies' per-beneficiary limits up to the national average over three years, or until the new home health prospective payment system is implemented and IPS is terminated.

To decrease total costs in order to remain under their per-beneficiary limits, agencies have had to significantly reduce the number of visits to patients, which has, in turn, increased the cost of each visit. Implementation of OASIS has also significantly increased agencies' per-visit costs. Therefore, the legislation will increase the IPS per-visit cost limit from 106 to 108 percent of the national median.

Other provisions of the legislation will:

Extend the current IPS overpayment recoupment period from one to three years without interest;

Revise the surety bond requirement for home health agencies to more appropriately target fraud;

Eliminate the 15-minute incremental reporting requirement; and

Maintain the Periodic Interim Payment (PIP) program through the first year of implementation of the prospective payment system to ensure that such a dramatic change in payment systems does not create new cash-flow problems for agencies. I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section summary further detailing these provisions be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1999 will provide a measure of financial and regulatory relief to beleaguered home health agencies in order to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries have access to medically-necessary home health services, and I encourage all of my colleagues to join us as cosponsors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOME HEALTH EQUITY ACT OF 1999—SUMMARY

The Home Health Equity Act of 1999 is intended to make needed adjustments to the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and related federal regulations to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries have access to medically-necessary home health care services.

MAJOR PROVISIONS

Eliminates the automatic 15 percent reduction in Medicare home health payments now scheduled for October 1, 2000.

Under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (as amended by the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act), expenditures for Medicare home health care are to be reduced by 15 percent, whether or not a Medicare home health prospective payment system is implemented on October 1, 2000. This provision would eliminate that proposed reduction. When it was enacted, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reported that the effect of the BBA would be to reduce home health expenditures by $16.1 billion between fiscal years 1998 and 2002. CBO's March 1999 revised analysis now estimates those reductions to exceed $47 billion—three times the anticipated budgetary impact. A further 15 percent cut to home health cost limits would be devastating to cost-efficient providers and would reduce seniors' access to care. Moreover, it is unnecessary since the budget target for home health outlays will be achieved, if not exceeded, without it.

Provides supplemental ''outlier'' payments to home health agencies on a patient-by-patient basis if the cost of care for an individual is considered by the Secretary to be significantly higher than average due to the patient's particular health and functional condition.

Recent reports issued by both the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC) conclude that patients with intensive medical needs are the individuals most at risk of losing access to home health care under the Interim Payment System (IPS). This provision would remove the existing financial disincentive under the IPS for agencies to care for these patients.

Increases the per-beneficiary cost limit for agencies with limits below the national average to the national average cost per patient over a three-year period or until the Medicare home health prospective payment system is implemented.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1997's Interim Payment System (IPS) bases an agency's average per-patient reimbursement on that agency's average cost per patient in 1993 or 1994. As a consequences, the system unfairly penalizes historically cost-efficient home health agencies that have been most prudent with their Medicare resources. This provision builds on reforms made by the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (OCESSA) by gradually raising low-cost agencies' per-beneficiary limits up to the national average over three years or until the new home health prospective payment system is implemented and IPS is terminated.

Increases the IPS per-visit cost limit to 108 percent of the national median.

The Balanced Budget Act reduced the per-visit cost limit from 112 percent of the mean to 105 percent of the median. The OCESSA increased the limit to 106 percent of the median. This provision would further increase it to 108 percent of the national median. Most analysts agree that the growth in Medicare home health expenditures in the early 1990s was due to the high number of visits provided to patients, not to the cost per visit. CBO confirms that controlling use, not price, is the key to Medicare home health cost containment. To decrease total costs in order to remain under their per-beneficiary limits, agencies have had to significantly reduce the number of visits to patients, which has, in turn, increased the cost of each visit. Implementation of OASIS has also significantly increased agencies' per-visit costs.

Revises the surety bond requirements for home health agencies to more appropriately target fraud.

This provision would clarify that the surety bond requirement is only to be used to protect against overpayments based on fraudulent claims or behavior. Perhaps the main problem with the surety bond proposal that HCFA developed last year (and which is currently in regulatory limbo) was that it went beyond Congressional intent. Congress enacted the original surety bond provision as a way to use private sector monitors to help keep fraudulent providers out of the market. HCFA tried, through the regulations it developed, to use surety bonds as a means to recover any overpayments they made to home health agencies. This unnecessarily increased both the costs and difficulties agencies encountered in trying to obtain a surety bond.

Extends the IPS overpayment recoupment period to three years without interest.

The BBA did not require HCFA to publish information on calculating the IPS per-visit limits until January 1, 1998, even though the limits were effective beginning October 1, 1997. Similarly, HCFA was not required to publish information related to the calculation of the agencies' annual aggregate per-beneficiary limit until April 1, 1998, despite an October 1 start date. More than a year after the implementation of the IPS, HCFA's fiscal intermediaries still had not notified many agencies of the visit and per-beneficiary limits under which they were expected to operate. Moreover, throughout this period, fiscal intermediaries continued to pay agencies in accordance with the previous years' limits, resulting in significant overpayments to many home health agencies throughout the country.

Fiscal intermediaries have begun to issue notices of overpayments to these agencies and are demanding repayment. This has posed a significant problem, particularly for smaller agencies that do not have large cash reserves. To ease these repayment problems, HCFA has directed the fiscal intermediaries to allow home health agencies to extend their repayments over 12 months. Many agencies, however, say that this is insufficient. This provision would extend the overpayment recoupment period to three years without interest.

Eliminates the 15-minute incremental reporting period.

The BBA mandates that home health agencies record the length of time of home health visits in 15-minute increments, which the HCFA will implement on July 1, 1999. Unfortunately, HCFA's instructions implementing the 15-minute reporting requirement are excessively labor-intensive. As proposed by HCFA, the only time that can be counted is time spent actively treating the beneficiary. Time for travel or for administrative duties that are essential to patient care, such as charting or coordinating work with the physician, may not be counted. Implementation of the 15-minute reporting requirement will not only be difficult for staff, but will also be disruptive to patient care. This provision would eliminate the current 15-minute reporting requirement. An alternative to the 15-minute reporting requirement that better measures time of direct patient care and its relationship to outcomes should be developed within the context of the Medicare home health PPS.

Temporarily maintains the Periodic Interim Payment (PIP) program

PIP is a program that is available to many home health agencies that permits HCFA to make payments to the agencies—based on

historical payment levels—prior to the final settlement of claims and cost-reports. This program, which is scheduled to terminate on October 1, 2000, has been invaluable to participating agencies and has helped them to avoid cash-flow difficulties. This provision would continue PIP through the first year of implementation of the prospective payment system to ensure that such a dramatic change in payment systems does not create new cash-flow problems.

Mr. BOND. In the last couple days, a lot of people have been talking about the Medicare program and what we want it to look like as we think far ahead into the future. I'm glad this is happening, because this is an important debate. We do need to discuss things like a prescription drug benefit, comprehensive Medicare reform, the long-term solvency of the program, and other related issues.

But as we focus on the future of Medicare, we also need to do our best to make sure that the existing program is working as well as it can. That's why we're here today. Part of the existing program— the home health care benefit—is completely broken, and we've come together to try to fix it.

Why do we care? Well, home health care is the key to fulfilling what is virtually a universal desire among seniors and those with disabilities—to remain independent and within the comfort of their own homes despite their health problems. For people who have difficulty leaving their home and who have health conditions that require low- to mid-level medical attention, home health care is a tremendous help. Home health care keeps these people out of more expensive and less comfortable settings such as nursing homes and hospitals. And home care is often the only source of care for many disabled individuals and frail elderly, especially those living in underserved rural and urban areas of our country. Simply put, home health is crucial to millions of Americans' comfort and health, and we must make sure they continue to have access to it.

The problem is that more and more Americans do not have access to needed home health services—they simply cannot find a home health agency that will care for them. This means they will either not receive the care they need, or that they will get this care, they'll just get it at more expensive and intimidating facilities like hospitals or nursing homes. This is the crisis we are facing.

I would like to take a moment to describe several different ways this home health crisis is rearing its ugly head across the country.

First, we have seen literally thousands of home health agencies close their doors in the last two years. Perhaps as many as 2,000 of the 10,000 agencies that existed in 1997 have either been driven out of business or out of Medicare. In Missouri alone, about 75 out of 300 home health agencies have closed since 1997, including the well-respected and well-established Visiting Nurse Association of Greater St. Louis. A few of the agencies that have closed have no doubt been shady characters we should be glad to see go. But many—and perhaps most—of the agencies that have closed are legitimate providers with real patients.

Second, those agencies that have survived have had to change drastically the way they operate. Many have been forced into layoffs and cutbacks in other areas that directly or indirectly impact patient care. Many face chronic cash flow problems and may be forced to refund large amounts of cash to the Health Care Financing Administration—perhaps in the hundreds of thousands of dollars—that they accidentally received because they had not yet been informed of the new ground rules for home health payments. Because of the bizarre incentives against caring for patients with the most complex cases, many home health agencies have also been actively managing the types of patients they care for, trying to avoid or discharge costlier patients.

All of this is bad for patients, and it will likely get worse. Without Congressional action, it may never get better. I truly believe that without significant changes, home health services within Medicare could practically disappear. Home health services would theoretically still be part of the Medicare program, but few if any people with Medicare would be able to receive care in their home simply because there will be nobody there to provide it for them.

The Medicare Home Health Equity Act—which I am introducing today with Senator COLLINS and 12 other colleagues—responds to this crisis and attempts to save home health care within the Medicare program.

This bill addresses a variety of payment and regulatory issues, all of which have impeded or prevented home health agencies from providing high-quality, efficient care. Two provisions are particularly critical.

First, as I have mentioned, home health agencies currently have little incentive to provide care for sicker and costlier patients. In fact, because more complex patients put an agency at risk of exceeding the annual per patient budget that is now in place for each home health agency, there is actually an incentive not to care for sicker patients. The result—which shouldn't be a surprise—is that home health agencies are actively trying to avoid these sicker patients, either leaving them without care or leaving them to check in to a more expensive health facility such as a nursing home or a hospital.

The Medicare Home Health Equity Act solves this problem by creating a system of ''extra'' payments for sicker patients—sometimes these are called ''outlier'' payments. Under this plan, home health agencies would be assured from the start that they could receive extra payments for patients who meet the criteria for ''sicker'' patients. This way, we can remove the incentive for home health agencies to try to deny care to seniors with complex cases.

The second crucial provision in the bill is something similar to a last-minute pardon from the governor. In addition to all of the problems they have faced in the last couple of years, home health agencies are scheduled to take another huge payment cut—about 15% of the total amount they receive from Medicare—in October of 2000. I fear that this cut would truly be the death-knell for the industry. We cannot allow this radical payment reduction to take place.

In addition to these core provisions, the Collins-Bond bill deals with a variety of payment and regulatory issues, all designed to make sure that Medicare recipients continue to have access to quality home health care and that the home health agencies are permitted to provide that care in an efficient manner.

I would like to commend Senator COLLINS for her leadership on this issue. I am pleased that we were able to develop a joint bill so that we could unite our forces behind one bipartisan legislative vehicle and one bipartisan solution. It is also encouraging to see that all of the national trade associations that represent home health agencies are supporting this bill. Finally, I would like to again thank this bill's cosponsors for supporting this effort and for helping to raise awareness that there is a home health crisis that desperately needs our attention in Congress.

I for one pledge to do my best to maintain seniors access to home health care. We cannot allow home health services within the Medicare program to disappear. It doesn't make sense for the patients, and it doesn't make sense for Medicare.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1311. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish an eleventh region of the Environmental Protection Agency, comprised solely of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EPA REGION 11

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to create a new regional office for the Environmental Protection Agency to be based in Alaska. I have been concerned for some time about the relationship between the federal government and my constituents. Alaska has always provided unique challenges for federal regulators. Its weather, remoteness, and the special problems caused by them have often resulted in a disconnect between federal regulators and my state. Currently, Alaska is part of Region 10 of the EPA based in Seattle. While it rains a lot in Seattle, the environment of Washington state is much more similar to Oregon and Idaho than Alaska. Alaska comprises 17% of America's total size and faces climactic extremes unheard of in the lower 48.

For example, many people have heard that the unique geography of Los Angeles creates extreme atmospheric inversion conditions that contributes to its air pollution. However, I have been told that my home town of Fairbanks actually has a greater inversion problem than not only Los Angeles, but also anywhere else in the world except for the South Pole.

I also believe that the cost issue is an important one since creation of a regional office would lower the tremendous travel and temporary duty costs faced by lower 48 based EPA staff who must fly back and forth to Alaska. Basing them in Alaska should significantly reduce these travel costs.

I recognize that some may feel that the creation of a new regional office in Alaska is unwise. I would point out that I do not believe that the Seattle office has regularly handled Alaska issues poorly, but I do believe that these issues could be handled better if there was a regional office located in Alaska. Alaska faces wetland challenges like no other state. Our nation has seen a tremendous loss in wetlands in states such as California that has lost over 80% of its original wetlands. In comparison, Alaska has lost less than half of one percent of our nation's wetlands due to development even though we are a large producer of our nation's natural resources. Alaska is a state where wetlands banking is not an appropriate solution to address the loss of wetlands in California. Alaska's wetlands are also very different than those found in California or anywhere else in our nation. Much of Alaska's wetlands are frozen for all but a few months of the year.

Even the Clean Air Act has a different application in Alaska. Low sulfur diesel in the lower 48 for on-road usage is not appropriate for my state where the percentage of diesel used for on-road uses is minuscule compared to that of the off-road uses. This situation is reversed in every other state. Fortunately, the EPA has seen fit to waive the low sulfur diesel requirement until a new lower national standard for both off and on-road diesel is in place during the next decade. However, we need to ensure that all federal regulations put into place reflect the realities of every state in our nation. Creation of a new Alaska based regional office of the EPA would be a firm step forward towards this goal.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill in order to make the EPA more efficient and responsive to some unique environmental challenges in my state.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be included in the RECORD.

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF EPA REGION FOR ALASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall establish—

(1) an eleventh region of the Environmental Protection Agency, comprised solely of the State of Alaska; and

(2) a regional office for the region located in the State.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 51

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 51, a bill to reauthorize the Federal programs to prevent violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 85

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 85, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on vaccines to 25 cents per dose.

S. 242

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 242, a bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require the labeling of imported meat and meat food products.

S. 285

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore the link between the maximum amount of earnings by blind individuals permitted without demonstrating ability to engage in substantial gainful activity and the exempt amount permitted in determining excess earnings under the earnings test.

S. 343

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for 100 percent of the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 386, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for tax-exempt bond financing of certain electric facilities.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 427, a bill to improve congressional deliberation on proposed Federal private sector mandates, and for other purposes.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 472

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) were added as cosponsors of S. 472, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide certain medicare beneficiaries with an exemption to the financial limitations imposed on physical, speech-language pathology, and occupational therapy services under part B of the medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 600

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 600, a bill to combat the crime of international trafficking and to protect the rights of victims.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) 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. 642

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Farm and Ranch Risk Management Accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 761

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) were added as cosponsors of S. 761, a bill to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and for other purposes.

S. 775

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 775, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a feasibility study for applying airport bubbles as a method of identifying, assessing, and reducing the adverse environmental impacts of airport ground and flight operations and improving the overall quality of the environment, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to provide for full parity with respect to health insurance coverage for certain severe biologically-based mental illnesses and to prohibit limits on the number of mental illness-related hospital days and outpatient visits that are covered for all mental illnesses.

S. 800

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to promote and enhance public safety through the use of 9–1–1 as the universal emergency assistance number, further deployment of wireless 9–1–1 service, support of States in upgrading 9–1–1 capabilities and related functions, encouragement of construction and operation of seamless, ubiquitous, and reliable networks for personal wireless services, and for other purposes.

S. 821

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 821, a bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops.

S. 826

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 826, a bill to limit the acquisition by the United States of land located in a State in which 25 percent or more of the land in that State is owned by the United States.

S. 879

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) 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. 881

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 881, a bill to ensure confidentiality with respect to medical records and health care-related information, and for other purposes.

S. 965

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 965, a bill to restore a United States voluntary contribution to the United Nations Population Fund.

S. 1043

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1043, a bill to provide freedom from regulation by the Federal Communications Commission for the Internet.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1053, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to incorporate certain provisions of the transportation conformity regulations, as in effect on March 1, 1999.

S. 1074

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1074, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to waive the 24-month waiting period for medicare coverage of individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), and to provide medicare coverage of drugs and biologicals used for the treatment of ALS or for the alleviation of symptoms relating to ALS.

S. 1139

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1139, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to civil penalties for unruly passengers of air carriers and to provide for the protection of employees providing air safety information, and for other purposes.

S. 1155

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 1197

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1197, a bill to prohibit the importation of products made with dog or cat fur, to prohibit the sale, manufacture, offer for sale, transportation, and distribution of products made with dog or cat fur in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1225

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1225, a bill to provide for a rural education initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a new prospective payment system for Federally-qualified health centers and rural health clinics.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, supra.

SENATE RESOLUTION 128—DESIGNATING MARCH 2000, AS ''ARTS EDUCATION MONTH''

Mr. COCHRAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 128

Whereas arts literacy is a fundamental purpose of schooling for all students;

Whereas arts education stimulates, develops and refines many cognitive and creative skills, critical thinking and nimbleness in judgment, creativity and imagination, cooperative decisionmaking, leadership, high-level literacy and communication, and the capacity for problem posing and problem-solving;

Whereas arts education contributes significantly to the creation of flexible, adaptable, and knowledgeable workers who will be needed in the 21st century economy;

Whereas arts education improves teaching and learning;

Whereas when parents and families, artists, arts organizations, businesses, local civic and cultural leaders, and institutions are actively engaged in instructional programs, arts education is more successful;

Whereas effective teachers of the arts should be encouraged to continue to learn and grow in mastery of their art form as well as in their teaching competence;

Whereas the 1999 study, entitled ''Gaining the Arts Advantage: Lessons from School Districts that Value Arts Education'', found that the literacy, education, programs, learning and growth described in the preceding clauses contribute to successful districtwide arts education;

Whereas the 1997 National Assessment of Educational Progress reported that students lack sufficient opportunity for participatory learning in the arts;

Whereas educators, schools, students, and other community members recognize the importance of arts education; and

Whereas arts programs, arts curriculum, and other arts activities in schools across the Nation should be encouraged and publicly recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF ARTS EDUCATION MONTH.

The Senate—

(1) designates March 2000, as ''Arts Education Month''; and

(2) encourages schools, students, educators, parents, and other community members to engage in activities designed to—

(A) celebrate the positive impact and public benefits of the arts;

(B) encourage all schools to integrate the arts into the school curriculum;

(C) spotlight the relationship between the arts and student learning;

(D) demonstrate how community involvement in the creation and implementation of arts policies enriches schools;

(E) recognize school administrators and faculty who provide quality arts education to students;

(F) provide professional development opportunities in the arts for teachers;

(G) create opportunities for students to experience the relationship between participation in the arts and developing the life skills necessary for future personal and professional success;

(H) increase, encourage, and ensure comprehensive, sequential arts learning for all students;

(I) honor individual, class, and student group achievement in the arts; and

(J) increase awareness and accessibility to live performances, and original works of art.

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, today I am submitting a Senate Resolution to designate March, 2000 as Arts Education Month. This legislation complements S. 1293, the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act, which I introduced earlier this week.

Instruction in music, visual arts, theater and dance occurs in schools across the nation. There is growing awareness of arts education as a serious academic subject with a list of benefits that include ensuring America's arts traditions, higher I.Q.'s, better SAT scores, better math and language skills, less juvenile delinquency, better chances of

higher education, and increased job opportunities.

The National Assessment of Education Progress, The College Board, The U.S. Department of Justice, The National Endowment for the Arts, and scientific research on the brain have all recently reported evidence of the multiple advantages of arts instruction. For example, the July 5, 1999 issue of Time magazine has a report titled, ''Fingers, Brains and Mozart'' which highlights recent brain research and the positive effects of music instruction.

It is time for the United States Senate to recognize the achievements and efforts in arts education in all schools. I hope that by designating March, 2000 as Arts Education Month, more schools will engage in activities that showcase celebrate, reward and provide new arts experiences.

I invite all of my colleagues to join me in sponsoring Arts Education Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 129—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES FOR YEARS OCTOBER 1, 1999 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2000 AND OCTOBER 1, 2000 TO FEBRUARY 28, 2001 BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 129

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized from October 1, 1999, through September 30, 2000, and October 1, 2000, through February 28, 2001 in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 1999, through September 30, 2000, under this resolution shall not exceed $2,924,935.

(b) For the period October 1, 2000, through February 28, 2001, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $1,248,068.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 2000, and February 28, 2001, respectively.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 1999 through September 30, 2000, and October 1, 2000, through February 28, 2001, to be paid from the Appropriation account for ''Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations.''

SENATE RESOLUTION—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT HAITI SHOULD CONDUCT FREE, FAIR, TRANSPARENT, AND PEACEFUL ELECTIONS

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. LUGAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 130

Expressing the sense of the Senate that Haiti should conduct free, fair, transparent, and peaceful elections.

Whereas Rene Preval was elected president of Haiti on December 17, 1995, and inaugurated on February 7, 1996;

Whereas a political impasse between President Preval and the Haitian Parliament over the past 2 years has stalled democratic development and contributed to the Haitian people's political disillusionment;

Whereas Haiti's economic development is stagnant, living conditions are deplorable, and democratic institutions have yet to become effective;

Whereas Haiti's political leaders propose free, fair, and transparent elections for local and national legislative bodies; and

Whereas Haiti's new independent Provisional Electoral Council has scheduled those elections for November and December 1999: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the provisional Electoral Council of Haiti for its decision to hold elections for 19 senate seats, providing for a transparent resolution of the disputed 1997 elections;

(2) urges the Government of Haiti to actively engage in dialogue with all elements of Haitian society to further a self-sustainable democracy;

(3) encourages the Government and all political parties in Haiti to proceed toward conducting free, fair, transparent, and peaceful elections as scheduled, in the presence of domestic and international observers, without pressure or interference;

(4) urges the Clinton Administration and the international community to continue to play a positive role in Haiti's economic and political development;

(5) urges the United Nations to provide appropriate technical support for the elections and to maximize the use of United Nations civilian police monitors of the CIVPOL mission during the election period;

(6) encourages the Clinton Administration and the international community to provide all appropriate assistance for the coming elections;

(7) encourages the Government of Haiti to adopt adequate security measures in preparation for the proposed elections;

(8) urges all elements of Haitian civil society, including the political leaders of Haiti, to publicly renounce violence and promote a climate of security; and

(9) urges the United States and other members of the international community to continue support toward a lasting and committed transition to democracy in Haiti.

SENATE RESOLUTION 131—RELATING TO THE RETIREMENT OF RON KAVULICK

Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 131

Whereas, Ron Kavulick will retire on June 30, 1999, from service to the United States Senate after twenty years as a member of the staff of the Official Reporters of Debates;

Whereas, he has served the United States Senate with honor and distinction since joining the staff of the Official Reporters of Debates on October 22, 1979;

Whereas, his self-determination and hard work as an official reporter resulted in his appointment to the position of Chief Reporter on May 22, 1995;

Whereas, Ron Kavulick, as Chief Reporter of the Congressional Record, has at all times executed the important duties and responsibilities of his office with dedication and excellence; and

Whereas, Ron Kavulick has demonstrated exemplary service to the United States Senate as an institution and leaves a legacy of superior and professional service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate expresses its deep appreciation and gratitude to Ron Kavulick for his years of faithful service to his country and to the United States Senate.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Ron and Pat Kavulick.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

BROWNBACK AMENDMENT NO. 1118

Mr. BROWNBACK proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1234) making

appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SILK ROAD STRATEGY ACT OF 1999.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Silk Road Strategy Act of 1999''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE OF 1961.—Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 12—SUPPORT FOR THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE OF THE COUNTRIES OF THE SOUTH CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA

''SEC. 499. UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO PROMOTE RECONCILIATION AND RECOVERY FROM REGIONAL CONFLICTS.

''(a) PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE.—The purposes of assistance under this section include—

''(1) the creation of the basis for reconciliation between belligerents;

''(2) the promotion of economic development in areas of the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia impacted by civil conflict and war; and

''(3) the encouragement of broad regional cooperation among countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia that have been destabilized by internal conflicts.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to provide humanitarian assistance and economic reconstruction assistance for the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia to support the activities described in subsection (c).

''(2) DEFINITION OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—In this subsection, the term 'humanitarian assistance' means assistance to meet humanitarian needs, including needs for food, medicine, medical supplies and equipment, education, and clothing.

''(c) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—Activities that may be supported by assistance under subsection (b) include—

''(1) providing for the humanitarian needs of victims of the conflicts;

''(2) facilitating the return of refugees and internally displaced persons to their homes; and

''(3) assisting in the reconstruction of residential and economic infrastructure destroyed by war.

''SEC. 499A. ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE.

''(a) PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE.—The purpose of assistance under this section is to foster economic growth and development, including the conditions necessary for regional economic cooperation, in the South Caucasus and Central Asia.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—To carry out the purpose of subsection (a), the President is authorized to provide assistance for the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia to support the activities described in subsection (c).

''(c) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—In addition to the activities described in section 498, activities supported by assistance under subsection (b) should support the development of the structures and means necessary for the growth of private sector economies based upon market principles.

''SEC. 499B. DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE.

''(a) PURPOSE OF PROGRAMS.—The purposes of programs under this section include—

''(1) to develop the physical infrastructure necessary for regional cooperation among the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia; and

''(2) to encourage closer economic relations and to facilitate the removal of impediments to cross-border commerce among those countries and the United States and other developed nations.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR PROGRAMS.—To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the following types of programs for the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia may be used to support the activities described in subsection (c):

''(1) Activities by the Export-Import Bank to complete the review process for eligibility for financing under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

''(2) The provision of insurance, reinsurance, financing, or other assistance by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

''(3) Assistance under section 661 of this Act (relating to the Trade and Development Agency).

''(c) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—Activities that may be supported by programs under subsection (b) include promoting actively the participation of United States companies and investors in the planning, financing, and construction of infrastructure for communications, transportation, including air transportation, and energy and trade including highways, railroads, port facilities, shipping, banking, insurance, telecommunications networks, and gas and oil pipelines.

''SEC. 499C. BORDER CONTROL ASSISTANCE.

''(a) PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE.—The purpose of assistance under this section includes the assistance of the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia to secure their borders and implement effective controls necessary to prevent the trafficking of illegal narcotics and the proliferation of technology and materials related to weapons of mass destruction (as defined in section 2332a(c)(2) of title 18, United States Code), and to contain and inhibit transnational organized criminal activities.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—To carry out the purpose of subsection (a), the President is authorized to provide assistance to the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia to support the activities described in subsection (c).

''(c) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—Activities that may be supported by assistance under subsection (b) include assisting those countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia in developing capabilities to maintain national border guards, coast guard, and customs controls.

''SEC. 499D. STRENGTHENING DEMOCRACY, TOLERANCE, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL SOCIETY.

''(a) PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE.—The purpose of assistance under this section is to promote institutions of democratic government and to create the conditions for the growth of pluralistic societies, including religious tolerance and respect for internationally recognized human rights.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—To carry out the purpose of subsection (a), the President is authorized to provide the following types of assistance to the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia:

''(1) Assistance for democracy building, including programs to strengthen parliamentary institutions and practices.

''(2) Assistance for the development of nongovernmental organizations.

''(3) Assistance for development of independent media.

''(4) Assistance for the development of the rule of law, a strong independent judiciary, and transparency in political practice and commercial transactions.

''(5) International exchanges and advanced professional training programs in skill areas central to the development of civil society.

''(6) Assistance to promote increased adherence to civil and political rights under section 116(e) of this Act.

''(c) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—Activities that may be supported by assistance under subsection (b) include activities that are designed to advance progress toward the development of democracy.

''SEC. 499E. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITIES.

''(a) ASSISTANCE THROUGH GOVERNMENTS AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Assistance under this chapter may be provided to governments or through nongovernmental organizations.

''(b) USE OF ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUNDS.—Except as otherwise provided, any funds that have been allocated under chapter 4 of part II for assistance for the independent states of the former Soviet Union may be used in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

''(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Assistance under this chapter shall be provided on such terms and conditions as the President may determine.

''(d) AVAILABLE AUTHORITIES.—The authority in this chapter to provide assistance for the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia is in addition to the authority to provide such assistance under the FREEDOM Support Act (22 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.) or any other Act, and the authorities applicable to the provision of assistance under chapter 11 may be used to provide assistance under this chapter.

''SEC. 499F. DEFINITIONS.

''In this chapter:

''(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

''(2) COUNTRIES OF THE SOUTH CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA.—The term 'countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia' means Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.''.

(c) RESTRICTION ON ASSISTANCE FOR GOVERNMENT OF AZERBAIJAN.—Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act (22 U.S.C. 5812 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) RESTRICTION.—''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) WAIVER.—The restriction on assistance in subsection (a) shall not apply if the President determines, and so certifies to Congress, that the application of the restriction would not be in the national interests of the United States.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 102(a) of the FREEDOM Support Act (Public Law 102–511) is amended in paragraphs (2) and (4) by striking each place it appears ''this Act)'' and inserting ''this Act and chapter 12 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961)''.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 104 of the FREEDOM Support Act (22 U.S.C. 5814) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) with respect to the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia—

''(A) an identification of the progress made by the United States in accomplishing the policy described in section 3 of the Silk Road Strategy Act of 1999;

''(B) an evaluation of the degree to which the assistance authorized by chapter 12 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 has accomplished the purposes identified in that chapter;

''(C) a description of the progress being made by the United States to negotiate a bilateral agreement relating to the protection of United States direct investment in, and other business interests with, each country; and

''(D) recommendations of any additional initiatives that should be undertaken by the United States to implement the policy and purposes contained in the Silk Road Strategy Act of 1999.''.

McCONNELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1119

Mr. McCONNELL (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. KENNEDY) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1118 proposed by Mr. BROWNBACK to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 9, line 3 strike all after ''(c) Restriction through line 12 States.''.

BROWNBACK AMENDMENT NO. 1120

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR SUNDANESE INDIGENOUS GROUPS.

The President, acting through the appropriate Federal agencies, is authorized to provide humanitarian assistance, including food, directly to the National Democratic Alliance participants and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement operating outside of the Operation Lifeline Sudan structure.

THOMAS (AND ENZI) AMENDMENT NO. 1121

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. THOMAS (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section and renumber the remaining sections accordingly:

''SEC. . PROHIBITION ON THE RETURN OF VETERANS MEMORIAL OBJECTS TO FOREIGN NATIONS WITHOUT SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION IN LAW.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding section 2572 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the President may not transfer a veterans memorial object to a foreign country or entity controlled by a foreign government, or otherwise transfer or convey such object to any person or entity for purposes of the ultimate transfer or conveyance of such object to a foreign country or entity controlled by a foreign government, unless specifically authorized by law.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENTITY CONTROLLED BY A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.—The term ''entity controlled by a foreign government'' has the meaning given that term in section 2536(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) VETERANS MEMORIAL OBJECT.—The term ''veterans memorial object'' means any object, including a physical structure or portion thereof, that—

(A) is located at a cemetery of the National Cemetery System, war memorial, or military installation in the United States;

(B) is dedicated to, or otherwise memorializes, the death in combat or combat-related duties of members of the United States Armed Forces; and

(C) was brought to the United States from aboard as a memorial of combat abroad.''

ASHCROFT (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1122

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY and Mr. CRAIG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. REQUIREMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF ANY UNILATERAL AGRICULTURAL OR MEDICAL SANCTION.—(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''agricultural commodity'' has the meaning given the term in section 402 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1732).

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''agricultural commodity'' does not include any agricultural commodity that is used to facilitate the development or production of a chemical or biological weapon.

(2) AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM.—The term ''agricultural program'' means—

(A) any program administered under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691 et. seq.);

(B) any program administered under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431);

(C) any commercial sale of agricultural commodities, including a commercial sale of an agricultural commodity that is prohibited under a unilateral agricultural sanction that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(D) any export financing (including credits or credit guarantees) for agricultural commodities.

(3) JOINT RESOLUTION.—The term ''joint resolution'' means—

(A) in the case of subsection (b)(1)(B), only a joint resolution introduced within 10 session days of Congress after the date on which the report of the President under subsection (b)(1)(A) is received by Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress approves the report of the President pursuant to section ____(b)(1)(A) of the _____ Act ____, transmitted on _____.'', with the blank completed with the appropriate date; and

(B) in the case of subsection (e)(2), only a joint resolution introduced within 10 session days of Congress after the date on which the report of the President under subsection (e)(1) is received by Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress approves the report of the President pursuant to section ____(e)(1) of the _____ Act ____, transmitted on _____.'', with the blank completed with the appropriate date.

(4) MEDICAL DEVICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''medical device'' has the meaning given the term ''device'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''medical device'' does not include any device that is used to facilitate the development or production of a chemical or biological weapon.

(5) MEDICINE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''medicine'' has the meaning given the term ''drug'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''medicine'' does not include any drug that is used to facilitate the development or production of a chemical or biological weapon.

(6) UNILATERAL AGRICULTURAL SANCTION.—The term ''unilateral agricultural sanction'' means any prohibition, restriction, or condition on carrying out an agricultural program with respect to a foreign country or foreign entity that is imposed by the United States for reasons of foreign policy or national security, except in a case in which the United States imposes the measure pursuant to a multilateral regime and the other member countries of that regime have agreed to impose substantially equivalent measures.

(7) UNILATERAL MEDICAL SANCTION.—The term ''unilateral medical sanction'' means any prohibition, restriction, or condition on exports of, or the provision of assistance consisting of, medicine or a medical device with respect to a foreign country or foreign entity that is imposed by the United States for reasons of foreign policy or national security, except in a case in which the United States imposes the measure pursuant to a multilateral regime and the other member countries of that regime have agreed to impose substantially equivalent measures.

(b) RESTRICTION.—

(1) NEW SANCTIONS.—Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not impose a unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction against a foreign country or foreign entity for any fiscal year, unless—

(A) not later than 60 days before the sanction is proposed to be imposed, the President submits a report to Congress that—

(i) describes the activity proposed to be prohibited, restricted, or conditioned; and

(ii) describes the actions by the foreign country or foreign entity that justify the sanction; and

(B) Congress enacts a joint resolution stating the approval of Congress for the report submitted under subparagraph (A).

(2) EXISTING SANCTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), with respect to any unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act for any fiscal year, the President shall immediately cease to implement such sanction.

(B) EXEMPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction imposed with respect to an agricultural program or activity described in subparagraph (B) or (D) of subsection (a)(2).

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The President may impose (or continue to impose) a sanction described in subsection (b) without regard to the procedures required by that subsection—

(1) against a foreign country or foreign entity with respect to which Congress has enacted a declaration of war that is in effect on or after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) to the extent that the sanction would prohibit, restrict, or condition the provision or use of any agricultural commodity that is controlled on—

(A) the United States Munitions List established under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778); or

(B) any control list established under the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 et seq.).

(d) COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—This section shall not affect the prohibition on providing assistance to the government of any country supporting international terrorism that is established by section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371).

(e) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—Any unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction that is imposed pursuant to the procedures described in subsection (b)(1) shall terminate not later than 2 years after the date on which the sanction became effective unless—

(1) not later than 60 days before the date of termination of the sanction, the President submits to Congress a report containing the recommendation of the President for the continuation of the sanction for an additional period of not to exceed 2 years and the request of the President for approval by Congress of the recommendation; and

(2) Congress enacts a joint resolution stating the approval of Congress for the report submitted under paragraph (1).

(f) CONGRESSIONAL PRIORITY PROCEDURES.—

(1) REFERRAL OF REPORT.—A report described in subsection (b)(1)(A) or (e)(1) shall be referred to the appropriate committee or committees of the House of Representatives and to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate.

(2) REFERRAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A joint resolution shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

(B) REPORTING DATE.—A joint resolution referred to in subparagraph (A) may not be reported before the eighth session day of Congress after the introduction of the joint resolution.

(3) DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE.—If the committee to which is referred a joint resolution has not reported the joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 30 session days of Congress after the date of introduction of the joint resolution—

(A) the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution; and

(B) the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House concerned.

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

(A) MOTION TO PROCEED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—When the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged under paragraph (3) from further consideration of, a joint resolution—

(I) it shall be at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for any member of the House concerned to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution; and

(II) all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived.

(ii) PRIVILEGE.—The motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution—

(I) shall be highly privileged in the House of Representatives and privileged in the Senate; and

(II) not debatable.

(iii) AMENDMENTS AND MOTIONS NOT IN ORDER.—The motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution shall not be subject to—

(I) amendment;

(II) a motion to postpone; or

(III) a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business.

(iv) MOTION TO RECONSIDER NOT IN ORDER.—A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(v) BUSINESS UNTIL DISPOSITION.—If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the House concerned until disposed of.

(B) LIMITATIONS ON DEBATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution.

(ii) FURTHER DEBATE LIMITATIONS.—A motion to limit debate shall be in order and shall not be debatable.

(iii) AMENDMENTS AND MOTIONS NOT IN ORDER.—An amendment to, a motion to postpone, a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, a motion to recommit the joint resolution, or a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(C) VOTE ON FINAL PASSAGE.—Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the House concerned, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—An appeal from a decision of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

(5) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by 1 House of a joint resolution of that House, that House receives from the other House a joint resolution, the following procedures shall apply:

(A) NO COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(B) FLOOR PROCEDURE.—With respect to a joint resolution of the House receiving the joint resolution—

(i) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(ii) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(C) DISPOSITION OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF RECEIVING HOUSE.—On disposition of the joint resolution received from the other House, it shall no longer be in order to consider the joint resolution originated in the receiving House.

(6) PROCEDURES AFTER ACTION BY BOTH THE HOUSE AND SENATE.—If a House receives a joint resolution from the other House after the receiving House has disposed of a joint resolution originated in that House, the action of the receiving House with regard to the disposition of the joint resolution originated in that House shall be deemed to be the action of the receiving House with regard to the joint resolution originated in the other House.

(7) RULEMAKING POWER.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such this subsection—

(i) is deemed to be a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution; and

(ii) supersedes other rules only to the extent that this subsection is inconsistent with those rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as the rules relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 1123

Mr. WELLSTONE proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new title:

TITLE—INTERNATIONAL TRAFFICKING OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN VICTIM PROTECTION

SEC. ___01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''International Trafficking of Women and Children Victim Protection Act of 1999''.

SEC. ___02. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The worldwide trafficking of persons has a disproportionate impact on women and girls and has been and continues to be condemned by the international community as a violation of fundamental human rights.

(2) The fastest growing international trafficking business is the trade in women, whereby women and girls seeking a better life, a good marriage, or a lucrative job abroad, unexpectedly find themselves in situations of forced prostitution, sweatshop labor, exploitative domestic servitude, or battering and extreme cruelty.

(3) Trafficked women and children, girls and boys, are often subjected to rape and other forms of sexual abuse by their traffickers and often held as virtual prisoners by their exploiters, made to work in slavery-like conditions, in debt bondage without pay and against their will.

(4) The President, the First Lady, the Secretary of State, the President's Interagency Council on Women, and the Agency for International Development have all identified trafficking in women as a significant problem.

(5) The Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing Conference) called on all governments to take measures, including legislative measures, to provide better protection of the rights of women and girls in trafficking, to address the root factors that put women and girls at risk to traffickers, and to take measures to dismantle the national, regional, and international networks on trafficking.

(6) The United Nations General Assembly, noting its concern about the increasing number of women and girls who are being victimized by traffickers, passed a resolution in 1998 calling upon all governments to criminalize trafficking in women and girls in all its forms and to penalize all those offenders involved, while ensuring that the victims of these practices are not penalized.

(7) Numerous treaties to which the United States is a party address government obligations to combat trafficking, including such treaties as the 1956 Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, which calls for the complete abolition of debt bondage and servile forms of marriage, and the 1957 Abolition of Forced Labor Convention, which undertakes to suppress and requires signatories not to make use of any forced or compulsory labor.

SEC. ___03. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are to condemn and combat the international crime of trafficking in women and children and to assist the victims of this crime by—

(1) setting a standard by which governments are evaluated for their response to trafficking and their treatment of victims;

(2) authorizing and funding an interagency task force to carry out such evaluations and to issue an annual report of its findings to

include the identification of foreign governments that tolerate or participate in trafficking and fail to cooperate with international efforts to prosecute perpetrators;

(3) assisting trafficking victims in the United States by providing humanitarian assistance and by providing them temporary nonimmigrant status in the United States;

(4) assisting trafficking victims abroad by providing humanitarian assistance; and

SEC. ___04. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) TRAFFICKING.—The term ''trafficking'' means the use of deception, coercion, debt bondage, the threat of force, or the abuse of authority to recruit, transport within or across borders, purchase, sell, transfer, receive, or harbor a person for the purpose of placing or holding such person, whether for pay or not, in involuntary servitude, or slavery or slavery-like conditions, or in forced, bonded, or coerced labor.

(2) VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term ''victim of trafficking'' means any person subjected to the treatment described in paragraph (2).

SEC. ___05. INTER-AGENCY TASK FORCE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT TRAFFICKING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the Department of State in the Office of the Secretary of State an Inter-Agency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking (in this section referred to as the ''Task Force''). The Task Force shall be co-chaired by the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Affairs and the Senior Coordinator on International Women's Issues, President's Interagency Council on Women.

(2) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—The members of the Task Force shall be appointed by the Secretary of State. The Task Force shall consist of no more than twelve members.

(3) COMPOSITION.—The Task Force shall include representatives from the—

(A) Violence Against Women Office, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice;

(B) Office of Women in Development, United States Agency for International Development; and

(C) Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Department of State.

(4) STAFF.—The Task Force shall be authorized to retain up to five staff members within the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Affairs, and the President's Interagency Council on Women to prepare the annual report described in subsection (b) and to carry out additional tasks which the Task Force may require. The Task Force shall regularly hold meetings on its activities with nongovernmental organizations.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of State, with the assistance of the Task Force, shall submit a report to Congress describing the status of international trafficking, including—

(1) a list of foreign states where trafficking originates, passes through, or is a destination; and

(2) an assessment of the efforts by the governments described in paragraph (1) to combat trafficking. Such an assessment shall address—

(A) whether any governmental authorities tolerate or are involved in trafficking activities;

(B) which governmental authorities are involved in anti-trafficking activities;

(C) what steps the government has taken toward ending the participation of its officials in trafficking;

(D) what steps the government has taken to prosecute and investigate those officials found to be involved in trafficking;

(E) what steps the government has taken to prohibit other individuals from participating in trafficking, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of individuals involved in trafficking, the criminal and civil penalties for trafficking, and the efficacy of those penalties on reducing or ending trafficking;

(F) what steps the government has taken to assist trafficking victims, including efforts to prevent victims from being further victimized by police, traffickers, or others, grants of stays of deportation, and provision of humanitarian relief, including provision of mental and physical health care and shelter;

(G) whether the government is cooperating with governments of other countries to extradite traffickers when requested;

(H) whether the government is assisting in international investigations of transnational trafficking networks; and

(I) whether the government—

(i) refrains from prosecuting trafficking victims or refrains from other discriminatory treatment towards trafficking victims due to such victims having been trafficked, or the nature of their work, or their having left the country illegally; and

(ii) recognizes the rights of victims and ensures their access to justice.

(c) REPORTING STANDARDS AND INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State shall ensure that United States missions abroad maintain a consistent reporting standard and thoroughly investigate reports of trafficking.

(2) CONTACTS WITH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In compiling data and assessing trafficking for the Human Rights Report and the Inter-Agency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking Annual Report, United States mission personnel shall seek out and maintain contacts with human rights and other nongovernmental organizations, including receiving reports and updates from such organizations, and, when appropriate, investigating such reports.

SEC. ___06. PROTECTION OF TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

(a) NONIMMIGRANT CLASSIFICATION FOR TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.—Section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (R);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (S) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(T) an alien who the Attorney General determines—

''(i) is physically present in the United States, and

''(ii) is or has been a trafficking victim (as defined in section ___04 of the International Trafficking of Women and Children Victim Protection Act of 1999),

for a stay of not to exceed 3 months in the United States, except that any such alien who has filed a petition seeking asylum or who is pursuing civil or criminal action against traffickers shall have the alien's status extended until the petition or litigation reaches its conclusion.''.

(b) WAIVER OF GROUNDS FOR INELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION.—Section 212(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(d)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The Attorney General shall, in the Attorney General's discretion, waive the application of subsection (a) (other than paragraph (3)(E)) in the case of a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(T), if the Attorney General considers it to be in the national interest to do so.''.

(c) INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE.—Section 1584 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) inserting ''(a)'' before ''Whoever'';

(2) by striking ''or'' after ''servitude'';

(3) by inserting ''transfers, receives or harbors any person into involuntary servitude, or'' after ''servitude,''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) In this section, the term 'involuntary servitude' includes trafficking, slavery-like practices in which persons are forced into labor through non-physical means, such as debt bondage, blackmail, fraud, deceit, isolation, and psychological pressure.''.

(d) TRAFFICKING VICTIM REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State shall jointly promulgate regulations for law enforcement personnel, immigration officials, and Foreign Service officers requiring that—

(1) Federal, State and local law enforcement, immigration officials, and Foreign Service officers shall be trained in identifying and responding to trafficking victims;

(2) trafficking victims shall not be jailed, fined, or otherwise penalized due to having been trafficked, or nature of work;

(3) trafficking victims shall have access to legal assistance, information about their rights, and translation services;

(4) trafficking victims shall be provided protection if, after an assessment of security risk, it is determined the trafficking victim is susceptible to further victimization; and

(5) prosecutors shall take into consideration the safety and integrity of trafficked persons in investigating and prosecuting traffickers.

SEC. ___07. ASSISTANCE TO TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

(a) IN THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services is authorized to provide, through the Office of Refugee Resettlement, assistance to trafficking victims and their children in the United States, including mental and physical health services, and shelter.

(b) IN OTHER COUNTRIES.—The President, acting through the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to provide programs and activities to assist trafficking victims and their children abroad, including provision of mental and physical health services, and shelter. Such assistance should give special priority to programs by nongovernmental organizations which provide direct services and resources for trafficking victims.

SEC. ___08. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INTER-AGENCY TASK FORCE.—To carry out the purposes of section ___05, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF HHS.—To carry out the purposes of section ___08(a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.—To carry out the purposes of section ___08(b), there are authorized to be appropriated to the President $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(d) PROHIBITION.—Funds made available to carry out this title shall not be available for the procurement of weapons or ammunition.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 1124

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. WELLSTONE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

TITLE VI—ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROJECTS IN CHINA AND TIBET

SEC. 601. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this title to establish principles governing the conduct of United States economic cooperation projects in the People's Republic of China and in Tibet.

(b) PRINCIPLES.—It is the sense of Congress that any United States economic cooperation project shall, within its facilities and those of its suppliers in the People's Republic of China or Tibet, do the following:

(1) Prohibit the manufacture of goods or products by bonded labor or forced labor, within prison camps or as part of reform-through-labor or reeducation-through-labor programs.

(2) Provide wages that meet workers' basic needs and provide fair and decent working hours, including at a minimum, adhering to the wage and hour guidelines under the national labor laws and policies of the People's Republic of China.

(3) Use production methods that do not negatively affect the occupational safety and health of workers.

(4) Prohibit the use of corporal punishment, as well as any physical, sexual, or verbal abuse or harassment, of workers.

(5) Refrain from seeking police or military intervention to prevent workers from exercising their rights.

(6) Promote the following freedoms among their employees and the employees of their suppliers: freedom of association and assembly (including the right to form unions and to bargain collectively); freedom of expression; and freedom from arbitrary arrest or detention.

(7) Prohibit discrimination in hiring, remuneration, or promotion based on age, gender, marital status, pregnancy, ethnicity, or region of origin.

(8) Prohibit discrimination in hiring, remuneration, or promotion based on labor, political, or religious activity, on involvement in demonstrations, past records of arrests or internal exile for peaceful protest, or on membership in organizations committed to nonviolent social or political change.

(9) Use environmentally responsible methods of production that have minimal adverse impact on land, air, and water quality.

(10) Prohibit child labor, including at a minimum, complying with guidelines on minimum age for employment under the national labor laws of the People's Republic of China.

(c) PROMOTION OF PRINCIPLES BY OTHER NATIONS.—The Secretary of State shall forward a copy of the principles set forth in subsection (b) to each member nation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and encourage such nation to promote principles similar to such principles.

SEC. 602. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each United States parent company conducting a United States economic cooperation project in the People's Republic of China or Tibet shall register with the Secretary of State and indicate whether such company agrees to implement the principles set forth in section 601(b).

(2) PROHIBITION ON FEE.—No fee shall be required for purposes of registration under paragraph (1).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 603. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORTS BY UNITED STATES PARENT COMPANIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each United States parent company conducting a United States economic cooperation project in the People's Republic of China or Tibet shall submit to the Secretary of State a report describing such company's adherence to the principles set forth in section 601(b) during the one-year period ending on the date of such report.

(2) FORM.—The report shall be submitted on a form furnished by the Secretary.

(3) SUBMITTAL DATES.—A United States parent company shall submit the report required by paragraph (1) not later than one year after the date on which the company registers under section 602 and annually thereafter.

(b) REVIEW OF REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review each report submitted under subsection (a) to determine whether the United States parent company submitting such report is adhering to the principles set forth in section 601(b).

(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Secretary may request additional information from a United States parent company for purposes of the review of its report under this subsection, and may use other sources of information to verify the information contained in such report.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and to the Secretariat of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development a report assessing the adherence of United States parent companies subject to the reporting requirement in subsection (a) to the principles set forth in section 601(b). Each report shall cover the one-year period ending on the date of such report.

SEC. 604. EXPORT MARKETING SUPPORT.

(a) SUPPORT.—A department or agency of the United States Government may intercede with a foreign government or foreign national regarding export marketing activity in the People's Republic of China or Tibet on behalf of a United States parent company subject to the reporting requirement in section 603(a) only if the United States parent company adheres to the principles set forth in section 601(b).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ADHERE.—The terms ''adhere to'', ''adhering to'', and ''adherence to'', in the case of the principles set forth in section 601(b), mean—

(A) agreeing to implement the principles;

(B) implementing the principles by taking good faith measures with respect to each principle; and

(C) reporting accurately to the Secretary of State on the measures taken to implement the principles.

(2) INTERCEDE WITH A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT OR FOREIGN NATIONAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''intercede with a foreign government or foreign national'' includes any contact by an officer or employee of the United States with officials of any foreign government or foreign national involving or contemplating any effort to assist in selling a good, service, or technology in the People's Republic of China or Tibet.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term does not include multilateral or bilateral government-to-government trade negotiations intended to resolve trade issues which may affect United States parent companies which do not adhere to the principles set forth in section 601(b).

(3) UNITED STATES ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROJECT.—The term ''United States economic cooperation project'' means the following:

(A) An equity joint venture, cooperative joint venture, or wholly foreign-owned enterprise established under the laws of the People's Republic of China in which—

(i) a corporation, partnership, wholly-owned subsidiary, or other business association organized under the laws of the United States is an investor; or

(ii) a corporation, partnership, or other business association organized under the laws of a country other than the United States, or under the laws of a territory or possession of a country other than the United States, which is wholly owned by a corporation, partnership, or other business association organized under the laws of the United States, is an investor and which employs more than 50 individuals in the People's Republic of China or Tibet.

(B) A branch office or representative office in the People's Republic of China or Tibet of—

(i) a corporation, partnership, wholly-owned subsidiary, or other business association organized under the laws of the United States; or

(ii) a corporation, partnership, or other business association organized under the laws of a country other than the United States, or under the laws of a territory or possession of a country other than the United States, which is wholly owned by a corporation, partnership, or other business association organized under the laws of the United States, which employs more than 25 individuals in the People's Republic of China or Tibet.

(4) ORGANIZED UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ''organized under the laws of the United States'' means organized under the laws of the United States, any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

(5) UNITED STATES PARENT COMPANY.—The term ''United States parent company'' means a corporation, partnership, or other business association organized under the laws of the United States which is—

(A) the direct investor in a United States economic cooperation project as described in paragraph (3)(A)(i), or the sole owner of the investor in a United States economic cooperation project as described in paragraph (3)(A)(ii); or

(B) the registrant in the People's Republic of China of a branch office or representative office as described in paragraph (3)(B)(i), or the sole owner of the registrant of a branch office or representative office in the People's Republic of China or Tibet as described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii).

SMITH AMENDMENT NO. 1125

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SMITH of Oregon) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section and renumber any remaining sections accordingly:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CITIZENS DEMOCRACY CORPS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) with regard to promoting economic development and open, democratic countries in

the former Soviet Union and Central Eastern Europe, the Committee commends the work of the Citizens Democracy Corps (CDC), which utilizes senior-level U.S. business volunteers to assist enterprises, institutions, and local governments abroad. Their work demonstrates the significant impact that USAID support of a U.S. non-governmental organization (NGO) program can have on the key U.S. foreign policy priorities of promoting broad-based, stable economic growth and open, market-oriented economies in transitioning economies. By drawing upon the skills and voluntary spirit of U.S. businessmen and women to introduce companies, CDC furthers the goals of the Freedom of Support Act (NIS) and Support for Eastern European Democracy (SEED), forging positive, lasting connections between the U.S. and these countries. The Committee endorses CDC's very cost-effective programs and believes they should be supported and expanded not only in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but in transitioning and developing economies throughout the world.

SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY—SISTERS, OREGON

SMITH AMENDMENT NO. 1126

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. SMITH of Oregon submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 416) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the city of Sisters, Oregon, a certain parcel of land for use in connection with a sewage treatment facility; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, strike the quotation marks.

On page 3, line 14, strike ''the following''.

At the end, add the following:

''(e) AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE LAND IN SUBSTITUTION.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall acquire land within Oregon, and within or in the vicinity of the Deschutes National Forest, of an acreage equivalent to that of the land conveyed under subsection (a). Any lands acquired shall be added to and administered as part of the Deschutes National Forest.''

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

McCONNELL (AND LEAHY) AMENDMENT NO. 1127

Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 11, line 12 strike everything after the word ''loans'' and through the word ''provision'' on line 22.

On page 18, line 21, after the colon insert the following:

Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds appropriated under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be made available for political, economic, humanitarian, and associated support activities for Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraqi Liberation Act (Public Law 105–338): *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days prior to the obligation of these funds, the Secretary shall inform the Committees on Appropriations of the purpose and amount of the proposed obligation of funds under this provision:

McCAIN (AND STEVENS) AMENDMENT NO. 1128

Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. STEVENS)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 7, line 3 strike the language beginning with ''but shall be'' through line 16 ''Appropriations.''

LEAHY (AND McCONNELL) AMENDMENT NO. 1129

Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 7, line 22, after the colon, insert the following:

Provided further, That funds made available to grantees may be invested pending expenditure for project purposes when authorized by the President of the Foundation: *Provided further*, That interest earned shall be used only for the purposes for which the grant was made: *Provided further*, That this authority applies to interest earned both prior to and following enactment of this provision: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 505(a)(2) of the African Development Foundation Act, in exceptional circumstances the board of directors of the Foundation may waive the $250,000 limitation contained in that section with respect to a project: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations before each time such waiver authority is exercised:

COVERDELL (AND STEVENS) AMENDMENT NO. 1130

Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. COVERDELL (for himself and Mr. STEVENS)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 8, line 6, after the word ''AIDS'' insert the following: ''and including up to $5,500,000 which may be made available to establish an International Health Center at Morehouse School of Medicine''.

McCONNELL (AND LEAHY) AMENDMENT NO. 1131

Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 22, line 5, before the word ''Ukraine'' insert the words ''Government of''.

On page 22, line 6, after ''1999'', insert the following: '', including taking effective measures to end corruption by government officials''.

LEAHY (AND McCONNELL) AMENDMENT NO. 1132

Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 22, line 15, before the period, insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds made available for Ukraine, $3,500,000 shall be made available for the destruction of stockpiles of anti-personnel landmines in Ukraine''.

LEAHY AMENDMENT NO. 1133

Mr. LEAHY proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 10, line 10, after the colon, insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That the proportion of funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for biodiversity activities should be at least the same as the proportion of funds that were made available for such activities from funds appropriated by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1995 (P.L. 103–306) to carry out sections 103 through 106 and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961''.

LEAHY AMENDMENT NO. 1134

Mr. LEAHY proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 32, line 12, delete everything beginning with ''For'' through ''expended'' on page 33, line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying direct or indirect loans and loan guarantees, as the President may determine, for which funds have been appropriated or otherwise made available for programs within the International Affairs Budget Function 150, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts owed to the United States as a result of concessional loans made to eligible countries, pursuant to parts IV and V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including necessary expenses for the administration of activities carried out under these parts), and of modifying concessional credit agreements with least developed countries, as authorized under section 411 of the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 as amended; and concessional loans, guarantees and credit agreements with any country in sub-Saharan Africa, as authorized under section 572 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Act, 1989 (Public Law 100–461); $43,000,000, to remain available until expended; provided that any limitation of subsection (e) of Section 411 of the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to the extent that limitation applies to sub-Saharan African countries shall not apply to funds appropriated hereunder or previously appropriate.

ROTH (AND LAUTENBERG) AMENDMENT NO. 1135

Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MANAGEMENT OF UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN UKRAINE

SEC. 580. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Ukraine is a major European nation as it has the second largest territory and sixth largest population of all the States of Europe.

(2) Ukraine has important geopolitical and economic roles to play within Central and Eastern Europe.

(3) A strong, stable, and secure Ukraine serves the interests of peace and stability in all of Europe, which are important national security interests of the United States.

(4) Ukraine is a member State of the Council of Europe, the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Central European Initiative, and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Conference, is a participant in the Partnership for Peace program of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and has entered into a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with the European Union.

(5) The Government of Ukraine has clearly articulated its country's aspirations to become fully integrated into European and transatlantic institutions, and, in pursuit of the attainment of that aspiration, the government of Ukraine has requested associate membership in the European Union with the intent of eventually becoming a full member of the European Union.

(6) It is the policy of the United States to support the aspiration of Ukraine to assume its rightful place among the European and transatlantic community of democratic States and in European and transatlantic institutions.

(7) In the United States Government, the responsibility for management of United States interests in Ukraine would be most effectively performed by the officials who perform the responsibility for management of United States interests in Europe, and a designation of those officials to do so would strongly underscore and most effectively support attainment of the United States objective to build a Europe whole and free.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should designate the Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs to perform, through the Bureau of European Affairs of the Department of State, the responsibilities of the Department of State for the management of United States interests in Ukraine.

HELMS (AND MACK) AMENDMENT NO. 1136

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. MACK)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 38, line 10, strike ''$785,000,000'' and insert ''$776,600,000''.

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 1137

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO ACQUISITION OF USAID FACILITIES.

(a) Funds appropriated under the heading ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development'' may be made available for acquisition of office space exceeding $5,000,000 of the United States Agency for International Development only if the appropriate congressional committees are notified at least 15 days in advance in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394–1)

(b) As used in this section, the term ''acquisition'' shall have the same meaning as in the Foreign Service Building Act of 1926.

HELMS (AND DEWINE) AMENDMENT NO. 1138

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. DEWINE)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

Beginning on page 92 delete section 560 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

ASSISTANCE FOR HAITI

SEC. 560. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in providing assistance to Haiti, the President should place a priority on the following areas:

(1) aggressive action to support the institution of the Hitian National Police, including support for efforts by the leadership and the Inspector General to purge corrupt and politicized elements from the Haitian National Police;

(2) steps to ensure that any elections undertaken in Haiti with United States assistance are full, free, fair, transparent, and democratic;

(3) a program designed to develop the indigenous human rights monitoring capacity;

(4) steps to facilitate the continued privatization of state-owned enterprises; and

(5) a sustained agricultural development program.

(b) REPORT.—Beginning six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and six months thereafter, the president shall submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives wit regard to—

(1) the status of each of the governmental institutions envisioned in the 1987 Haitian constitution, including an assessment of whether or not these institutions and officials hold positions on the basis of a regular, constitutional process;

(2) the status of the privatization (or placement under long-term private management or concession) of the major public entities, including a detailed assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti has completed all required incorporating documents, the transfer of assets, and the eviction of unauthorized occupants of the land or facility;

(3) the status of efforts to re-sign and implement the lapsed bilateral Repatriation Agreement and an assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti has been cooperating with the United States in halting illegal emigration from Haiti;

(4) the status of the Government of Haiti's efforts to conduct thorough investigations of extrajudicial and political killings and—

(A) an assessment of whether or not substantial progress has been made in bringing to justice the persons responsible for these extrajudicial or political killings in Haiti, and

(B) an assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti is cooperating with United States authorities and with United States-funded technical advisors to the Haitian National Police in such investigations;

(5) an assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti has taken action to remove and maintain the separation from the Haitian National Police, national palace and residential guard, ministerial guard, and any other public security entity or unit of Haiti those individuals who are credibly alleged to have engaged in or conspired to conceal gross violations of internationally recognized human rights;

(6) the status of steps being taken to secure the ratification of the maritime counter-narcotics agreements signed in October 1997;

(7) an assessment of the degree to which domestic capacity to conduct free, fair, democratic, and administratively sound elections has been developed in Haiti; and

(8) an assessment of whether or not Haiti's Minister of Justice has demonstrated a commitment to the professionalism of judicial personnel by consistently placing students graduated by the Judicial School in appropriate judicial positions and has made a commitment to share program costs associated with the Judicial School, and is achieving progress in making the judicial branch in Haiti independent from the executive branch.

MCCONNELL (AND LEAHY) AMENDMENT NO. 1139

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 24, line 18, strike all after ''(h)'' through the period on page 25, line 2, and insert the following:

Of the funds appropriated under this heading that are allocated for assistance for the Central Government of Russia, 50 percent shall be withheld from obligation until the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that The Government of Russia has terminated implementation of arrangements to provide Iran with technical expertise, training, technology, or equipment necessary to develop a nuclear reactor, related nuclear research facilities or programs, or ballistic missile capability.

MCCONNELL (AND LEAHY) AMENDMENT NO. 1140

Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 22, line 24, after the word ''Armenia'' and before the period insert the following: '': *Provided*, That of the funds made available for Armenia, $15,000,000 shall be available for earthquake rehabilitation and reconstruction''.

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 1141

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 37, line 11, before the period insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be available only for the Philippines''.

ABRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 1142

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. ABRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 12 line 6 insert a new section:

LEBANON

Of the funds appropriated under the headings ''Development Assistance'' and ''Economic Support Fund,'' not less than $15,000,000 shall be made available for Lebanon to be used, among other programs, for scholarships and direct support of the American educational institutions in Lebanon.

THOMAS AMENDMENT NO. 1143

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THOMAS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 13, line 5, after the word ''Appropriations'' insert the following words: '', the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House,''; and

On page 98, line 16, after the word ''Appropriations'', insert the following words: '', the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House,''.

DORGAN AMENDMENT NO. 1144

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 21, line 22, before the period insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That of the

amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $200,000 shall be available only for the REAP International School Linkage Program''.

CAMPBELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1145

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. BYRD) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

RESTRICTION ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS IN THE BALKANS REGION.

SEC. . (a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for United States assistance for reconstruction efforts in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or any contiguous country may be used for the procurement of, any article produced outside the United States, the recipient country, or least developed countries or any service provided by a foreign person.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if—

(1) the provision of such assistance requires articles of a type that are produced in and services that are available for purchase in the United States, the recipient country, or least developed countries, or if the cost of articles and services produced in or available from the United States and such other counties is significantly more expensive, including the cost of transportation, than the cost from other sources; or

(2) the President determines that the application of subsection (a) will impair the ability of the United States to maximize the use of United States articles and services in such reconstruction efforts of other donor countries, or if the President otherwise determines that subsection (a) will impair United States foreign assistance objectives.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ARTICLE.—The term ''article'' means any agricultural commodity, steel, communications equipment, farm machinery, or petrochemical refinery equipment.

(2) FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA.—The term ''Federal Republic of Yugoslavia'' means the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and includes Kosovo.

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person'' means any foreign national exclusive of any national or recipient country or least developed countries including any foreign corporation, partnership, other legal entity, organizations, or association that is beneficially owned by foreign persons or controlled in fact by foreign persons.

(4) PRODUCED.—The term ''produced'', with respect to an item, includes any item mined, manufactured, made, assembled, grown, or extracted.

(5) SERVICE.—The term ''service'' means any engineering, construction or telecommunication.

(6) STEEL.—The term ''steel'' includes the following categories of steel products: semi-finished, plates, sheets and strips, wire rods, wire and wire products, rail type products, bars, structural shapes and units, pipes and tubes, iron ore, and coke products.

LAUTENBERG AMENDMENT NO. 1146

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

Beginning on page 100, strike line 11 and all that follows through line 13 on page 107 and insert the following:

RESTRICTIONS ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES, ENTITIES, AND COMMUNITIES IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA PROVIDING SANCTUARY TO PUBLICLY INDICTED WAR CRIMINALS

SEC. 567. (a) POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use bilateral and multilateral assistance to promote peace and respect for internationally recognized human rights by encouraging countries, entities, and communities in the territory of the former Yugoslavia to cooperate fully with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia—

(1) by apprehending publicly indicted war criminals and transferring custody of those individuals to the Tribunal to stand trial; and

(2) by assisting the Tribunal in the investigation and prosecution of crimes subject to its jurisdiction.

(b) SANCTIONED COUNTRY, ENTITY, OR COMMUNITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A sanctioned country, entity, or community described in this section is one in which there is present a publicly indicted war criminal or in which the Tribunal has been hindered in efforts to investigate crimes subject to its jurisdiction.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Subject to subsection (f), subsections (c) and (d) shall not apply to the provision of assistance to an entity that is not a sanctioned entity within a sanctioned country, or to a community that is not a sanctioned community within a sanctioned country or sanctioned entity, if the Secretary of State determines and so reports to the appropriate congressional committees that providing such assistance would further the policy of subsection (a).

(c) BILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds made available by this or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs may be provided for any country, entity, or community described in subsection (b).

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Not less than 15 days before any assistance described in this subsection is disbursed to any country, entity, or community described in subsection (b), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, shall publish in the Federal Register a written justification for the proposed assistance, including a description of the location of the proposed assistance program or project by municipality, its purpose, and the intended recipient of the assistance, including the names of individuals, companies and their boards of directors, and shareholders with controlling or substantial financial interest in the program or project.

(d) MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors of the international financial institutions to work in opposition to, and vote against, any extension by such institutions of any financial or technical assistance or grants of any kind to any country or entity described in subsection (b).

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Not less than 15 days before any vote in an international financial institution regarding the extension of financial or technical assistance or grants to any country or community described in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall provide to the appropriate Congressional committees a written justification for the proposed assistance, including an explanation of the United States position regarding any such vote, as well as a description of the location of the proposed assistance by municipality, its purpose, and its intended beneficiaries, including the names of individuals with a controlling or substantial financial interest in the project.

(e) EXCEPTIONS.—Subject to subsection (f), subsections (c) and (d) shall not apply to the provision of—

(1) humanitarian assistance;

(2) assistance to nongovernmental organizations that promote democracy and respect for human rights; and

(3) assistance for cross border physical infrastructure projects involving activities in both a sanctioned country, entity, or community and a nonsanctioned contiguous country, entity, or community, if the project is primarily located in and primarily benefits the nonsanctioned country, entity, or community and if the portion of the project located in the sanctioned country, entity, or community is necessary only to complete the project.

(f) FURTHER LIMITATIONS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO PUBLICLY INDICTED WAR CRIMINALS AND OTHER PERSONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (e) or subsection (g), no assistance may be made available by this Act, or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs, in any country, entity, or community described in subsection (b), for any financial or technical assistance, grant, or loan that would directly benefit a publicly indicted war criminal, any person who aids or abets a publicly indicted war criminal to evade apprehension, or any person who otherwise obstructs the work of the Tribunal.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—At the end of each fiscal year, the President shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that no assistance described in paragraph (1) directly benefited any person described in that paragraph during the preceding 12-month period.

(g) WAIVER.—The Secretary of State may waive the application of subsection (c) with respect to specified United States projects, or subsection (d) with respect to specified international financial institution programs or projects, in a sanctioned country or entity upon providing a written determination to the appropriate congressional committees that the government of the country or entity is doing everything within its power and authority to apprehend or aid in the apprehension of publicly indicted war criminals and is fully cooperating in the investigation and prosecution of war crimes.

(h) CURRENT RECORD OF WAR CRIMINALS AND SANCTIONED COUNTRIES, ENTITIES, AND COMMUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Ambassador at Large for War Crimes Issues, and after consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, shall establish and maintain a current record of the location, including the community, if known, of publicly indicted war criminals and of sanctioned countries, entities, and communities.

(2) REPORT.—Beginning 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not later than September 1 each year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report in classified and unclassified form to the appropriate congressional committees on the location, including the community, if known, of publicly indicted war criminals and the identity of countries, entities, and communities that are failing to cooperate fully with the Tribunal.

(3) INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.—Upon the request of the chairman or ranking minority member of any of the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State shall make available to that committee the information recorded under paragraph (1) in

a report submitted to the committee in classified and unclassified form.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(2) CANTON.—The term ''canton'' means the administrative units in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(3) COMMUNITY.—The term ''community'' means any canton, district, opstina, city, town, or village.

(4) COUNTRY.—The term ''country'' means Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia-Montenegro), the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Slovenia.

(5) DAYTON AGREEMENT.—The term ''Dayton Agreement'' means the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, together with annexes relating thereto, done at Dayton, November 10 through 16, 1995.

(6) ENTITY.—The term ''entity'' refers to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republika Srpska, Brcko in Bosnia, Serbia, Montenegro, and Kosovo.

(7) INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''international financial institution'' includes the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Multilateral Investment Guaranty Agency, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(8) PUBLICLY INDICTED WAR CRIMINALS.—The term ''publicly indicted war criminals'' means persons indicted by the Tribunal for crimes subject to the jurisdiction of the Tribunal.

(9) TRIBUNAL OR INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL FOR THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA.—The term ''Tribunal'' or the term ''International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia'' means the International Tribunal for the prosecution of persons responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991, as established by United Nations Security Council Resolution 827 of May 25, 1993.

BROWNBACK AMENDMENT NO. 1147

Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ____. INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds made available under chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international disaster assistance) for fiscal year 2000, up to $4,000,000 should be made available for rehabilitation and economic recovery in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan. Such funds are to be used to improve civil society, primary education, agriculture, and other locally-determined priorities. Such funds are to be administered by the United States Agency for International Development, in consultation with the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. ____. DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.

(a) INCREASE IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—The President, acting through the United States Agency for International Development, should increase the amount of development assistance for capacity building, democracy promotion, civil administration, judiciary, and infrastructure support in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than May 1, 2000, the President shall submit a report to the Congress on progress made in carrying out subsection (a).

GRASSLEY AMENDMENTS NOS. 1148–1149

Mr. GRASSLEY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1148

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 580. (a) The amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''DEPARTMENT OF STATE'' under the subheading ''INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT'' is hereby increased by $61,000,000.

(b)(1) The amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT'' under the subheading ''AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' that is specified as available for agriculture and rural development programs including international agriculture research programs is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

(2) The amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT'' under the subheading ''CYPRUS'' is hereby reduced by $3,000,000.

(3) The amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT'' under the subheading ''INDONESIA'' is hereby reduced by $10,000,000.

(4) The amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT'' under the subheading ''INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE'' is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

(5) The amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE'' under the subheading ''ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION'' is hereby reduced by $30,000,000.

(6) The amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY'' under the subheading ''DEBT RESTRUCTURING'' is hereby reduced by $3,000,000.

(7) The amount appropriated by title III under the heading ''FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT'' under the subheading ''FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM'' is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 1149

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

TITLE VI—DRUG CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Most Favored Rogue States Act of 1999''.

SEC. 602. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF ''MAJOR DRUG-TRANSIT COUNTRY''.

Section 481(e)(5) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e)(5)) is amended by striking ''significantly affecting the United States''.

SEC. 603. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES AS MAJOR DRUG-TRANSIT COUNTRIES FOR PURPOSES OF CERTIFICATIONS.

(a) TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided under section 604(a), the countries specified in subsection (b) shall be treated as major drug-transit countries for purposes of section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j) for fiscal years after fiscal year 1999.

(b) COVERED COUNTRIES.—The countries specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) Iran.

(2) Syria.

(3) North Korea.

(4) Cuba.

SEC. 604. LIMITATION ON REMOVAL OF COUNTRIES FROM LIST OF MAJOR DRUG-TRANSIT AND MAJOR ILLICIT DRUG PRODUCING COUNTRIES.

(a) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in notifying Congress of the countries determined to be major drug-transit or major illicit drug producing countries for purposes of section 490(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (2291j(h)) in any year after 1999, the President may not exclude from among such countries any country that was determined to be such a country for purposes of that section in 1998, or any country specified in section 603(b) that was not otherwise so determined, unless 30 days before making the notification that so excludes such country the President submits to the Members of Congress specified in subsection (b) a written notice of an intent to so exclude such country.

(b) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—The Members of Congress referred to in this subsection are the following:

(1) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 605. REPORT ON NATIONAL INTEREST WAIVER FOR PARAGUAY DURING FISCAL YEAR 1999 CERTIFICATION PROCESS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a justification for the decision to submit to Congress a certification under section 490(b)(1)(B) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j(b)(1)(B)) with respect to Paraguay for fiscal year 1999.

SEC. 606. REPORT ON DRUG TRAFFICKING ACTIVITIES OF KOSOVO LIBERATION ARMY.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report on the drug-trafficking activities of the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

HELMS (AND VOINOVICH) AMENDMENT NO. 1150

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. VOINOVICH) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . ASSISTANCE TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN YUGOSLAVIA.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE.—The purpose of assistance under this subsection is to promote and strengthen institutions of democratic government and the growth of an independent civil society in Yugoslavia, including ethnic tolerance and respect for internationally recognized human rights.

(2) AUTHORIZATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized to furnish assistance and other support for individuals and independent nongovernmental organizations to carry out the purpose of paragraph (1) through support for the activities described in paragraph (3).

(3) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—Activities that may be supported by assistance under paragraph (2) include the following:

(A) Democracy building.

(B) The development of nongovernmental organizations.

(C) The development of independent media.

(D) The development of the rule of law, a strong, independent judiciary, and transparency in political practices.

(E) International exchanges and advanced professional training programs in skill areas central to the development of civil society and a market economy.

(F) The development of all elements of the democratic process, including political parties and the ability to administer free and fair elections.

(G) The development of local governance.

(H) The development of a free-market economy.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the President $100,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 1999, and ending September 30, 2001, to carry out this subsection.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subparagraph (A) are authorized to remain available until expended.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENT OF SERBIA.—In carrying out subsection (a) the President shall take all necessary steps to ensure that no funds or other assistance is provided to the Government of Yugoslavia or to the Government of Serbia.

(c) ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENT OF MONTENEGRO—In carrying out subsection (a), the President is authorized to provide assistance to the Government of Montenegro, if the President determines, and so reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, that the Government of Montenegro is committed to, and is taking steps to promote, democratic principles, the rule of law, and respect for internationally recognized human rights.

BURNS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1151

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. COVERDELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 26, line 15, before the period insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not less than $10,000,000 shall be made available to continue mycoherbicide counter drug research and development''.

ASHCROFT AMENDMENTS NOS. 1152–1153

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. ASHCROFT submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1152

On page 128, after line 13, insert the following new section:

SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING UNITED STATES CITIZENS KILLED IN TERRORIST ATTACKS

SEC. 580. (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Palestinian Authority, in formal commitments made under the Oslo peace process, repeatedly has pledged to wage a relentless campaign against terrorism.

(2) At least 12 United States citizens have been killed in terrorist attacks in Israel since the Oslo process began in 1993, and full cooperation from the Palestinian Authority regarding these cases has not been forthcoming.

(3) At least 280 Israeli citizens have died in terrorist attacks since the Oslo process began, a greater loss of life than in the 15 years prior to 1993.

(4) The Palestinian Authority has released terrorist suspects repeatedly, and suspects implicated in the murder of United States citizens have found shelter in the Palestinian Authority, even serving in the Palestinian police force.

(5) The Palestinian Authority uses official institutions such as the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation to train Palestinian children to hate the Jewish people.

(6) Terrorist violence likely will undermine a genuine peace settlement and jeopardize the security of Israel and United States citizens in that country as long as incitement against the Jewish people and the State of Israel continues.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is the solemn duty of the United States and every Administration to bring to justice those suspected of murdering United States citizens in acts of terrorism;

(2) the Palestinian Authority has not taken adequate steps to undermine and eradicate terrorism and has not cooperated fully in detaining and prosecuting suspects implicated in the murder of United States citizens;

(3) Yasser Arafat and senior Palestinian leadership continue to create an environment conducive to terrorism by releasing terrorist suspects and inciting violence against Israel and the United States; and

(4) United States assistance to the Palestinian Authority should be conditioned on full cooperation in combating terrorist violence and full cooperation in investigating and prosecuting terrorist suspects involved in the murder of United States citizens.

AMENDMENT NO. 1153

SEC. ___. REPORT ON TERRORIST ACTIVITY IN WHICH UNITED STATES CITIZENS WERE KILLED AND RELATED MATTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall prepare and submit a report, with a classified annex as necessary, to the appropriate congressional committees regarding terrorist attacks in Israel, in territory administered by Israel, and in territory administered by the Palestinian Authority. The report shall contain the following information:

(1) A list of formal commitments the Palestinian Authority has made to combat terrorism.

(2) A list of terrorist attacks, occurring between September 13, 1993 and the date of the report, against United States citizens in Israel, in territory administered by Israel, or in territory administered by the Palestinian Authority, including—

(A) a list of all citizens of the United States killed or injured in such attacks;

(B) the date of each attack and the total number of people killed or injured in each attack;

(C) the person or group claiming responsibility for the attack and where such person or group has found refuge or support;

(D) a list of suspects implicated in each attack and the nationality of each suspect, including information on -

(i) which suspects are in the custody of the Palestinian Authority and which suspects are in the custody of Israel;

(ii) which suspects are still at large in areas controlled by the Palestinian Authority or Israel; and

(iii) the whereabouts (or suspected whereabouts) of suspects implicated in each attack.

(3) Of the suspects implicated in the attacks described in paragraph (2) and detained by Palestinian or Israeli authorities, information on—

(A) the date each suspect was incarcerated;

(B) whether any suspects have been released, the date of such release, and whether any released suspect was implicated in subsequent acts of terrorism; and

(C) the status of each case pending against a suspect, including information on whether the suspect has been indicted, prosecuted, or convicted by the Palestinian Authority or Israel.

(4) The policy of the Department of State with respect to offering rewards for information on terrorist suspects, including any information on whether a reward has been posted for suspects involved in terrorist attacks listed in the report.

(5) A list of each request by the United States for assistance in investigating terrorist attacks listed in the report, a list of each request by the United States for the transfer of terrorist suspects from the Palestinian Authority and Israel since September 13, 1993, and the response to each request from the Palestinian Authority and Israel.

(6) A description of efforts made by United States officials since September 13, 1993 to bring to justice perpetrators of terrorist acts against United States citizens as listed in the report.

(7) A list of any terrorist suspects in these cases who are members of Palestinian police or security forces, the Palestine Liberation Organization, or any Palestinian governing body.

(8) A list of all United States citizens killed or injured in terrorist attacks in Israel or in territory administered by Israel between 1950 and September 13, 1993, including in each case, where such information is available, any stated claim of responsibility and the resolution or disposition of each case, including information as to the whereabouts of the perpetrators of the acts. The list required by this paragraph shall be submitted only once with the initial report required under this section, unless additional relevant information on these cases becomes available.

(9) The amount of compensation the United States has requested for United States citizens, or their families, injured or killed in attacks by terrorists in Israel, in territory administered by Israel, or in territory administered by the Palestinian Authority since September 13, 1993, and, if no compensation has been requested, an explanation of why such requests have not been made.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS.—The Secretary of State shall, in preparing the report required by this section, consult and coordinate with all other Government officials who have information necessary to complete the report. Nothing contained in this section shall require the disclosure, on a classified or unclassified basis, of information that would jeopardize sensitive sources and methods or other vital national security interests or jeopardize ongoing criminal investigations or proceedings.

(c) INITIAL REPORT.—Except as provided in subsection (a)(8), the initial report filed under this section shall cover the period between September 13, 1993 and the date of the report.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committees on Foreign Relations

of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

CRAIG AMENDMENT NO. 1154

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

REDUCTION OF AMOUNT FOR PAYMENT OF ARREARS TO MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 580. The total amount appropriated under this Act for payment of amounts owed in arrears by the United States to miltilateral international institutions is reduced by the total amount paid by the United States for the costs incurred by the United States during fiscal years 1995 through 1999 for peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, and elsewhere in the Balkins.

BIDEN AMENDMENTS NOS. 1155–1156

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BIDEN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1155

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. ___. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR THE IRAQ FOUNDATION.

Of the funds made available by this Act for activities of Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraqi Liberation Act (Public Law 105–338), not less than $250,000 shall be made available for the Iraq Foundation.

AMENDMENT NO. 1156

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. ___. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR THE IRAQ FOUNDATION.

Of the funds made available by this Act for activities of Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraqi Liberation Act (Public Law 105–338), funds shall also be available for the Iraq Foundation.

DODD (AND LEAHY) AMENDMENT NO. 1157

Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill at the following new section:

SEC. . TERMINATION OF PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL TO CUBA.

(a) TRAVEL TO CUBA.—

(1) FREEDOM OF TRAVEL FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LEGAL RESIDENTS.—Subject to subsection (b), the President shall not regulate or prohibit, directly or indirectly, travel to or from Cuba by United States citizens or legal residents, or any of the transactions incident to such travel that are set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSACTIONS INCIDENT TO TRAVEL.—The transactions referred paragraph (1) are—

(A) any transaction ordinarily incident to travel to or from Cuba, including the importation into Cuba or the United States of accompanied baggage for personal use only;

(B) any transaction ordinarily incident to travel or maintenance within Cuba, including the payment of living expenses and the acquisition of goods or services for personal use;

(C) any transaction ordinarily incident to the arrangement, promotion, or facilitation of travel to, from, or within Cuba;

(D) any transaction incident to non-scheduled air, sea, or land voyages, except that this subparagraph does not authorize the carriage of articles into Cuba or the United States except accompanied baggage; and

(E) any normal banking transaction incident to any activity described in any of the preceding subparagraphs, including the issuance, clearing, processing, or payment of checks, drafts, travelers checks, credit or debit card instruments, or similar instruments; except that this paragraph does not authorize the importation into the United States of any goods for personal consumption acquired in Cuba.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The restrictions on authority contained in subsection (a)(1) do not apply in a case in which—

(1) the United States is at war with Cuba; or

(2) armed hostilities between the two countries are in progress.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to actions taken by the President before the date of the enactment of this Act which are in effect on such date, and to actions taken on or after such date.

(d) SUPERSEDES OTHER PROVISIONS.—This section supersedes any other provision of law, including section 102(h) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996.

DODD AMENDMENT NO. 1158

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. DODD) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill at the following new section:

SEC. . FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING REPORT.

(a) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly provide to the Congress by January 31, 2000 a report on all military training provided to foreign military personnel (excluding sales) administered by the Department of Defense and the Department of State during fiscal years 1999 and 2000, including those proposed for fiscal year 2000. This report shall include, for each such military training activity, the foreign policy justification and purpose for the training activity, the cost of the training activity, the number of foreign students trained and their units of operation, and the location of the training. In addition, this report shall also include, with respect to United States personnel, the operational benefits to United States forces derived from each such training activity and the United States military units involved in each such training activity. This report may include a classified annex if deemed necessary and appropriate.

(b) For purposes of this section a report to Congress shall be deemed to mean a report to the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the Appropriations and International Relations Committees of the House of Representatives.

LANDRIEU (AND HELMS) AMENDMENT NO. 1159

Mr. LEAHY (for Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. HELMS)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 21, line 22, before the period insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available for grants to nongovernmental organizations that work with orphans who are transitioning out of institutions to teach life skills and job skills".

BYRD AMENDMENT NO. 1160

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REDRESSING UNFAIRNESS IN THE DISBURSEMENT OF ASSISTANCE UNDER THE CAMP DAVID ACCORDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Egypt and Israel together negotiated the Camp David Accords, an historic breakthrough in beginning the process of bringing peace to the Middle East.

(2) As part of the Camp David Accords, a concept was reached regarding the ratio of United States foreign assistance between Egypt and Israel, a formula which has been followed since the signing of the Accords.

(3) The United States is proportionally reducing both military and economic assistance to Egypt and Israel, with the agreement of those nations.

(4) The United States is committed to maintaining parity between Egypt and Israel in United States foreign assistance programs within the context of the overall reduction in assistance.

(5) Egypt has consistently fulfilled an historic role of peacemaker in the context of the Arab-Israeli disputes.

(6) The recent elections in Israel offer fresh hope of resolving the remaining issues of dispute in the region.

(7) The mechanism by which United States foreign assistance has been provided to Egypt and Israel has resulted in an imbalance in that program in that Israel has the unique advantage of having immediate access to an interest bearing account while Egypt has not been accorded the same treatment, a procedure which can be interpreted as a departure from the standard of fairness that is central to United States assistance under the Camp David Accords;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the United States should correct the imbalance caused by the difference in treatment of disbursements of United States foreign assistance to Israel and Egypt by providing Egypt access to an interest bearing account as a part of the United States foreign assistance program pursuant to the principles of fairness and parity which underlie the Camp David Accords.

LEAHY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1161

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SELF-DETERMINATION IN EAST TIMOR

SEC. . (a) The President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury (acting through United States executive directors to international financial institutions) should immediately intensify their efforts to prevail upon the Indonesian Government and military to—

(1) disarm and disband anti-independence militias in East Timor;

(2) grant full access to East Timor by international human rights monitors, humanitarian organizations, and the press;

(3) allow Timorese who have been living in exile to return to East Timor to campaign for and participate in the ballot; and

(4) release all political prisoners.

(b) The President shall submit a report to Congress not later than 15 days after passage of this Act, containing a description of the Administration's efforts and his assessment of efforts made by the Indonesian Government and military to fulfill the steps described in paragraph (a).

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the United States executive directors to international financial institutions to take into account the extent of efforts made by the Indonesian Government and military to fulfill the steps described in paragraph (a), in determining their vote on any loan or financial assistance to Indonesia.

BOXER (AND LEAHY) AMENDMENT NO. 1162

Mr. LEAHY (for Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. LEAHY)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5 . (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Since the development of antibiotics in the 1950s, tuberculosis has been largely controlled in the United States and the Western World.

(2) Due to societal factors, including growing urban decay, inadequate health care systems, persistent poverty, overcrowding, and malnutrition, as well as medical factors, including the HIV/AIDS epidemic and the emergence of multi-drug resistant strains of tuberculosis, tuberculosis has again become a leading and growing cause of adult deaths in the developing world.

(3) According to the World Health Organization

(A) in 1998, about 1,860,000 people worldwide died of tuberculosis-related illnesses;

(B) one-third of the world's total population is infected with tuberculosis; and

(C) tuberculosis is the world's leading killer of women between 15 and 44 years old and is a leading cause of children becoming orphans.

(4) Because of the ease of transmission of tuberculosis, its international persistence and growth pose a direct public health threat to those nations that had previously largely controlled the disease. This is complicated in the United States by the growth of the homeless population, the rate of incarceration, international travel, immigration, and HIV/AIDS.

(5) With nearly 40 percent of the tuberculosis cases in the United States attributable to foreign-born persons, tuberculosis will never be eliminated in the United States until it is controlled abroad.

(6) The means exist to control tuberculosis through screening, diagnosis, treatment, patient compliance, monitoring, and ongoing review of outcomes.

(7) Efforts to control tuberculosis are complicated by several barriers, including—

(A) the labor intensive and lengthy process involved in screening, detecting, and treating the disease;

(B) a lack of funding, trained personnel, and medicine in virtually every nation with a high rate of the disease; and

(C) the unique circumstances in each country, which requires the development and implementation of country-specific programs.

(8) Eliminating the barriers to the international control of tuberculosis through a well-structured, comprehensive, and coordinated worldwide effort would be a significant step in dealing with the increasing public health problem posed by the disease.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that if the total allocation for this Act is higher than the level passed by the Senate, a top priority for the additional funds should be to increase the funding to combat infectious diseases, especially tuberculosis.

CLELAND AMENDMENT NO. 1163

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. CLELAND) proposed as amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE BALKANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conducted large-scale military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(2) At the conclusion of 78 days of these hostilities, the United States and its NATO allies suspended military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia based upon credible assurances by the latter that it would fulfill the following conditions as laid down by the so called Group of Eight (G–8):

(A) An immediate and verifiable end of violence and repression in Kosovo.

(B) Staged withdrawal of all Yugoslav military, police, and paramilitary forces from Kosovo.

(C) Deployment in Kosovo of effective international and security presences, endorsed and adopted by the United Nations Security Council, and capable of guaranteeing the achievement of the agreed objectives.

(D) Establishment of an interim administration for Kosovo, to be decided by the United Nations Security Council which will seek to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all inhabitants in Kosovo.

(E) Provision for the safe and free return of all refugees and displaced persons from Kosovo and an unimpeded access to Kosovo by humanitarian aid organizations.

(3) These objectives appear to have been fulfilled, or to be in the process of being fulfilled, which has led the United States and its NATO allies to terminate military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(4) The G–8 also called for a comprehensive approach to the economic development and stabilization of the crisis region, and the European Union has announced plans for $1,500,000,000 over the next 3 years for the reconstruction of Kosovo, for the convening in July of an international donors' conference for Kosovo aid, and for subsequent provision of reconstruction aid to the other countries in the region affected by the recent hostilities followed by reconstruction aid directed at the Balkans region as a whole.

(5) The United States and some of its NATO allies oppose the provision of any aid, other than limited humanitarian assistance, to Serbia until Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic is out of office.

(6) The policy of providing reconstruction aid to Kosovo and other countries in the region affected by the recent hostilities while withholding such aid for Serbia presents a number of practical problems, including the absence in Kosovo of financial and other institutions independent of Yugoslavia, the difficulty in drawing clear and enforceable distinctions between humanitarian and reconstruction assistance, and the difficulty in reconstructing Montenegro in the absence of similar efforts in Serbia.

(7) In any case, the achievement of effective and durable economic reconstruction and revitalization in the countries of the Balkans is unlikely until a political settlement is reached as to the final status of Kosovo and Yugoslavia.

(8) The G–8 proposed a political process towards the establishment of an interim political framework agreement for a substantial self-government for Kosovo, taking into full account the final Interim Agreement for Peace and Self-Government in Kosovo, also known as the Rambouillet Accords, and the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the other countries of the region, and the demilitarization of the UCK (Kosovo Liberation Army).

(9) The G–8 proposal contains no guidance as to a final political settlement for Kosovo and Yugoslavia, while the original position of the United States and the other participants in the so-called Contact Group on this matter, as reflected in the Rambouillet Accords, called for the convening of an international conference, after 3 years, to determine a mechanism for a final settlement of Kosovo status based on the will of the people, opinions of relevant authorities, each Party's efforts regarding the implementation of the agreement and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

(10) The current position of the United States and its NATO allies as to the final status of Kosovo and Yugoslavia calls for an autonomous, multiethnic, democratic Kosovo which would remain as part of Serbia, and such an outcome is not supported by any of the Parties directly involved, including the governments of Yugoslavia and Serbia, representatives of the Kosovar Albanians, and the people of Yugoslavia, Serbia and Kosovo.

(11) There has been no final political settlement in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where the Armed Forces of the United States, its NATO allies, and other non-Balkan nations have been enforcing an uneasy peace since 1996, at a cost to the United States alone of over $10,000,000,000, with no clear end in sight to such enforcement.

(12) The trend throughout the Balkans since 1990 has been in the direction of ethnically based particularism, as exemplified by the 1991 declarations of independence from Yugoslavia by Slovenia and Croatia, and the country in the Balkans which currently comes the closest to the goal of a democratic government which respects the human rights of its citizens is the nation of Slovenia, which was the first portion of the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to secede and is also the nation in the region with the greatest ethnic homogeneity, with a population which is 91 percent Slovene.

(13) The boundaries of the various national and sub-national divisions in the Balkans have been altered repeatedly throughout history, and international conferences have frequently played the decisive role in fixing such boundaries in the modern era, including the Berlin Congress of 1878, the London Conference of 1913, and the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.

(14) The development of an effective exit strategy for the withdrawal from the Balkans of foreign military forces, including the armed forces of the United States, its NATO allies, Russia, and any other nation from outside the Balkans which has such forces in the Balkans is in the best interests of all such nations.

(15) The ultimate withdrawal of foreign military forces, accompanied by the establishment of durable and peaceful relations among all of the nations and peoples of the Balkans is in the best interests of those nations and peoples.

(16) An effective exit strategy for the withdrawal from the Balkans of foreign military forces is contingent upon the achievement of a lasting political settlement for the region, and that only such a settlement, acceptable to all parties involved, can ensure the fundamental goals of the United States of peace, stability, and human rights in the Balkans;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should call immediately for the convening of an international conference on the Balkans, under the auspices of the United Nations, and based upon the principles of the Rambouillet Accords for a final settlement of Kosovo status, namely that such a settlement should be based on the will of the people, opinions of relevant authorities, each Party's efforts regarding the implementation of the agreement and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act;

(2) the international conference on the Balkans should also be empowered to seek a final settlement for Bosnia-Herzegovina based on the same principles as specified for Kosovo in the Rambouillet Accords; and

(3) in order to produce a lasting political settlement in the Balkans acceptable to all parties, which can lead to the departure from the Balkans in timely fashion of all foreign military forces, including those of the United States, the international conference should have the authority to consider any and all of the following: political boundaries; humanitarian and reconstruction assistance for all nations in the Balkans; stationing of United Nations peacekeeping forces along international boundaries; security arrangements and guarantees for all of the nations of the Balkans; and tangible, enforceable and verifiable human rights guarantees for the individuals and peoples of the Balkans.

CLELAND AMENDMENT NO. 1164

(Ordered to lie on the table)

Mr. CLELAND submittted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____. PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL AND REPORTING OF CERTAIN MILITARY OPERATIONS.

(a) The President may not authorize the deployment of forces of the Armed Forces of the United States into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into a contingency operation as defined under section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code, and may not authorize or commit to such a deployment to any multilateral organization, unless and until the President makes a finding under subsection (b) and reports such finding to Congress under subsection (c).

(b) The Presidential finding required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) specify the vital national interests at stake which require the deployment of forces of the Armed Forces of the United States, the likely consequences of such a deployment on those and any other relevant vital national interests, and the adverse consequences to those interests likely to occur in the absence of such deployment;

(2) specify why diplomatic and other means are unable to secure those interests;

(3) identify concrete policy objectives which are to be achieved by such deployment, the specific military missions which are designed to achieve each policy objective, and the anticipated date, or the set of conditions, that defines the endpoint of the deployment; and

(4) specify the authorities for the deployment under constitutional and international law.

(c) The President shall ensure that any finding approved pursuant to subsection (b) shall be reported to the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on International Relations as soon as possible after such approval and before the initiation of the deployment authorized by the finding.

(d) In the case of a national emergency caused by an attack on the United States, its territories or possessions, or Armed Forces, the finding required by subsection (b) and the reporting required by subsection (c) shall not be required prior to the initiation of the deployment of the Armed Forces of the United States, but such finding and reporting shall take place as soon as possible after such deployment.

(e) No funds appropriated for, or otherwise available to, any department, agency, or entity of the United States Government under this or any other Act may be expended, or may be directed to be expended, for any deployment of the Armed Forces of the United States described in this section, unless and until a Presidential finding described in subsection (b) has been signed and reported in accordance with this section.

BINGAMAN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1165

Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. CLELAND Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA.

It is the sense of the Senate that nothing in this Act, or Senate Report No. 106–81, relating to assistance provided to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the Foreign Military Financing Program, should be interpreted as expressing the will of the Senate to accelerate membership of those nations into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 1166

(Ordered to lie on the table)

Mr. NICKLES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

Strike section 577, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 557. RESTRICTIONS ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE FOR THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP.—The term ''congressional leadership'' means the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate.

(3) HEBRON PROTOCOL.—The term ''Hebron Protocol'' means the Protocol Concerning Redeployment In Hebron, signed January 17, 1997.

(4) OSLO II ACCORD.—The term ''Oslo II Accord'' means the Israel-Palestinian Interim Agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, signed September 28, 1995.

(5) WYE RIVER MEMORANDUM.—The term ''Wye River Memorandum'' means the agreement between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization, done at Washington, D.C. on October 23, 1998.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by law (including funds appropriated for fiscal year 1999 and prior fiscal years) may be available for assistance to the Palestinian Authority, or to any third party performing work under contract of the Palestinian Authority, in fiscal year 2000 or any fiscal year thereafter unless the following requirements have been satisfied:

(1) PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATIONS.—The President has certified to Congress the following:

(A) No unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood has been made.

(B) The Palestinian Authority has brought to justice (or transferred to Israel or the United States for legal action) those Palestinians responsible for killing United States citizens, as determined by the President, including the following United States citizens:

(i) David Berger, killed at the 1972 Munich Olympics.

(ii) Ambassador Cleo A. Noel, Jr., the United States Ambassador to the Sudan, who was murdered in March of 1973.

(iii) George Curtis Moore, who was killed with Ambassador Noel.

(iv) Gail Rubin, the niece of former Senator Abraham Ribicoff, who was murdered in 1978.

(v) Leon Klinghoffer, who was murdered aboard the ship Achille Lauro in 1985.

(vi) Navy diver Robert Stethem, who was murdered when TWA flight 847 was hijacked to Beirut in June of 1985.

(vii) Nachshon Wachsman, who was kidnapped on October 9, 1994 and murdered.

(viii) Alisa Flatow, who was killed in a bus bombing in April of 1995.

(ix) Joan Davenny, who was killed in a Jerusalem bus bombing in August of 1995.

(x) Sara Duker, Matthew Bisenfeld, and Ira Weinstein, who were killed while riding a bus in Jerusalem in February of 1996.

(xi) David Boim, who was murdered by a gunman in May of 1996.

(xii) Yaron Unger, who was killed in a drive-by shooting attack in June of 1996.

(xiii) Leah Stern, who was killed in the July 1997 market bombing in Jerusalem.

(xiv) Yael Botwin, who was killed in the September 1997 bombing on Ben Yehuda street in Jerusalem.

(xv) Dov Dribben, who was murdered in April of 1998.

(C) The Palestinian authority is cooperating fully with the United States and Israel in their efforts to locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, a United States citizen, and his colleagues, Yehuda Katz and Zvi Feldman.

(D) The Palestinian Authority has agreed that, in each case in which the Palestinian Authority brought someone to justice for killing a United States citizen, the Palestinian Authority has notified the President of the person it has brought to justice.

(E) The Palestinian Authority has cooperated fully with the General Accounting Office (GAO), including cooperation with GAO investigators, to provide a full accounting of all funds previously provided by the United States to the Palestinian Authority or to any third party that was under contract to perform work for the Palestinian Authority.

(F) The size of the Palestinian Authority police force is in conformity with obligations

of the Palestinian Authority as outlined under the Oslo II Accord.

(G) Based on information available to the President from the Director of Central Intelligence, the Palestinian Authority is confiscating illegal weapons as outlined in the Wye River Memorandum and the Oslo II Accord.

(H) The Palestinian Authority (or any entity controlled by the Palestinian Authority) is abiding by its commitments under the Wye River Memorandum, the Oslo II Accord, and the Hebron Protocol, not to incite violence.

(I) The Palestinian Authority has made a good faith effort to eliminate from its publications, textbooks, broadcasts, and other public and official information of the Palestinian Authority inflammatory statements, drawings, or pictures that could be used to incite violence.

(2) AMENDED PALESTINIAN CHARTER.—The Palestinian Authority has transmitted a certified and signed copy of the amended Palestinian Charter to the President, and the President has further transmitted that document to the appropriate congressional committees and congressional leadership.

(3) GAO CERTIFICATION.—Not more than 30 days prior to the obligation or expenditure of funds, the Comptroller General of the United States has certified that the Palestinian Authority—

(A) has adopted and implemented generally accepted accounting principles or an equivalent accounting system for tracking and documenting all financial transactions and affairs of the Palestinian Authority;

(B) has adopted and implemented a set of guidelines that ensures transparency in all financial activities of the Palestinian Authority; and

(C) has cooperated fully with the Comptroller General in the certification process under this paragraph.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) STATE DEPARTMENT REPORTS.—Beginning 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 months thereafter, the Department of State shall prepare and the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the congressional leadership a report on the disposition of the cases described in subsection (b)(1)(B). If an individual is convicted in a case described in subsection (b)(1)(B), the President shall track that individual until the individual's sentence has been fully carried out.

(2) CIA REPORTS.—The Director of Central Intelligence shall submit a report in classified and unclassified forms to the appropriate congressional committees and the congressional leadership every 6 months on the progress made by the Palestinian Authority with respect to confiscating illegal weapons and the quantity and types of illegal weapons remaining to be confiscated.

(3) GAO REPORTS.—Beginning 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit the following reports to the congressional committees and the congressional leadership:

(A) A report on the protection of human rights by the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank and Gaza during the preceding year.

(B) A report on the economic condition of the areas under the control of the Palestinian Authority during the preceding year, including a description of areas of improvement and shortcomings of the economies of these regions and what steps should be taken to remedy such shortcomings and foster economic growth.

(d) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All United States assistance to the Palestinian Authority shall terminate if, at any time, the Palestinian Authority—

(A) makes a unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood; or

(B) does not cooperate with the activities of the Comptroller General of the United States under paragraph (2).

(2) GAO AUDITS.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—Beginning 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of the Palestinian Authority's financial records to ensure that the Palestinian Authority is implementing generally accepted accounting principles (or an equivalent accounting system) in tracking and documenting the financial transactions and affairs of the Palestinian Authority, and the Palestinian Authority has adequately implemented a set of guidelines that ensures transparency in all financial activities of the Palestinian Authority.

(B) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—If the Comptroller General of the United States finds that the Palestinian Authority's financial records are not being kept in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (or an equivalent accounting system), or there is a lack of transparency in the Palestinian Authority recordkeeping, then United States assistance to the Palestinian Authority or any third party performing work under contract for the Palestinian Authority shall be terminated until the Comptroller General certifies to Congress that the Palestinian Authority has complied with the actions described in subparagraph (A).

(3) GAO INITIAL REVIEWS.—Beginning one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the following:

(A) The confiscation of illegal arms by the Palestinian Authority.

(B) The size of the police force of the Palestinian Authority.

(C) A review of publications, textbooks, broadcasts, and other types of public and official information of the Palestinian Authority to ensure it is free from inflammatory statements, drawings, or pictures that could be used to incite violence.

(4) GAO FOLLOWUP REVIEWS.—If the Comptroller General finds that the Palestinian Authority is not in compliance with its obligations under the Wye River Memorandum, the Oslo II Accord, or the Hebron Protocol, the Comptroller General shall conduct a review in the succeeding 6 months. If the Comptroller General finds in the second review that the Palestinian Authority is not in compliance with its obligations under the Wye River Memorandum, the Oslo II Accord, or the Hebron Protocol, then all United States assistance to the Palestinian Authority or any third party performing work under contract for the Palestinian Authority shall be terminated until the Comptroller General certifies that the Palestinian Authority is in compliance with the Wye River Memorandum, the Oslo II Accord, and the Hebron Protocol.

(e) REIMBURSEMENTS.—Funds available to the Palestinian Authority shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriations accounts of the Central Intelligence Agency and the General Accounting Office for expenses incurred by those agencies as a result of investigations, certifications, and reports required to be conducted by those agencies under this Act.

KERRY AMENDMENT NO. 1167

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. KERRY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) The President shall continue and expand efforts through the United Nations and other international fora, including the Wassenaar Arrangement, to limit arms transfers worldwide. The President shall take the necessary steps to begin multilateral negotiations within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, for the purpose of establishing a permanent multilateral regime to govern the transfer of conventional arms, particularly transfers to countries:

(1) that engage in persistent violations of human rights, engage in acts of armed aggression in violation of international law, and do not fully participate in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms; and

(2) in regions in which arms transfers would exacerbate regional arms races or international tensions that present a danger to international peace and stability.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—(1) Not later than 6 months after the commencement of the negotiations under subsection (a), and not later than the end of every 6-month period thereafter until an agreement described in subsection (a) is concluded, the President shall report to the appropriate committees of the Congress on the progress made during these negotiations.

KERRY (AND MCCAIN) AMENDMENT NO. 1168

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; and follows:

On page 13, strike lines 2 through the colon on line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

''None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for activities or programs for the Central Government of Cambodia until the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Government of Cambodia has established a tribunal consistent with the requirements of international law and justice and including the participation of international jurists and prosecutors for the trial of those who committed genocide or crimes against humanity and that the Government of Cambodia is making significant progress in establishing an independent and accountable judicial system, a professional military subordinate to civilian control, and a neutral and accountable police force:''.

KERRY AMENDMENT NO. 1169

(Ordered to lie on the table)

Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), United States assistance as defined in subsection (c) may be provided to a foreign government during the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1999, only if the President determines and reports to Congress that:

(1) such government is not engaged in persistent violations of human rights, is not engaged in acts of armed aggression in violation of international law, and is fully participating in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms; and

(2) arms sales will not exacerbate regional arms races or international tensions that present a danger to international peace and stability.

(b) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to a foreign government for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1999, if—

(1) the President determines that it is in the national security interest of the United States to provide assistance and submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees containing the justification for such determination. No assistance may be provided until 15 days after the submission of such a report; or

(2) the President determines and reports that a national security emergency exists requiring the United States to provide immediate assistance to such government and submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees containing the justification for such determinations.

(c) For purposes of this section the term ''assistance'' means the transfer of defense articles, defense service and training pursuant to this Act and the Arms Export Control Act, but does not include transfers of such assistance to countries that are specifically identified in law and approved for such assistance, or assistance provided pursuant to the Expanded International Military Education and Training program.

BROWNBACK (AND HELMS) AMENDMENT NO. 1170

Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself and Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ___. INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds made available under chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international disaster assistance) for fiscal year 2000, up to $4,000,000 should be made available for rehabilitation and economic recovery in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan. Such funds are to be used to improve economic governance, primary education, agriculture, and other locally-determined priorities. Such funds are to be programmed and implemented jointly by the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture, and may be utilized for activities which can be implemented for a period of up to two years.

SEC. ___. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR SUDANESE INDIGENOUS GROUPS.

The President, acting through the appropriate Federal agencies, is authorized to provide humanitarian assistance, including food, directly to the National Democratic Alliance participants and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement operating outside of the Operation Lifeline Sudan structure.

SEC. ___. DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.

(a) INCREASE IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—The President, acting through the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to increase substantially the amount of development assistance for capacity building, democracy promotion, civil administration, judiciary, and infrastructure support in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORT.—The President shall submit a report on a quarterly basis to the Congress on progress made in carrying out subsection (a).

DEWINE (AND COVERDELL) AMENDMENT NO. 1171

Mr. MCCONNELL. (for Mr. DEWINE for himself and Mr. COVERDELL) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COLOMBIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Colombia is a democratic country fighting multiple wars:

(A) a war against the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC);

(B) a war against the National Liberation Army (ELN);

(C) a war against paramilitary organizations; and

(D) a war against drug lords who traffic in deadly cocaine and heroin.

(3) Colombia is the world's third most dangerous country in terms of political violence with 34 percent of world terrorist acts committed there.

(4) Columbia is the world's kidnaping capital of the world with 2,609 kidnapings reported in 1998 and 513 reported in the first three months of 1999.

(5) In 1998 alone, 308,000 Colombians were internally displaced in Colombia. Over the last decade, 35,000 Colombians have been killed.

(6) The FARC and ELN are the two main guerilla groups which have waged the longest-running anti-government insurgency in Latin America.

(7) The Colombian rebels have a combined strength of 10,000 to 20,000 full-time guerillas; they have initiated armed action in nearly 700 of the country's 1073 municipalities, and control or influence roughly 60 percent of rural Colombia including a demilitarized zone using their armed stranglehold to abuse Colombian citizens.

(8) Although the Colombian Army has 122,000 soldiers, there are roughly only 20,000 soldiers available for offensive combat operations.

(9) Colombia faces the threat of the armed paramilitaries, 5,000 strong, who are constantly driving a wedge in the place process by their insistence in participating in the peace talks.

(10) More than 75 percent of the world's cocaine HCL and 75 percent of the heroin seized in the northeast United States is of Colombian origin.

(11) The conflicts in Colombia are creating spillovers to the border countries of Venezuela, Panama and Equador: Venezuela has sent 30,000 troops to its border and Ecuador is sending 10,000 troops to its border.

(12) Venezuela is our number one supplier of oil.

(13) By the end of 1999, all U.S. military troops will have departed from Panama, leaving the Panama Canal unprotected.

(14) In 1998, two-way trade between the United States and Colombia was more than $11 billion, making the United States Colombia's number one trading partner and Colombia the fifth largest market for U.S. exports in the region.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should recognize the crisis in Colombia and play a more pro-active role in its resolution;

(2) the United States should mobilize the international community to pro-actively engage in resolving Colombian wars; and

(3) pledge our political support to help Colombia with the peace process.

REID AMENDMENT NO. 1172

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that the President and the Secretary of State should—

(1) raise the need for accountability of Saddam Hussein and several key members of his regime at the International Criminal Court Preparatory Commission, which will meet in New York on July 26, 1999, through August 13, 1999;

(2) continue to push for the creation of a commission under the auspices of the United Nations to establish an international record of the criminal culpability of Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi officials;

(3) continue to push for the United Nations to form an international criminal tribunal for the purpose of indicting, prosecuting, and imprisoning Saddam Hussein and any other Iraqi officials who may be found responsible for crimes against humanity, genocide, and other violations of international humanitarian law; and

(4) upon the creation of a commission and international criminal tribunal, take steps necessary, including the reprogramming of funds, to ensure United States support for efforts to bring Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi officials to justice.

BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 1173

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following section:

SEC. . EXPANDED THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the programs contained in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative are vital to the national security of the United States and that funding for those programs should be restored in conference to the levels requested in the President's budget.

LEVIN AMENDMENT NO. 1174

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING U.S. COMMITMENTS UNDER THE U.S.-NORTH KOREAN AGREED FRAMEWORK.

It is the Sense of the Senate that, as long as North Korea meets its obligations under the U.S.-North Korean nuclear Agreed Framework of 1994, the U.S. should meet its commitments under the Agreed Framework, including required deliveries of heavy fuel oil to North Korea and support of the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO).

DOMENICI (AND HUTCHISON) AMENDMENT NO. 1175

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 17, line 10, before the period insert the following: ''That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $1.5 million shall be made available to Habitat for Humanity International for the purchase of 14 acres of land on behalf of Tibetan refugees living in northern India, and the construction of a multi-unit development.''

COCHRAN (AND LOTT) AMENDMENT NO. 1176

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. LOTT) proposed an

amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 33, line 6, before the colon, insert the following: '', of which no less than $1,000,000 shall be available for the Defense Institute of International Studies to enhance its mission, functioning and performance by providing for its fixed costs of operation''.

SCHUMER AMENDMENT NO. 1177

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. SCHUMER) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

It is the sense of the Senate that:

The Senate finds that:

The proposed programs under the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI) are critical and essential to preserving US national security.

The Department of State programs under the ETRI be funded at or near the full request of $250 million in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill for Fiscal year 2000 prior to final passage.

COVERDELL AMENDMENT NO. 1178

(Ordered to lie on the table)

Mr. COVERDELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following

SEC. . FUNDING FOR COLOMBIAN NATIONAL POLICE.

Of the funds made available pursuant to this Act, not less than $20 million shall be made available to the Colombian National Police to combat narcotics trafficking activities.

LEAHY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1179

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section: self-determination in east timor

SEC. . (a) The President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury (acting through United States executive directors to international financial institutions) should immediately intensify their efforts to prevail upon the Indonesian Government and military to—

(1) disarm and disband anti-independence militias in East Timor;

(2) grant full access to East Timor by international human rights monitors, humanitarian organizations, and the press:

(3) allow Timorese who have been living in exile to return to East Timor to campaign for and participate in the ballot; and

(4) release all political prisoners.

(b) The President shall submit a report to Congress not later than 15 days after passage of this Act, containing a description of the Administration's efforts and his assessment of efforts made by the Indonesian Government and military to fulfill the steps described in paragraph (a).

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the United States executive directors to international financial institutions to take into account the extent of efforts made by the Indonesian Government and military to fulfill the steps described in paragraph (a), in determining their vote on any loan or financial assistance to Indonesia.

VOINOVICH AMENDMENT NO. 1180

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. VOINOVICH) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

To Sec. 525—Designation of Serbia as a Terrorist State add:

(C) This section would become null and void should the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (other than Montenegro and Kosova) complete a democratic reform process that brings about a newly elected government that respects the rights of ethnic minorities, is committed to the rule of law and respects the sovereignty of its neighbor states.

BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 1181

(Ordered to lie on the table)

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. . ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR THE IRAQ FOUNDATION.

Of the funds made available by this Act for activities of Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraqi Liberation Act (Public Law 105–338). $250,000 shall be made available for the Iraq Foundation.

LEAHY AMENDMENT NO. 1182

Mr. LEAHY proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1157 proposed by Mr. DODD to the bill, S 1234, supra; as follows:

Strike everything after ''**SEC.** ____.'' and insert in lieu thereof the following:

RELAXATION OF RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL BY AMERICAN CITIZENS TO CUBA.

(a) TRAVEL TO CUBA.—

(1) FREEDOM OF TRAVEL FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LEGAL RESIDENTS.—Subject to subsection (b), the President shall not regulate or prohibit, directly or indirectly, travel to or from Cuba by United States citizens or legal residents, or any of the transactions incident to such travel that are set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSACTIONS INCIDENT TO TRAVEL.—The transactions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) any transaction ordinarily incident to travel to or from Cuba, including the importation into Cuba or the United States of accompanied baggage for personal use only;

(B) any transaction ordinarily incident to travel or maintenance within Cuba, including the payment of living expenses and the acquisition of goods or services for personal use;

(C) any transaction ordinarily incident to the arrangement, promotion, or facilitation of travel to, from, or within Cuba;

(D) any transaction incident to nonscheduled air, sea, or land voyages, except that this subparagraph does not authorize the carriage of articles into Cuba or the United States except accompanied baggage; and

(E) any normal banking transaction incident to any activity described in any of the preceding subparagraphs, including the issuance, clearing, processing, or payment of checks, drafts, travelers checks, credit or debit card instruments, or similar instruments;

except that this paragraph does not authorize the importation into the United States of any goods for personal consumption acquired in Cuba.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The restrictions on authority contained in subsection (a)(1) do not apply in a case in which—

(1) the United States is at war with Cuba;

(2) armed hostilities between the two countries are in progress; or

(3) there is imminent danger to the public health or the physical safety of United States travelers.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to actions taken by the President before the date of the enactment of this Act which are in effect on such date, and to actions taken on or after such date.

(d) SUPERSEDES OTHER PROVISIONS.—This section supersedes any other provision of law, including section 102(h) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996.

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 1183

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . CONSULTATIONS ON ARMS SALES TO TAIWAN.

Consistent with the intent of Congress expressed in the enactment of section (3)(b) of the Taiwan Relations Act, the Secretary of State shall consult with the appropriate committees and leadership of Congress to devise a mechanism to provide for Congressional input prior to making any determination on the nature or quantity of defense articles and services to be made available to Taiwan.

BYRD AMENDMENT NO. 1184

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BYRD) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ASSISTANCE UNDER THE CAMP DAVID ACCORDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Egypt and Israel together negotiated the Camp David Accords, an historic breakthrough in beginning the process of bringing peace to the Middle East.

(2) As part of the Camp David Accords, a concept was reached regarding the ratio of United States foreign assistance between Egypt and Israel, a formula which has been followed since the signing of the Accords.

(3) The United States is reducing economic assistance to Egypt and Israel, with the agreement of those nations.

(4) The United States is committed to maintaining proportionality between Egypt and Israel in United States foreign assistance programs.

(5) Egypt has consistently fulfilled an historic role of peacemaker in the context of the Arab-Israeli disputes.

(6) The recent elections in Israel offer fresh hope of resolving the remaining issues of dispute in the region.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the United States should provide Egypt access to an interest bearing account as part of the United States foreign assistance program pursuant to the principles of proportionality which underlie the Camp David Accords.

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 1185

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

Strike section 577, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 577. UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

(1) GAO CERTIFICATION.—Not more than 30 days prior to the obligation of funds made available by the Act for assistance for the Palestinian Authority the Comptroller General of the United States shall certify that the Palestinian Authority—

(A) has adopted an acceptable accounting system to ensure that such funds will be used for their intended assistance purposes; and

(B) has cooperated with the Comptroller General in the certification process under this paragraph.

(2) GAO AUDITS.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—Six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit to determine the extent to which the Palestinian Authority is implementing and acceptable accounting system that is to check the use of funds now available by the act for assistance for the Palestinian Authority.

LEAHY AMENDMENT NOS. 1186–1188

Mr. LEAHY proposed three amendments to the bill, S. 1234, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1186

At the appropriate place, insert:

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. . The Secretary of the Treasury may, to fulfill commitments of the United States, (1) effect the United States participation in the fifth general capital increase of the African Development Bank, the first general capital increase of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, and the first general capital increase of the Inter-American Investment Corporation; (2) contribute on behalf of the United States to the eighth replenishment of the resources of the African Development Fund, the twelfth replenishment of the International Development Association. The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury: $40,847,011 for paid-in capital, and $639,932,485 for callable capital, of the African Development Bank; $29,870,087 for paid-in capital, and $139,365,533 for callable capital, of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency; $125,180,000 for paid-in capital of the Inter-American Investment Corporation; $300,000,000 for the African Development Fund; $2,410,000,000 for the International Development Association; and $50,000,000 for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development's HIPC Trust Fund.

AMENDMENT NO. 1187

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

SEC. . Section 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2395) Is amended by adding a new subsection (l) as follows:

''(l)(1) There is hereby established a working capital fund for the United States Agency for International Development which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for the expenses of personal and nonpersonal services, equipment and supplies for: (A) International Cooperative Administrative Support Services; (B) central information technology, library, audiovisual and administrative Support services. (C) medical and health care of participants and others; and (D) such other functions which the Administrator of such agency, with the approval of the Office of Management and budget, determines may be provided more advantageously and economically as central services.

''(2) The capital of the fund shall consist of the fair and reasonable value of such supplies, equipment and other assets pertaining to the functions of the fund as the Administrator determines and any appropriations made available for the purpose of providing capital, less related liabilities.

''(3) The fund shall be reimbursed or credited with advance payments for services, equipment or supplies provided from the fund from applicable appropriations and funds of the agency, other federal agencies and other sources authorized by section 607 or this Act at rates that will recover total expenses of operation, including accrual of annual leave and depreciation. Receipts from the disposal of, or payments for the loss or damage to, property held in the fund, rebates, reimbursements, refunds and other credits applicable to the operation of the fund may be deposited in the fund.

''(4) The agency shall transfer to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts as of the close of the fiscal year such amounts which the Administrator determines to be in excess of the needs of the fund.

''(5) The fund may be charged with the current value of supplies and equipment returned to the working capital of the fund by a post, activity or agency and the proceeds shall be credited to current applicable appropriations.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1188

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

DEVELOPMENT CREDIT AUTHORITY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees, up to $7,500,000 to be derived by transfer from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and funds appropriated by this Act under the heading. ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further. That for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, up to $500,000 of this amount may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development'': Provided further. That the provisions of section 107A(d) (relating to general provisions applicable to the Development Credit Authority) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as contained in section 306 of H.R. 1486 as reported by the House Committee on International Relations on May 9, 1997, shall be applicable to direct loans and loan guarantees provided under this heading.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

MOYNIHAN AMENDMENT NO. 1189

Mr. DORGAN (for Mr. MOYNIHAN) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1282) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 56, line 3, after ''and'', insert the following: ''$4,300,000 shall be available for demolition of the United States Mission to the United Nations at 755 United Nations Plaza (First Avenue and 45th Street), New York, New York, and''.

MOYNIHAN (AND SCHUMER) AMENDMENT NOS. 1190–1191

Mr. DORGAN (for Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) proposed two amendments to the bill, S. 1282, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1190

Beginning on page 52, line 25, strike the colon and all that follows through ''rescinded'' on page 53, line 2.

AMENDMENT NO. 1191

On page 56, line 6, after '';'', insert the following: ''$5,870,000 shall be made available for the repairs and alterations of the Federal Courthouse at 40 Centre Street, New York, New York;''.

CAMPBELL (AND DORGAN) AMENDMENT NO. 1192

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1282, supra; as follows:

On page 51, line 15 and page 57, line 14 strike ''5,140,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$5,261,478,000''.

On page 53 line 2 after ''are rescinded'' insert ''and shall remain in the Fund''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 Wednesday, June 30, for purposes of conducting a Full Committee business meeting which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this business meeting is to consider pending calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Finance Committee requests unanimous consent to conduct a hearing on Wednesday, June 30, 1999 beginning at 10 a.m. in room 215 Dirksen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 30, 1999 at 10:30 a.m. to hold a business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor,

and Pensions be authorized to meet for a hearing on ''ESEA: Facilities'' during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 30, 1999, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 30, 1999 at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing on S. 438, to settle the water rights claims of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation; to be followed by a business meeting on pending committee business. The hearing/meeting will be held in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 30, 1999 at 9:30 a.m. to receive testimony on the operations of the Architect of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be permitted to meet on June 30, 1999 from 10 a.m.—1 p.m. in Hart 216 for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREST & PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Forests & Public Land Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 30, for purposes of conducting a hearing which is scheduled to begin at 2 p.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to conduct general oversight of the U.S. Forest Service Economic Action Programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND FISHERIES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Oceans and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 30, 1999, at 2:30 p.m. on coral reef and marine sanctuaries

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REFLECTIONS FROM RABBI ISRAEL ZOBERMAN

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in light of recent events in Kosovo and the continuing struggles of the many still displaced families, I would like to offer an excerpt from a piece written by a very well-respected spiritual leader from the Commonwealth of Virginia, Rabbi Israel Zoberman.

He writes:

> We take pride in our American servicemen and women—many from our own Hampton Roads—representing the world's sole superpower, who leading the NATO alliance are braving the dangers of war, determined to restore civilized life to all of a continent poised to reverse its long history of conflict and bloodshed through the promise of unity. The presence of the State of Israel among the nations offering critical humanitarian support to a sea of refugees displaying so much dignity, and extending its home to some of them, is inspiring testimony to its acting upon the Jewish people's vast legacy of suffering.

I thank Rabbi Zoberman for these somber yet hopeful words and am once again reminded that the tragedy of Kosovo touches the lives of many and in many different ways. Rabbi Zoberman was born to Polish Holocaust survivors and spent his early childhood in a Displaced Persons Camp in Frankfurt, Germany. Rabbi Zoberman, shalom and thank you.●

EISENHOWER LEADERSHIP AWARD

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on the evening of Tuesday, May 18, 1999, the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and my good friend, Senator TED STEVENS of Alaska, received the Eisenhower World Affairs Institute's annual Leadership Award in recognition of his outstanding lifetime accomplishments. This is indeed an honor TED richly deserves. TED has dedicated his life to public service, and embodies the values, commitment and integrity that were the hallmark of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. It is an honor to work with such an able legislator, particularly on the Senate Appropriations Committee, where TED's leadership has earned him the respect of his Senate colleagues. TED is a great American and serves this institution well. I was delighted to be part of the evening's festivities. I would like to share with my Senate colleagues and all Americans, Senator TED STEVENS' remarks upon the acceptance of the Eisenhower Leadership Award. I ask that the full text of Senator STEVENS' remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The remarks follow.

SENATOR TED STEVENS' REMARKS AT THE EISENHOWER WORDD AFFAIRS DINNER UPON RECEIVING THE EISENHOWER LEADERSHIP PRISE, MAY 18, 1999

This is a very unexpected honor. Thanks to Rocco Siciliano and to my departed friend, Al McDermott, who served as Assistant to Ike's Secretary of Labor—a special friend who would be pleased that his wife, Krieks, is here. Al, under Ike's command, drove his LCT to Omaha Beach in Normandy on D-Day.

Alaska's small population seems to be here—the effort all Alaskans made to come so far to share this night means a lot to me. Catherine and I are especially pleased that Lily, soon to be on the Farm at Stanford, is here, together with Catherine's sister, Judi.

This evening overwhelms me. Friends are here from almost every phase of my life.

Russ Green and I met in California when we were 14. We traveled far to be with each other for brief periods during WWII. Russ still lives in California—he was our best man in 1952 when Ann and I were married.

George Reycraft has been a companion since 1947, when we started law school. Catherine, Lily and I have spent Thanksgiving with George since 1980. Roemer McPhee and Burton Wood were with us at law school.

Bill Ewald served in the Interior Department before going to the White House to become Ike's biographer. Donna DeVarona and I were on President Ford's Commission on Amateur Sports—she encouraged me and assisted me when Congress enacted my Amateur Sports Act. Sandra Day and John O'Connor are Arizonans from a ranching family like Catherine's mother, Ellie. Tony Motley and Judy—Tony and I survived a Lear Jet crash in 1978—that's a bond that is never broken.

My constant companions in Alaska—and anywhere the fishing is good—are my brother-in-law Bill Bittner, Chuck Robinson, Bill Allen and my long-time friend and traveling companion, Marshall Coyne. General Joe Ralston and Dede have been close friends since he commanded our 11th Air Force in Alaska—they too are Alaska residents. Throughout this room are members of the Senate staff with whom I have worked. I thank each of you for coming.

And, I thank Senators Bennett, Inouye, Specter and Warner—and Elizabeth Letchworth, Secretary to the Majority, who made certain there were no votes tonight.

I am filled with awe and trepidation when the list of past recipients of this award is read. I was a foot soldier in Ike's battle to ''Wage Peace.'' To follow President Bush, Colin Powell, Bob Dole, Lloyd Bentsen, and Brent Scowcroft is an honor that takes my breath away.

Those previous recipients spoke much about Ike. George Bush said:

''I think every person in my generation, certainly every product of WWII, who witnessed his dedication to duty and the devotion with which he undertook his many weighty responsibilities, feels exactly the same way I do. In a sense, Eisenhower was like a guardian to us. Certainly, he was a hero figure before he became President of the United States.''

Bob Dole remembered that of ''the four federal balanced budgets in the last half of this century, Ike gave us three of them''.

Colin Powell told us of the Eisenhower Corridor in the Pentagon where, among the President's treasures, is his portrait and as Colin said the ''simple, but oh so eloquent, final words Ike spoke before his death, 'I've always loved my wife. I've always loved my children. I've always loved my grandchildren. I've always loved my country.' ''

I have made many statements on the Senate Floor about President Eisenhower. After Ike died in 1969, my comments as a freshman Senator reminded Americans the President held a special place in the hearts of Alaskans. To our 34th President, statehood for Alaska was a matter of simple justice. And, when he listed the accomplishments of his administration, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii appeared first. Alaska first sought statehood in 1913. Two world wars interrupted our quest. After WWII, Hawaii joined the fight. Congress considered Hawaii's bill first, but proponents of Alaska amended their bill and added Alaska, resulting in the defeat of both.

Democrats in Congress were certain Alaska would be a solid state for them; Republicans knew Hawaii was certain to be solidly for them. Neither state has followed such predictions.

In 1950, General Eisenhower said, ''. . . quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood would show the world that America practices what it preaches.''

However, in ''Eisenhower the President,'' Bill Ewald reported, ''One day in Ike's first term, Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, cautiously entered the Oval Office with Secretary Douglas McKay. 'What do you want to talk to me about?' The President asked. 'Statehood for Alaska,' McKay replied. 'Well, it better be goddamn good,' the President shot back.''

Ike was under Department of Defense pressure to oppose Alaska statehood. Explaining that his 1950 statement endorsing Alaska statehood was made before he had Presidential responsibility, in his first term Ike urged that Hawaii be admitted, but not Alaska.

This was at the height of the Cold War. Many WWII veterans went north to find a new life, including my wife Ann and me. Only 206,000 people, including military, lived in our Territory. Anyone could enter Alaska without a passport, but when we went to the ''South 48,'' our own Immigration Service demanded a passport from everyone, or at least a birth certificate and we, like Americans before us, found taxation without representation downright un-American! It was demeaning to those of us who had fought WWII. We wanted Congress to listen to Ike and show America does practice what it preaches.

Alaskans called a Constitutional Convention; we adopted a Constitution for a new state and we also adopted the ''Tennessee Plan.'' Tennessee, when it sought statehood, elected two Senators and a Congressman, then sent them to Washington, D.C. to demand statehood.

In mid-1956, I arrived back in Washington, D.C. to become Legislative Counsel at the Interior Department. President Eisenhower had just appointed as Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, Publisher of the Hastings Tribune, who had served briefly as one of Nebraska's Senators.

Alaska's newspaper publishers, particularly my friends Bill Snedden of the Fairbanks News-Miner and Bob Atwood of the Anchorage Times, knew Fred well and urged me to accept the appointment.

In many ways, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii was a triumph for newspaper publishers. Snedden and Atwood visited almost every news entity in the United States from Bill Hearst to Henry R. Luce of Time, Inc. From hundreds of daily, weekly and monthly newspapers and magazines, editorial and even financial support poured in. Seaton's own Western Farm Life, plus his papers, radio and television stations in Wyoming, Colorado and Nebraska, were all active in this endeavor.

Alaskans found their national champion for statehood in Fred Seaton. His maiden speech on the Senate Floor was an impassioned plea for immediate action on the Alaska bill. (I've always believed it was ghostwritten by Bill Snedden.)

At Interior, I joined friends with whom I had worked here in D.C. as a volunteer in Ike's 1952 campaign, preparing position papers on natural resource and western issues. Later, at the 1956 Republican Convention, working behind the scenes with Fred Seaton, Alaskans and Hawaiians obtained a provision in our Platform pledging action on both statehood bills.

During the campaign, on September 11, 1956, the President said:

''Now, Alaska is a very great area, there are few people in it, and they are confined almost exclusively in the southeast corner.

''Could there be a way worked out where the areas necessary for defense requirements could be retained under Federal control in the great outlying regions and a State made out of that portion in which the population is concentrated, it would seem to be a good solution to the problem.

''But, the great and vast area is completely dependent upon the United States for protection, and it is necessary to us in our defense arrangements.''

That statement led Secretary Seaton and me to meet in 1957 in Fred's hospital room with General Nate Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, one of Ike's favorite military advisors. With Twining was Jack Stempler, then in charge of legislation for DoD. Jack told me just this past week, ''Legislation is spawned in many places in D.C., but I wonder how many legislative solutions came from a hospital room?''

Secretary Seaton was in traction because of a bad back. We showed him and General Twining the map upon which Ike had drawn a rough line, North and West of which Ike believed there were special defense problems. Twining, who had commanded in Alaska, explained the military reasons for Eisenhower's reservations, particularly the need for unfettered access along the Northern and Western shores of Alaska, obviously defense strategy for opposing the Soviets.

The General pointed out Ike remembered that part of Alaska's Aleutian Islands were occupied by the Japanese in World War II and that Alaska's Little Diomede Island in the North Pacific was just two miles from the Soviet's Big Diomede Island.

We developed a concept to meet Ike's military concerns, while at the same time admitting the whole territory as a state, drafting a provision to give the President power to make defense withdrawals, in essence creating martial law, taking over all aspects of government in the area North or West of Ike's line. No such power exists in any other state.

The Tennessee Plan members—Bill Egan, Ernest Gruening, and Ralph Rivers—later agreed, and Bob Bartlett presented the concept in the House. This was not an easy decision. House Rules Chairman Howard Smith was a dedicated opponent of Alaska. Alaska's statehood bill bypassed his Rules Committee under an old, seldom-used House Rule, which allowed statehood bills to be taken directly to the House Floor. The strategy worked. Alaska's bill passed the House despite repeated attacks from Republicans and Southern Democrats.

Senate strategy was to avoid amendments. Had an amendment been adopted, the bill would be returned to the House where Chairman Smith would bury it.

In the Senate debate, our provision, known as Section 10, was the principal target of statehood opponents. Senator Eastland, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, led the charge saying:

''I submit that the reservation contained in section 10 is such a condition imposed upon the new State of Alaska as a price for admission in of the Union of States that it does violence to the equal footing doctrine, whereby all the preceding states entering into this Union all entered on equal footing.

''The President of the United States is authorized without a declaration of martial law, to withdraw sovereignty from over half of the area of the State of Alaska.''

Senators Thurmond and Russell spoke at length, leaving Majority Leader Mansfield to wonder out loud if there was a filibuster going on.

Senator Thurmond objected to any unanimous consent agreement. I remember loud sighs then from Alaskans in the Senate gallery, knowing as we did Strom's capability for long debate. And Strom did speak extremely long and eloquently. Senators Monroney, Fulbright, and Stennis each made motions; all failed. Then Senator Russell, an absolute powerhouse in the Senate, joined Stennis in seeking to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee. This also failed. Thurmond moved to eliminate a portion of the land in Alaska subject to section 10. That failed by a vote of 16–67. That vote showed enough votes to cut off debate. Soon thereafter, our bill passed, unamended, by a vote of 64–20.

I later served in the Senate with those Senators who opposed Alaska vigorously. Each was not only a good friend, but worked hard to help me and our new state.

Bill Ewald, when commenting on the passage of the Alaska bill in ''Eisenhower the President,'' rightfully concluded Seaton was a zealot on the subject—and I was a fanatic.

Bill also said:

''. . . in the end . . . the greatest glory must go to Eisenhower. He chose his lieutenants, gave them the freedom to think and to innovate, backed them to the hilt despite his qualms, and thus produced an outcome that, in retrospect, remains a triumph of his administration.

''They worked in his name; and history will, and should, honor him for what they did.''

The privilege of being near Ike in those days is hard to describe. It wasn't just a battle for Alaska—ten years after Ike approved our Statehood Act, oil was discovered in Alaska. Now 25 percent of all oil produced in the U.S. comes from our North Slope and Cook Inlet. Over 50 percent of all fish landed in the U.S. comes from waters off our shores. Alaska has the highest educated population in this nation. Air Force pilots train above our vast tundra, and our joint Army/Air Force exercises give our defense forces the finest training in the world.

Bryce Harlow, the President's assistant for legislative affairs, held weekly meetings every Saturday for the liaison assistants from every Department, reviewing the past week, and planning strategy for the week ahead. Ed McCabe and Roemer McPhee attended some of those meetings. General Jerry Pearson joined us once in a while. Ike often stopped by Harlow's meetings; he'd joke a little, take time to clearly and simply explain what his priorities were, and would always end with a plea to get our work done and go home to our families. Once he told us, ''If you are ever at a dinner here in Washington that lasts beyond ten p.m., go to your hostess and tell her the President needs to see you!'' Ike firmly believed in ''early to bed and early to rise.''

I'm sure you join me in saying how happy we are to be with members of the Eisenhower family again—David and Julie, Mary Jean and Susan. Ike's legacy of family love is obviously a code for each of them.

In 1982, on the Senate Floor, I discussed Bill Ewald's speech to the Eisenhower Old Guard dinner that year. Bill commented about Ike's calm as the President discussed his decision to send troops into Lebanon just eight days after he signed the Alaska Statehood Bill.

Ike told Bill, ''Look, when you appeal to the force, there's just one thing you must never do—that's lose. There's no such thing as a little force. When you use it, you use it overwhelmingly.''

Bill closed that speech with a comment with which we all agree:

''Not often in the story of mankind does a man arrive on earth of steel and velvet. Peace unspeakable and perfect.

''Something like that resided in the mind and heart and soul of Dwight Eisenhower. In

the midst of many threatening clouds it brought us a beautiful golden season of Eisenhower weather.

''For what he did, and above all for what he was, we thank God from the bottom of our hearts tonight.''

President Eisenhower's Covenant for Total Peace is known to many of you. It was read by Charlton Heston on the anniversary of D-Day, June 6th 1998, in Philadelphia. Americans who didn't know Ike personally should read it—and know what he did for us, and for the world.

I enlisted in General Eisenhower's crusade 50 years ago. And as a member of the Eisenhower Administration, I joined the President in the battle for Alaska statehood. His admonition that ''there is one thing you must never do—lose'' is a principle which continues to guide my public life.

Ike will always be my Supreme Commander. His devotion to duty, country, honor have shaped my nearly 50 years of public service. I view the world and my responsibility to it through his prism. Whether it's continuing the battle to ensure the promises of statehood are kept or working side by side with my partner, Dan Inouye, to maintain the strong national defense that Ike helped build, I am honored to continue as a foot soldier in his battle to ''wage peace.''

The Crusade I want to join is obvious: In my mind Dwight David Eisenhower must be named the Person of the Twentieth Century. My question is: where do I enlist?●

NED HOMFELD WINS ENTREPRENEUR OF THE YEAR AWARD

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge Ned Homfeld, who has been named Entrepreneur of the Year for 1999, by Ernst & Young, Mr. Homfeld was selected as the most outstanding company owner-manager from among 500 other exemplary nominees.

Ned Homfeld, the president of Spirit Airlines, is the driving force behind the young company and its remarkable success in the highly competitive airline business. Spirit Airlines, a small air carrier, offers low cost jet service to some of America's most popular business and leisure destinations as well as underserved areas in need of air travel service.

Before his involvement with Spirit Airlines, Mr. Homfeld was involved in numerous other operations including Ground Air Transfers, which delivered critically needed parts to automotive plants, and Charter One, a company that offered public charter day trips. Mr. Homfeld's drive for continued improvements in the airline industry is a testament to his hard work and devotion to the American public.

Mr. Homfeld's continued dedication has not only served Spirit Airlines, but has greatly benefited the greater community as well. Spirit Airlines, providing safe, quality air travel at affordable prices, has been a welcome contributor to Detroit's and other cities across the United States, economic successes during the past decade. His creativity, perseverance and entrepreneurial spirit is an example to us all.●

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ANTI-CRUELTY SOCIETY ON THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is with pride and pleasure that I take a moment today to recognize the Anti-Cruelty Society of Chicago on the occasion of their 100th anniversary. The society's centennial celebration is entitled ''1999—The Anti-Cruelty Society Centennial: A Legacy of Caring, A Vision of Hope for the 21st Century,'' and is truly an appropriate description of the organization's valuable impact on the lives and treatment of the nation's animals.

One hundreds years ago, the society's founders, led by Illinois resident Mrs. Theodore Thomas, were concerned with inhumane butchery in slaughterhouses, the treatment of old sick workhorses, and hundreds of thousands of malnourished homeless dogs and cats. In their efforts to eliminate cruelty to animals, to educate the public on the humane treatment of animals, and to create a refuge for stray animals until they could be placed in good homes, the society achieved impressive accomplishments in Illinois and across the nation. In fact, the group gave rise to an organization so dynamic that it has impacted and continues to impact public policy and set the standard of humane treatment for animals worldwide.

Once again, I congratulate the Anti-Cruelty Society in Chicago on their remarkable first 100 years of service, and wish them the best of luck as they continue to make a positive impact upon the lives of animals and humans in the many years to come.●

MISS MISSOURI 1999

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the winner of the 1999 Miss Missouri Pageant, Miss Patryce CoRae King. On June 12th, in my home town of Mexico, MO, Miss King won the State pageant and will go on to represent Missouri in the Miss America Pageant. Miss King is an accomplished pianist and won the talent competition of the pageant with a rendition of Gershwin's ''Rhapsody in Blue.'' I wish Miss King the best of luck and know that she will represent Missouri well at the Miss America Pageant in September.●

RETIREMENT OF JAMES R. SASSER AS AMBASSADOR TO CHINA

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my thanks and appreciation to Ambassador James Sasser for the excellent job he has done as United States ambassador to China. After more than three years of dedicated service, Ambassador Sasser will be stepping down from his position.

Ambassador Sasser served during an interesting, often strenuous, period of U.S.-China relations. Drawing on his experiences as a distinguished three term United States Senator and member of the Foreign Relations Committee, he worked tirelessly to ensure that the United States remained engaged with China to promote stability, openness, and prosperity in that country. Even Henry Kissinger, who initially expressed misgivings about Ambassador Sasser's appointment, recently remarked, ''I have known no American ambassador who has done a better or more passionate job on Sino-U.S. relations than Ambassador Sasser.''

Even during the bad times, when relations soured, Ambassador Sasser has maintained a high level of communication with Chinese leaders and provided a calm and steady influence. He recognized that no single issue can make or break U.S.-China relations and that open and frank dialogue is essential to promoting American values, especially those in the area of human rights.

Though he served with distinction for more than three years, perhaps Ambassador Sasser's finest hour came only a few weeks ago. After the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, tens of thousands of angry protesters gathered in front of the American embassy in Beijing and hurled bricks and rocks at the building. The situation was dangerously close to spinning out of control and the lives of those inside the embassy were potentially in danger. Rather than seek cover in a safer place, Ambassador Sasser stayed.

Near the end of his service, he provided us with a lasting image of poise, strength, and courage. His actions were indeed inspiring to those that were with him in Beijing and also to those of us who were watching as the events unfolded on television. He represented the finest of Americans who serve their country in embassies and consulates around the world—he was a diplomat who would not give up his post.

Again, I congratulate Ambassador Sasser for a job well done and wish him the best for his future endeavors.●

KICKOFF OF THE WOMEN'S WORLD CUP

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, last week marked the beginning of the 1999 Women's World Cup, a competition that includes the best soccer teams from throughout the world. Held every four years since 1991, the women's World Cup brings together the finest women athletes and allows them to compete at the highest level. It is so wonderful that young women throughout the world have these role models to look up to—role models such as our very own charismatic Julie Foudy, working mother Joy Fawcett, teenage sensation Tiffany Roberts, and veteran superstar Michelle Akers.

The United States team, which is among the favorites to win the tournament, is led by the best women's soccer player of all time: Mia Hamm. Mia Hamm has scored more international goals than any person—man or

woman—in the history of the game. It was perfectly fitting that she scored the first goal of the tournament by half-volleying a Brandi Chastain pass into the roof of the net.

It is also fitting that Mia Hamm was born in 1972, the same year that President Nixon signed into law Title IX of the Education Amendments Act. This law ensures that federally funded schools provide equal athletic opportunity for members of both sexes. Twenty-five years later, the U.S. National Team is one clear sign that this law is a success.

According to the Women's Sports Foundation, the number of girls who participate in high school sports since the enactment of Title IX has risen from 300 thousand to 2.37 million. Women are now 37 percent of college athletes and were 39 percent of the 1996 United States Olympic Team members.

The record-breaking crowds this weekend in San Jose and Pasadena reveal that the enthusiasm for women's soccer is not restricted to players only, but is shared by the public. Over 78,000 loyal fans packed the seats of Giants Stadium to watch the US-Denmark match, and the weekend ticket sales total of over 134,000 surpassed the 112,000 for the entire 1995 Women's World Cup in Sweden. Ticket sales for the Cup to date have passed 500,000 and are rapidly growing—potentially shattering the 600,000 world record for a sporting event held for women.

The stellar start for the World Cup speaks volumes for the future of women's soccer. Female soccer players may not have to wait much longer to play professionally in the United States. The successful weekend attests to the wonderful athletic stars and enthusiastic fans ready, willing and eager to support a women's professional soccer league in major markets such as Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York and Chicago. Citizens both domestic and worldwide are watching the Women's World Cup with pride that our teams are pioneering the path to put women's sports on parity with men's.

The impact of gender equality in sports goes far beyond the soccer field and ticket sales. Female student athletes are more likely to graduate from college than students who do not participate in sports, women who are active in sports and recreational activities as girls feel greater confidence, self-esteem and pride in their physical and social selves; and 80 percent of women identified as key leaders in Fortune 500 companies participated in sports during their childhood.

The Women's World Cup is also an important way to bring together diverse nations of the world. From North Korea to Canada, from Ghana to Sweden, everyone shares in the joys of competition and love of the game. Television viewers throughout the world have been introduced to many countries and its players. During the first week of play, we saw the flamboyant Nigerian goalkeeper Ann Chiejinei confidently lead the ''Super Falcons'' to the second round. The Brazilian one-name wonders of Sissi and Preinha brought to mind visions of Pele and Romario in scoring the first hat tricks of the tournament. And Norway, which has played in the previous two World Cup title games, opened its title defense with three impressive victories.

So, Mr. President, I will make two predictions. My first prediction is that the United States will reclaim their title as women's World Cup Champions on July 10, in Pasadena, California. And more importantly, my second prediction is that generations of women and girls for years to come will continue to thrive because of Title IX.●

HIGHMORE RESEARCH STATION

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to express my warmest congratulations to the South Dakota State University Central Research Station in Highmore, SD.

Today the experiment station is celebrating one hundred years of dedicated service to the agriculture industry in the Northern Plains. It is an outstanding example of the continued application of technological advancements by our farmers and ranchers in an ever-changing competitive environment.

The Highmore Research Farm, also known as the Central Crops and Soils Research Station, was the first research farm created in the north-central United States. It was created in 1899 at the request of livestock producers who desired drought-resistant forage plants on the prairie. It was determined that a substation was to be established between the James and Missouri Rivers and a location was eventually secured near Highmore. Initially the work at the experiment station was centered around testing drought-resisting forage and devising ways and means for livestock producers to obtain winter forage as well. Later, crop production and rotation became an integral part of the research station.

Affiliated with South Dakota State University in Brookings, this experiment station has been a leader in providing and conducting state-of-the-art agriculture research. In Highmore and at the various other South Dakota Agricultural Experiment Stations across the state, researchers cover a variety of aspects of agriculture, ranging from crop to livestock production. Over 150 different projects demand the time and effort by these dedicated researchers at this time. Through sound science and a problem solving attitude these researchers expand the knowledge base for all of agriculture and those affected by it on a daily basis.

In this critical time in production agriculture while depressed crop and livestock prices are driving agriculture producers from their operations, it is all the more essential that we encourage the research taking place at the experiment stations. As we enter a new millennium we must develop ways for producers to afford and adapt to the technological advancements that can make United States agriculture more competitive. This is crucial in order for South Dakota to compete in the ever-changing global market.

The research and knowledge gained from these experiment stations benefit not only agriculture producers, but also consumers living in rural towns and urban cities. Learning from the past and building towards the future is a daily mission at the Highmore Experiment Station. I applaud the efforts of each researcher and all of those who dedicated their time and effort to this farm in the last 100 years. I extend my best wishes to the Central Research Station in Highmore for another 100 years of successful research and service to South Dakota agriculture.●

THE HISTORIC CONTRIBUTION OF THE 5TH BOMB WING, MINOT, NORTH DAKOTA, TO OPERATION ALLIED FORCE

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense has described our military action in Kosovo as the most accurate application of Air Power in history. The men and women of the 5th Bomb Wing, Minot, North Dakota, were critical to that effort, and the citizens of this state and our entire country are justifiably proud of their efforts.

The B–52 bombing raids on Yugoslavian positions on June 7, 1999, undoubtedly hastened the decision by Yugoslavia to sign the NATO peace agreement ending the conflict. As the Washington Post reported on the significance of the strike, ''Two days later, Yugoslav generals formally agreed to withdraw all forces from Kosovo.'' The Washington Post Article entitled, ''NATO's Most Lethal Airstrike Ended a Battle, Perhaps a War,'' reported that the B–52 attack on Mount Pastrik was the turning point in the Kosovo conflict.

Like the ''Linebacker'' operations in Vietnam, the unmatched striking power of the B–52 bomber convinced the enemy that negotiation was preferable to suffering the business end of over 70,000 pounds of munitions. The crews of the B–52 bombers that carried out their missions in Kosovo proved the anecdote again, ''That bomber pilots make history.''

In recognizing the efforts of the crews and support personnel of the 5th Bomb Wing, we cannot forget the sacrifices made by the families and loved ones left behind. Today's professional All-Volunteer Air Force is a different organization than the one that preceded it. More times than not, when an Air Force member deploys, he or she leaves behind a spouse and small children who depend on them, who miss them, and who pray for their safe return. We in the Senate owe a debt of gratitude to those brave families who

lovingly support the men and women of our Armed Forces.

Mr. President, in every conflict following the Korean War, the B–52 bomber has delivered the most debilitating blows to our enemies. As demonstrated in Yugoslavia, the B–52 is still capable of delivering the initial strikes in a conflict with stand-off weapons, and then executing decisive strikes on fielded forces with a range of munitions.

The United States Air Force's plan to fly the B–52 bomber well into the next century is a tribute both to the aircraft and the innovative crews that continue to demonstrate the decisive capabilities of the aircraft. Most importantly, as long as the Air Force has men and women like those who serve in the 5th Bomb Wing, this nation sleeps well protected.●

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to now, on behalf of the leadership, the majority leader, Senator LOTT, ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar:

Nos. 109 through 130, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, the Army, the Coast Guard, the Marine Corps, and the Navy.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations were considered and confirmed as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 1552 and 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Edward W. Rosenbaum (Retired), 0000

The following named offiers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

John A. Bradley, 0000
Gerald P. Fitzgerald, 0000
Edward J. Mechenbier, 0000
Allan R. Poulin, 0000
Larry L. Twitchell, 0000

To be brigadier general

Thomas L. Carter, 0000
Richard C. Collins, 0000
John M. Fabry, 0000
Hugh H. Forsythe, 0000
Michael F. Gjede, 0000
Leon A. Johnson, 0000
Howard A.McMahan, 0000
Douglas S. Metcalf, 0000
Jose M. Portela, 0000
Peter K. Sullivan, 0000
David H. Webb, 0000

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Archie J. Berberian II, 0000
Verna D. Fairchild, 0000
Daniel J. Gibson, 0000

To be brigadier general

George C. Allen II, 0000
Roger E. Combs, 0000
Michael A. Cushman, 0000
Thomas N. Edmonds, 0000
Jared P. Kennish, 0000
Paul S. Kimmel, 0000
Virgil W. Lloyd, 0000
Alexander T. Mahon, 0000
Marvin S. Mayes, 0000
David E. McCutchin, 0000
Calvin L. Moreland, 0000
Mark R. Musick, 0000
John D. Rice, 0000
Robert O. Seifert, 0000
Lawrence A. Sittig, 0000
James M. Skiff, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William J. Begert, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles R. Holland, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Maxwell C. Bailey, 0000

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C. section 624:

To be major General

Brig. Gen. Alan D. Johnson, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C. section 601:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Donald L. Kerrick, 0000

The following named officers for apointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. James M. Collins, Jr., 0000
Brig. Gen. Robert W. Smith, III, 0000

To be brigadier general

Col. Dennis J. Laich, 0000
Col. Robert B. Ostenberg, 0000
Col Ronald D. Silverman, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major General

Robert E. Armburuster, Jr., 0000
Joseph L. Bergantz, 0000
William L. Bond, 0000
Colby M. Broadwater, III, 0000
Richard A. Cody, 0000
John M. Curran, 0000
Dell L. Dailey, 0000
John J. Deyermond, 0000
Larry J. Dodgen, 0000
James M. Dubik, 0000
Richard A. Hack, 0000
Russel L. Honore, 0000
Roderick J. Isler, 0000
Terry E. Juskowiak, 0000
Geoffrey C. Lambert, 0000
James J. Lovelace, Jr., 0000
Wade H. McManus, Jr., 0000
William H. Russ, 0000
Walter L. Sharp, 0000
Toney Stricklin, 0000
John R. Vines, 0000
Robert W. Wagner, 0000
Craig B. Wheldon, 0000
R. Steven Whitcomb, 0000
Robert Wilson, 0000
Joseph L. Yakovac, Jr., 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general, Chaplain Corps

Col. David H. Hicks, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Thomas N. Burnette, Jr., 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Billy K. Solomon, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Harry B. Axson, Jr., 0000
Col. Guy M. Bourn, 0000
Col. Ronald L. Burgess, Jr., 0000
Col. Remo Butler, 0000
Col. William B. Caldwell, IV, 0000
Col. Randal R. Catro, 0000
Col. Stephen J. Curry, 0000
Col. Robert L. Decker, 0000
Col. Ann E. Dunwoody, 0000
Col. William C. Feyk, 0000
Col. Leslie L. Fuller, 0000
Col. David F. Gross, 0000
Col. Edward M. Harrington, 0000
Col. Keith M. Huber, 0000
Col. Galen B. Jackman, 0000
Col. Jerome Johnson, 0000
Col. Ronald L. Johnson, 0000
Col. John F. Kimmons, 0000
Col. William M. Lenaers, 0000
Col. Timothy D. Livsey, 0000
Col. James A. Marks, 0000
Col. Michael R. Mazzucchi, 0000
Col. Stanley A. McChrystal, 0000
Col. David F. Melcher, 0000
Col. Dennis C. Moran, 0000
Col. Roger Nadeau, 0000
Col. Craig A. Peterson, 0000
Col. James H. Pillsbury, 0000
Col. Gregory J. Premo, 0000
Col. Kenneth J. Quinlan, Jr., 0000
Col. Fred D. Robinson, Jr., 0000
Col. James E. Simmons, 0000
Col. Stephen M. Speakes, 0000
Col. Edgar E. Stanton, III, 0000
Col. Randal M. Tieszen, 0000
Col. Bennie E. Williams, 0000
Col. John A. Yingling, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to

the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Carlton W. Fulford, Jr., 0000

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David J. Antanitus, 0000
Capt. Dale E. Baugh, 0000
Capt. Richard E. Brooks, 0000
Capt. Evan M. Chanik, Jr., 0000
Capt. Barry M. Costello, 0000
Capt. Kirkland H. Donald, 0000
Capt. Dennis M. Dwyer, 0000
Capt. Mark J. Edwards, 0000
Capt. Bruce B. Engelhardt, 0000
Capt. Tom S. Fellin, 0000
Capt. James B. Godwin, III, 0000
Capt. Charles H. Johnston, Jr., 0000
Capt. John M. Kelly, 0000
Capt. Steven A. Kunkle, 0000
Capt. Willie C. Marsh, 0000
Capt. George E. Mayer, 0000
Capt. John G. Morgan, Jr., 0000
Capt. Dennis G. Morral, 0000
Capt. Eric T. Olson, 0000
Capt. James J. Quinn, 0000
Capt. Ann E. Rondeau, 0000
Capt. Frederick R. Ruehe, 0000
Capt. Lindell G. Rutherford, 0000
Capt. John D. Stufflebeem, 0000
Capt. William D. Sullivan, 0000
Capt. Gerald L. Talbot, Jr., 0000
Capt. Hamlin B. Tallent, 0000
Capt. Richard P. Terpstra, 0000
Capt. Thomas J. Wilson, III, 0000
Capt. James M. Zortman, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Raymond A. Archer, III, 0000
Rear Adm. (lh) Justin D. McCarthy, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Naval Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Darold F. Bigger, 0000
Capt. Fenton F. Priest, III, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Donald C. Arthur, Jr., 0000
Capt. Linda J. Bird, 0000
Capt. Michael K. Loose, 0000
Capt. Richard A. Mayo, 0000
Capt. Joseph P. Vanlandingham, Jr., 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Naval Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Robert M. Clark, 0000
Capt. Mark M. Hazara, 0000
Capt. John R. Hines, Jr., 0000
Capt. James Manzelmann, Jr., 0000
Capt. Noel G. Preston, 0000
Capt. Howard K. Unruh, Jr., 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Vernon E. Clark, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Thomas B. Fargo, 0000

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE, ARMY, COAST GUARD, MARINE CORPS, NAVY

Air Force nominations beginning *Raan R. Aalgaard, and ending Steven R. Zwicker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1999.

Army nominations beginning with Michael R. Collyer, and ending Renee M. Ponce, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19, 1999.

Army nomination of Michael L. Mcginnis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1999.

Coast Guard nomination of James W. Seeman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1999.

Marine Corps nomination of Loston E. Carter, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1999.

Marine Corps nomination of Jack A. Maberry, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Sylvester P. Abramowicz, Jr., and ending Shelley W.S. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Bruce A. Abbott, and ending Bertrand L. Zeller, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Thomas Abernathy, and ending Paul M. Ziegler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Sevak Adamian, and ending John E. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1999.

Navy nomination of Theodore H. Brown, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Richard W. Bauer, and ending Derek K. Webster, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Robert A. Yourek, and ending Lorenzo D. Brown, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Douglas G. Maccrea, and ending Mladen K. Vranjican, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1999.

Navy nomination of James N. Frame, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Nils S. Erikson, and ending Edward C. Ziegler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Thor D. Aakre, and ending Mary M. Zurowski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1999.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDER FOR BILL TO BE PRINTED—S. 886

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, also on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that S. 886, the State Department authorization bill, be printed as passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RETIREMENT OF RON KAVULICK

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 131 submitted earlier by Senators LOTT and DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 131) relating to the retirement of Ron Kavulick.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today, Ron Kavulick, who has faithfully served the United States Senate for 20 years, will officially retire from the Senate family.

It took Ron Kavulick a while to get to the Senate. He worked first as an official court reporter for the office of The Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, and later, as an official reporter in the White House—serving Presidents Nixon and Johnson. When he finally got to us, as an Official Reporter of Senate Debates, he advanced quickly, ultimately serving as Chief Reporter.

As Chief Reporter, Ron oversaw the preparation and editing of the proceedings of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record. His greatest challenge, perhaps, was the impeachment trial of the President, where Ron's institutional memory and experience were called upon throughout the lengthy proceedings. It's all too easy for us to assume that capable and dedicated Senate employees, like Ron, will always be here providing abiding support and quiet efficiency.

Thomas Carlyle argued that history is the sum of the work of outstanding individuals. If so, then Ron Kavulick has contributed much to our Senate history. His support to me and my staff will always be remembered. I commend Ron for his dedicated service, and wish him and his wife, Pat, many years of health and happiness in retirement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today we honor 20 years of service to the Senate by its Chief Reporter, Ron Kavulick. For 16 years, beginning in 1979, Ron

worked on the Senate floor as a reporter of debates, where he distinguished himself as a friend to everyone and as one who labored mightily to accurately report Senators' statements for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He was a stickler for detail and bent over backwards to make sure every aspect of his work was correct, as he strove to preserve Senate history to its fullest.

As a result of his tenacity and dedication, Ron was promoted to Chief Reporter in 1995. In that position, Ron was invaluable to the Senate in his dedication to the accuracy of the CONGESSIONAL RECORD. He gave of himself unselfishly to be a fair and considerate supervisor.

Ron now retires to be with his wife, Pat, and their two married children, Jeff and Susan, and granddaughter Allison.

The Senate today says thank you to Ron and his family for his exemplary service to the Senate and its family. He truly is our friend.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to thank and applaud Ron Kavulick, the Chief Reporter of Debates, for the tremendous work that he did for the U.S. Senate. Being in charge of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a very demanding and important responsibility. For it is the historical document of the Senate—the bills we introduce, the statements that we make, and all of our debates are printed in the RECORD. I am often amazed how the RECORD is compiled and printed in such a short amount of time.

Ron was to have ended his Senate career at the close of the 105th Congress, but remained in his position as the Senate conducted the impeachment trial of the President. His experience was greatly appreciated throughout this historical proceeding.

Ron's reporting background is both extensive and impressive. He became an Official Reporter of the RECORD of Senate Debates in 1979 and served in that capacity until he was elevated to the position of Chief Reporter in 1995. Before that, he was an official court reporter in the Air Force's Judge Advocate General Corp, and while employed with Alderson Reporting Company, Ron had the opportunity to work at the White House. He traveled extensively both with President Johnson and President Nixon.

My staff and I personally cannot thank Ron enough for his service. He was always available, day or night, for any help that my staff or I needed. I once wrote that the single most exciting thing you encounter in government is competence, because it's so rare. In that case, Ron Kavulick is a rarity in government, and we are blessed to have had him in the Senate.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and, finally, that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 131) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 131

Whereas, Ron Kavulick will retire on June 30, 1999, from service to the United States Senate after twenty years as a member of the staff of the Official Reporters of Debates;

Whereas, he has served the United States Senate with honor and distinction since joining the staff of the Official Reporters of Debates on October 22, 1979;

Whereas, his self-determination and hard work as an official reporter resulted in his appointment to the position of Chief Reporter on May 22, 1995;

Whereas, Ron Kavulick, as Chief Reporter of the Congressional Record, has at all times executed the important duties and responsibilities of his office with dedication and excellence; and

Whereas, Ron Kavulick has demonstrated exemplary service to the United States Senate as an institution and leaves a legacy of superior and professional service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate expresses its deep appreciation and gratitude to Ron Kavulick for his years of faithful service to his country and to the United States Senate.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Ron and Pat Kavulick.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES DAY

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 145, S. Res. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 21) to designate September 29, 1999, as ''Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my sincere appreciation to my colleagues for joining me in honoring the more than two million veterans of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, VFW, of the United States as we pass legislation I introduced earlier this year, S.J. Res. 21, to designate September 29, 1999, as Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Day.

September 29, 1999 marks the centennial of the VFW. As veterans of the Spanish American War and the Philippine Insurrection of 1899 and the China Relief Expedition of 1900 returned home, they drew together in order to preserve the ties of comradeship forged in service to their country.

They began by forming local groups to secure rights and benefits for the service they rendered to our country. In Columbus, OH, veterans founded the American Veterans of Foreign Service. In Denver, Colorado, veterans started the Colorado Society of the Army of the Philippines. In 1901, the Philippine War Veterans organization was started by the Philippine Veterans in Altoona and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In 1913, these varied organizations with a common mission joined forces as the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I am honored to salute this proud organization.

Mr. President, when many of us think about war veterans, we think about the tremendous sacrifices these defenders of freedom made to safeguard the democracy we cherish, especially those who made the ultimate sacrifice. S.J. Res. 21 recognizes those contributions and sacrifices. It also recognizes the contributions that VFW members continue to make day-in and day-out in our communities—the youth activities and scholarships programs, the Special Olympics, homeless assistance initiatives, efforts to reach out to fellow veterans in need, and national leadership on issues of importance to veterans and all Americans. Over the last 100 years, members of the VFW have contributed greatly to our nation both in and out of uniform in ways too numerous to enumerate.

I have nothing but the utmost respect for those who have served their country. With this legislation, we honor the men and women and their families who have served this country with courage, honor and distinction. They answered the call to duty when their country needed them, and this is but a small token of our appreciation.

The centennial of the founding of the VFW will present all Americans with an opportunity to honor and pay tribute to the more than two million active members of the VFW and to all veterans, as well as to the ideals for which many made the ultimate sacrifice. I thank my colleagues for joining me in a strong show of support and an expression of thanks to the VFW and all veterans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read a third time and passed, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Joint Resolution (S.J. Res. 21) was read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 21

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was founded on September 29, 1899;

Whereas the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States will occur on September 29, 1999;

Whereas for the past 100 years, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has made valuable contributions to the well-being of veterans of the Armed Forces and to the States and their communities, and has exhibited national leadership on issues of

importance to all veterans of the Armed Forces; and

Whereas the centennial anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States presents an opportunity to recognize, honor, and pay tribute to the more than 2,000,000 veterans of the Armed Forces represented by that organization, and to all the individuals who have served in the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That September 29, 1999, is designated as ''Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Day'', and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all Government agencies and the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 208 of the 105th Congress, appoints the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) to the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, vice the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS).

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—SOCIAL SECURITY LOCKBOX

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, Senator LOTT, I ask unanimous consent that following the cloture vote on Thursday relative to the Social Security lockbox issue, if invoked, the Senate immediately proceed to the bill, and following the offering of the cloture motion on the pending amendment, the bill be laid aside until Friday, July 16.

I further ask unanimous consent that 9:30 a.m. on Friday there be 1 hour for debate to be equally divided in the usual form, and that the cloture vote occur at 10:30 a.m. on Friday, July 16, and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—Y2K CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate proceeds to the conference report to accompany H.R. 775, the Y2K liability bill, the reading be waived and it be limited to the following debate time: Senator MCCAIN, 20 minutes; Senator DODD, 15 minutes; Senator WYDEN, 15 minutes; Senator LEAHY, 10 minutes; and Senator HOLLINGS, 50 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEWINE. I ask consent that immediately following that debate, the Senate proceed to a vote on adoption of the conference report with no other intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY JULY 1, 1999

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 1. I further ask that on Thursday, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I further ask that the Senate then begin 1 hour of debate prior to the cloture motion to proceed to the Social Security lockbox issue, with time to be equally divided between the two leaders, or their designees, and that the live quorum be waived. I also ask that following the vote, notwithstanding rule XXII, Senator SPECTER then be recognized up to 30 minutes, as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Majority Leader LOTT, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow the Senate will convene at 9:30 a.m. and will debate cloture on the motion to proceed to the Social Security lockbox legislation for 1 hour, to be followed by a cloture vote at 10:30 a.m. If cloture is invoked, the leader will then file a cloture motion on the pending amendment, which is the Social Security lockbox issue. That cloture vote will occur at 10:30 a.m. on Friday, July 16, as under a previous order.

Following that action, Senator SPECTER will be recognized as in morning business for up to 30 minutes. Upon completion of Senator SPECTER's remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill with the hope of completing that bill during Thursday's session of the Senate.

Under a previous consent, all amendments must be offered by 11:30 a.m. on Thursday. It may also be the intention of the leader to debate and vote on the Y2K conference report and to begin consideration of any other appropriations bills cleared for action on Thursday.

Therefore, Senators can expect votes throughout the day.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, 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 9:02 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 1, 1999.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 30, 1999:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CHARLES A. BLANCHARD, OF ARIZONA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, VICE WILLIAM T. COLEMAN III.

CAROL DI BATTISTE, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE F. WHITTEN PETERS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BARBRO A. OWENS-KIRKPATRICK, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NIGER.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT H. FOGLESONG, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. CHARLES R. HEFLEBOWER, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. LANSFORD E. TRAPP, JR., 0000.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

LARITA A. ARAGON, 0000
FRANCES M. AUCLAIR, 0000
HENRY E. BELLION, 0000
JAMES D. BLAZEY, 0000
THOMAS H. BOGUN, 0000
JOHNNY E. BONNER, 0000
MARK L. BOOTS, 0000
MICHAEL G. BRANDT, 0000
HUGH T. BROOMALL, 0000
ALAN C. BUNTING, 0000
NORMAN L. BURSON, 0000
GEORGE N. CLARK, JR., 0000
NEIL A. CURRIE, 0000
JOHN B. CYRIACKS, 0000
PAUL E. DAVENPORT, 0000
THORNE A. DAVIS, 0000
JOHN E. DENT, JR., 0000
VAUGHN A. DUNHAM, 0000
DONALD N. EDMANDS, JR., 0000
SHEREE M. ETTER, 0000
JUSTIN W. FISHER, 0000
WAYNE A. GALLO, 0000
TERRY A. GRAYBEAL, 0000
RONALD A. HALE, JR., 0000
R ANTHONY HAYNES, 0000
MARK C. HOOPER, 0000
HOWARD P. HUNT III, 0000
THOMAS C. HUTCHINGS, 0000
CONSTANCE E. ILLING, 0000
ROBERT D. IRETON, 0000
KENNETH A. IRLAND, 0000
CORA M. JACKSON, 0000
RICHARD Y. JACOBSON, 0000
EARL G. JAQUES, JR., 0000
MURRAY O. KING, JR., 0000
GARY D. LANHAM, 0000
EMIL LASSEN III, 0000
VERGEL L. LATTIMORE, 0000
KERMIT L. LEMON II, 0000
BRIAN E. LOFTUS, 0000
BENJAMIN F. LUCAS II, 0000
WILLIAM MAIORANO, 0000
SCOTT B. MCEVOY, 0000
WILLIAM E. MELL, 0000
DANIEL G. MORRIS, 0000
HENRY C. MORROW, 0000
DANIEL ST J. MORTAG, 0000
JOHN F. NICHOLS, 0000
MICHAEL J. NUGENT, 0000
SYLVIA J. NYE, 0000
DANIEL B. OHOLLAREN, 0000
PATRICK J. PAULI, 0000
GARY L. PETERS, 0000
RICHARD J. PROSEK, 0000
WILLIAM A. PROSISE, JR., 0000
DONALD P. ROBERTS, 0000
JOE A. ROSE, JR., 0000
JOSEPH R. ROSS, JR., 0000
DANIEL R. ROTA, 0000
TIMOTHY R. RUSH, 0000
WILLIAM G. SCHAETZLE, 0000
FREDERICK SCHMIDT, 0000
RICHARD E. SELTZER, 0000
JOHN G. SHEEDY, 0000
RONALD L. SHULTZ, 0000
ROBERT C. STCLAIR, 0000
RICHARD M. STEDDING, JR., 0000
MICHAEL J. STINSON, 0000
RICHARD J. UTECHT, 0000
ROBERT L. VAUGHN, 0000
EDWARD J. WAITTE, 0000
WILLIAM H. WEATHERS, 0000
JAMES J. WHITE, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHARLES E. HEADDEN, 0000
MICHAEL W. VIERS, 0000

To be major

ANTHONY R. ANDEREGG, 0000
FREDERICK J. BEATA, 0000
THOMAS H. BELL, 0000
MICHAEL W. BINNEY, 0000
RAFEAL D. CHEATHAM, 0000
STEVEN K. COKER, 0000
DANIEL H. DUBBS, 0000
MATTHEW H. GREEN, 0000
SCOTT W. HARRIS, 0000
STEVEN J. LAND, 0000
DAVID A. LAPAN, 0000
JOHN F. LICARI, 0000
ANDREW R. MELLON, 0000
JEFF A. NAGEL, 0000
CHRISTIAN D. NELSON, 0000
ROBERT A. ODAY, 0000
DOUGLAS W. PASNIK, 0000
MARK PRICE, 0000
TIMOTHY B. SEAMON, 0000
RONALD A. SPEARS, 0000
BLAYNE H. SPRATLIN, 0000
JEFFREY S. STIMPSON, 0000
SHAWN B. STITH, 0000
PATRICK J. TOWEY, 0000
THOMAS W. WHITE, 0000

To be captain

BAMIDELE J. ABOGUNRIN, 0000
JOHN K. ADAMS, 0000
MICHAEL AKSELRUD, 0000
OSCAR M. ALVAREZ II, 0000
STEVEN L. AMENT, 0000
ERIC S. ANDERSON, 0000
ROBERT L. ANDERSON III, 0000
PHILIP M. ANDRESS III, 0000
VIRGILIO G. ARCEGA, JR., 0000
KENNETH L. ASBRIDGE III, 0000
RHESA J. ASHBACHER, 0000
SEAN T. AUTH, 0000
TODD W. BACKHUS, 0000
DANIEL J. BAKER, 0000
WESLEY T. BANE, 0000
HERNAN BARRERO, 0000
CRAIG E. BARTON, 0000
ROBERT L. BATES, JR., 0000
TODD A. BECKMAN, 0000
GREGORY M. BEISBIER, 0000
MICHAEL C. BELCHER, 0000
ROBERT H. BELKNAP II, 0000
JAMES M. BELL, JR., 0000
EDWARD J. BENJAMIN, 0000
WADE J. BIEBERDORF, 0000
NICHOLAS C. BLACK, 0000
THOMAS J. BLACKWELL, 0000
DAVID H. BOHN, 0000
ANGELL C. BOLDEN-GREEN, 0000
BRET A. BOLDING, 0000
RAPHAEL E. BONITA, 0000
JAY D. BORELLA, 0000
DARREN S. BOYD, 0000
ROBERT J. BRAATZ, JR., 0000
WILLIAM C. BRADLEY, 0000
PHILLIP M. BRAGG, 0000
IAN D. BRASURE, 0000
SCOTT A. BRINK, 0000
RODNEY S. BRINTON, 0000
PATRICK S. BRODERICK, 0000
NGAIO I. BROWN, 0000
GARY B. BROWNING, 0000
BART A. BUCKEL, 0000
MICHAEL R. BUNTING, 0000
DARREN C. BURCH, 0000
HAROLD E. BURKE, 0000
STEVEN P. BURNETT, 0000
STEVE A. BUTLER, 0000
JOSHUA B. BYER, 0000
RANDY E. CADIEUX, 0000
ALBERT S. CALAMUG, 0000
CHARLES D. CAMPBELL, 0000
EDWARD T. CARD, JR., 0000
GLEN M. CARLSON, 0000
JOHN D. CARROLL, 0000
ERIC R. CASEY, 0000
ROBERT T. CASTRO, 0000
HENRY CENTENO, JR., 0000
WALTER D. CERKAN, 0000
BERNARD C. CERNOSEK, 0000
CLARK D. CHASE, 0000
JASON K. CHRISTIANSEN, 0000
MILTON J. CLAUSEN, JR., 0000
JOSEPH E. CLEARY, 0000
BRIAN CLEMENS, 0000
NATHAN P. CLYNCKE, 0000
THADDEUS COAKLEY, 0000
LAWRENCE A. COLBY, 0000
WILLIAM D. COLLIER, 0000
BRIAN C. COLLINS, 0000
WILLIAM J. COLLINS, JR., 0000
CHARLOTTE M. COMISKY, 0000
TIMOTHY R. CONNELL, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. CONNELLY, 0000
HUGH K. CONNOLLY, 0000
BRIAN H. CONRAD, 0000
JESSE C. CONSTANTE, 0000
FRANK P. CONWAY, 0000
JAMES B. COOKSEY, 0000
JAMES R. COPPERSMITH, 0000
MARC D. COSTAIN, 0000
PAUL T. COURTAWAY, JR., 0000
ELIZABETH F. CRAIL, 0000
DAVID C. CROSS, 0000
ALAN F. CROUCH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C. CROWE, 0000
JOHN W. CURRIE IV, 0000
KARLA E. DANE, 0000
ROMIN DASMALCHI, 0000
GEORGE J. DAVID, JR., 0000
SARAH M. DEAL, 0000
JOHN E. DEATON, 0000
EDWARD J. DEBISH, 0000
JOSEPH K. DECAPITE, 0000
SEAN P. DEHLINGER, 0000
JOHN E. DELLINGER, 0000
DENNIS C. DERIENZO, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. DEVER, 0000
RICHARD A. DICKEY, 0000
DANIEL J. DIMICCO, 0000
LEONARD V. DORRIAN, JR., 0000
ERIC R. DROWN, 0000
ALFREDO DUBOIS, 0000
JOHN G. DUCOTE, 0000
SEAN T. DUGAN, 0000
DANIEL E. DUGGAN, 0000
PETER C. DUNNING, 0000
JOHN R. DUPREE, 0000
MATTHEW S. DUTKIEWICZ, 0000
ROBERT M. DWYER, 0000
NORMAN D. EADIE, 0000
HAROLD B. EGGERS, 0000
JAY M. EGLOFF, 0000
DANIEL P. ERICKSON, 0000
GREGORY J. ESTVANDER, 0000
GABRIEL J. FABBRI, 0000
DANIEL D. FERNANDES, 0000
JOHN M. FIELD, 0000
DANNY R. FIELDS, 0000
SEAN B. FILSON, 0000
SHAUN T. FITZPATRICK, 0000
TIMOTHY S. FITZPATRICK, 0000
MICHAEL D. FOLGATE, 0000
CRAIG A. FORRESTER, 0000
BRYAN C. FORTE, 0000
DUANE M. FOSTER, 0000
PHILIP H. FRAZETTA, 0000
JAMES H. FULLER, 0000
TIMOTHY R. GABRIEL, 0000
THOMAS W. GAGNON, JR., 0000
FRANCIS G. GALA, 0000
WILLIAM A. GALLARDO, 0000
THOMAS J. GALVIN, 0000
RAYMUNDO R. GAMBOL, 0000
CHARLES L. GANT III, 0000
ERIC GARCIA, 0000
THOMAS A. GARCIA, 0000
PETER W. GARDNER, 0000
WENDY S. GARRITY, 0000
MICHAEL E. GATHERCOLE, 0000
LEWIS W. GEIL, 0000
JASON S. GERIN, 0000
DAVID S. GIBBS, 0000
ALLEN L. GILBERT, 0000
MARK W. GILDAY, 0000
DEREK E. GILLETTE, 0000
TIMOTHY C. GOLDEN, 0000
JOSE A. GOMEZ, 0000
ADRIAN C. GOSS, 0000
RONALD S. GOUKER, 0000
RYAN G. GOULETTE, 0000
WILLIAM C. GRAY, 0000
ROBERT M. GREEN, 0000
KIRK A. GREINER, 0000
CHRISTEON C. GRIFFIN, 0000
MICHAEL R. GRISCHKOWSKY, 0000
BRADLEY G. GROSVENOR, 0000
DAVID S. GRUHN, 0000
THOMAS A. GRUNDHERR, 0000
CHRIS T. GUARNIERI, 0000
JOSEPH L. GUGINO, 0000
PATRICK M. GUINEE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. HAASE, 0000
EDWARD J. HAGGERTY, 0000
DOUGLAS P. HALE II, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W. HAMPTON, 0000
JARED J. HANSBROUGH, 0000
DOUGLAS HARDY, 0000
THOMAS O. HARPER, JR., 0000
ANDREAS S. HAU, 0000
HENRY C. HEIM, 0000
DAVID S. HEINO, 0000
ANDREW H. HESTERMAN, 0000
ALEXANDER G. HETHERINGTON, 0000
DAVID S. HILL, 0000
LARRY D. HILLIARD, 0000
BRIAN M. HILYER, 0000
GARRETT R. HOFFMAN, 0000
TIMOTHY H. HOGAN, 0000
JASON T. HOLDEN, 0000
ERIC A. HOLDT, 0000
SEANAN R. HOLLAND, 0000
STANLEY D. HOLLAND, 0000
PIERRE G. HOLLIS, 0000
SHANNON V. HOLLOWAY, 0000
PATRICK S. HOULAHAN, 0000
RICHARD N. HUNTE, 0000
NATHAN E. HUNTINGTON, 0000
JAMES J. HURD, 0000
DARYL S. HURST, 0000
KEVIN H. HUTCHISON, 0000
PHILLIP G. JACKSON, 0000
TIMOTHY J. JAMES, 0000
JAN M. JANUARY, 0000
EDWARD L. JEEP, 0000
BETHANY D. JENKINS, 0000
KARL E. JOHNSON, 0000
THEODORE S. JOHNSON, 0000
WILLIAM W. JOHNSON, 0000
JOHN S. JOLLEY, 0000
RONALD A. JONES, 0000
HENRY JUNE, JR., 0000
DAVID A. KALINSKE, 0000
BRIAN J. KAMBUROFF, 0000
BRIAN H. KANE, 0000
THOMAS D. KEATING, 0000
HUNTER R. KELLOGG, 0000
ALBERT K. KIM, 0000
KYLE T. KIMBALL, 0000
JOHN M. KITCHAR, 0000
TODD F. KLIMPEL, 0000
CRAIG A. KOPEL, 0000
MICHAEL R. KROHMER, 0000
RAYMOND C. LABBE, 0000
LARRY E. LASATER, JR., 0000
BRUCE W. LAUGHLIN, 0000
BRENT A. LAWNICZAK, 0000
MICHAEL G. LEBEAU, 0000
EDWARD Y. LEE, 0000
JEFFREY D. LEE, 0000
KENNETH G. LEE, 0000
Kyuwon Lee, 0000
CRAIG C. LEFLORE, 0000
JOSEPH P. LENTIVECH III, 0000
LORI K. LETZRING, 0000
GLEN A. LEWIS, 0000
ERIC S. LIVINGSTON, 0000
FERDINAND F. LLANTERO, 0000
ERIK A. LLUFRIO, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. LOHMANN, 0000
MICHAEL W. LOWES, 0000
DOUGLAS G. LUCCIO, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C. LYNCH, 0000
JOHN W. LYNCH III, 0000
WILLIAM R. LYNCH, 0000
ERIC M. LYON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER G. MADELINE, 0000
FRANK A. MAKOSKI, JR., 0000
RUSSELL W. MANTZEL, 0000
WENDY L. MAROTTA, 0000
MARIA A. MARTE, 0000
THEODORE E. MARTIN, 0000
NICHOLAS R. MARTINSON, 0000
CLYDE D. MAYS, 0000
PETER C. MC CONNELL, 0000
JAMES S. MC DERMOTT, 0000
DANIEL M. MC DONALD, 0000
GARY D. MC GEE, 0000
RONALD H. MC LAUGHLIN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. MEDLIN, 0000
ANDREW O. METCALF, 0000
PETER M. MEYER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. MICHEL, 0000
PHILIP A. MIDDLETON, JR., 0000
ALEXANDER H. MILLER, 0000
CRAIG A. MILLER, 0000
DUNCAN W. MILLER, 0000
MATTHEW B. MIXA, 0000
MICHAEL C. MONTI, 0000
DEREK T. MONTROY, 0000
SEAN P. MOONEY, 0000
ALONZO B. MOORE, 0000
JOHN E. MOORE, 0000
PAUL M. MORENO, 0000
MICHAEL D. MORI, 0000
MATTHEW T. MOWERY, 0000
JOHN R. MUNDAY, 0000
NEIL F. MURPHY, JR., 0000
MICHAEL D. MURRAY, 0000
DOUGLAS B. NELSON, 0000
MARCUS J. NELSON, 0000
NICHOLAS M. NICHOLSON, 0000
ANDREW M. NIEBEL, 0000
MICHAEL A. NIERMEIER, 0000
KEVIN P. NOONAN, 0000
RICHARD E. NUTT, 0000
JONATHAN P. OGLE, 0000
CARLOS L. OLIVO, 0000
DEREK J. OLOUGHLIN, 0000
MICHAEL J. O NEIL, 0000
BRIAN T. O NEILL, 0000
ANTHONY C. ORLANDO, 0000
KEVIN T. OROURKE, 0000
TRAVIS F. OSELMO, 0000
PATRICK R. OWENS, 0000
MATTHEW J. PALMA, 0000
DAVID J. PARK, 0000
LARRY D. PARKER, JR., 0000
CLARKE A. PAULUS, 0000
THOMAS A. PECINA, 0000
PHILLIP E. PETERS II, 0000
BRIAN R. PETERSON, 0000
DAVID H. PETERSON, JR., 0000
DAVID S. PETERSON, 0000
LLOYD G. PHILLIPS, JR., 0000
KATHERINE I. POLEVITZKY, 0000
ANTHONY G. PORTER, 0000
STEVEN M. PRATHER, 0000
THEODORE W. PRESS, 0000
DONALD J. PRESTO, 0000
JOHN J. PRIFF, 0000
MICHAEL B. PROSSER, 0000
JOHN A. PRYCE, 0000
JOHN A. RAHE, JR., 0000
DAVID V. RAIMO, 0000
ANDREW W. RALSTON, 0000
KELLY C. RAMSHUR, 0000
DAVID A. RATZEL, 0000
JEFFREY A. RAY, 0000
MATTHEW D. RAZVILLAS, 0000
BRIAN A. REED, 0000
JON A. REISTROFFER, 0000
BARRON E. RENDEL, 0000
JAMES V. RENQUIST, 0000
SCOTT A. RICE, 0000
CHRISTIAN D. RICHARDSON, 0000
RODNEY A. RICHARDSON, 0000
MICHAEL M. RICHMAN, 0000
RALPH J. RIZZO, JR., 0000
MICHAEL C. ROBERTS, 0000
BENJAMIN A. ROBERTSON, 0000
SCOTT A. ROBINSON, 0000
STEVEN ROBINSON, 0000
WAYNE E. ROLLINGS, JR., 0000
JAMES K. ROUDEBUSH, 0000
ROBERT V. RUBIO, 0000
JOSEPH E. RUPP, 0000
RANDAL L. RUSSELL, 0000
GREGORY A. RYAN, 0000
SEAN M. SADLIER, 0000
RUSSELL M. SAGE, 0000
KENNETH M. SANDLER, 0000
MATTHEW R. SASSE, 0000
MORGAN N. SAVAGE, 0000
MICHAEL E. SAYEGH, 0000
PIETRO P. SCARSELLI, 0000
BRYNN H. SCHREINER, 0000
MARK R. SCHROEDER, 0000
KENNETH J. SCHWANTNER, 0000
CRAIG R. SCHWETJE, 0000
DANIEL D. SEIBEL, 0000
GLENN R. SEIFFERT, 0000
DHARMESH M. SHAH, 0000
TIMOTHY A. SHEYDA, 0000
JAMES E. SHORES, 0000
JOHN R. SIARY, 0000
DAVID J. SIKORA, 0000
MARK T. SILCOX, 0000
BRYAN W. SIMMONS, 0000
BRIAN D. SIMON, 0000
DAVID P. SLACK, 0000
WILLIAM M. SLOAN, 0000
WINFRED J. SMEDLEY, JR., 0000
JASON E. SMITH, 0000
MARY M. SMITH, 0000
THOMAS C. SMITH, 0000
TROY E. SMITH, 0000
MATTHEW R. SNYDER, 0000
JAMES M. SOBIEN, 0000
JOHN M. STAFFORD, 0000
SEAN R. STALLARD, 0000
SEAN E. STEPHENS, 0000
MARK T. STEWART, 0000
STEPHEN R. STEWART, 0000
KYLE M. STODDARD, 0000
KURT A. STRANGE, 0000
SCOTT P. SUCKOW, 0000
MICHAEL J. SUTHERLAND, 0000
DAVID S. SWIATKOWSKI, 0000
JONATHAN S. SWOPE, 0000
PATRICK J. TANSEY, 0000
WILLIAM P. TEICHGRAEBER, 0000
DENNIS C. TEITZEL, 0000
MATTHEW L. THOMAS, 0000
JOHN D. THURMAN, 0000
STEPHEN S. TIELEMANS, 0000
JONATHON A. TONEY, 0000
TERRY L. TROGDON, 0000
SCOTT E. UKEILEY, 0000
WILLIAM A. ULLMARK, JR., 0000
ALEXANDER UMANSKY, 0000
STEWART T. UPTON, 0000
MICHAEL A. URENA, 0000
CARLOS A. VALLEJO, 0000
MATTHEW W. VANDERLOO, 0000
MICHAEL K. VANNEST, 0000
MARCO P. VANVLIET, 0000
NICHOLAS P. VAVICH, 0000
SALVATORE VISCUSO III, 0000
RHETT J. VRANISH, 0000
TODD S. WALDRON, 0000
ROBERT Q. WARD, 0000
SCOTT C. WARD, 0000
GILBERT A. WARNER, 0000
DAVID E. WATKINS II, 0000
ERIC R. WATSON, 0000
CARL A. WATT, 0000
MARC E. WEINTRAUB, 0000
MARGARET M. WEITZEL, 0000
ROBERT S. WHITE, 0000
JAMES S. WHITEKER, 0000
BYRON T. WIEDEMAN, 0000
JOHN J. WIENER, 0000
RAYSHAW L. WILLIAMS, 0000
VINCENT H. WILLIAMS, 0000
STANLEY E. WILLIAMSON, 0000
MICHAEL F. WILONSKY, 0000
COREY M. WILSON, 0000
DARYL M. WILSON, 0000
ROBERT L. WISER, 0000
THOMAS J. WITCZAK, 0000
DANIEL J. WITTNAM, 0000
ROGER M. WOOD, 0000
KEVIN S. WOODARD, 0000
MELVIN T. WOODING, JR., 0000
ARTHUR J. WOODS, 0000
JOSEPH B. WOODS, 0000
ERIK G. WOODSON, 0000
GREGORY T. WRIGHT, 0000
MICHAEL S. YAROSCHUK, 0000
RANDALL S. YEARWOOD, 0000
DAVID J. YOST, 0000
MATTHEW T. YOUNG, 0000

To be first lieutenant

BRAD J. AIELLO, 0000
AMY B. ALGER, 0000
JUSTIN J. ANSEL, JR., 0000
BRYAN J. APPLETON, 0000
VICTOR A. ARANA II, 0000
MITCHELL S. BALL, 0000
ERIK J. BARTELT, 0000
PETER D. BARTLE, 0000
JOHN M. BASEEL, 0000
THEODORE W. BATZEL, JR., 0000
THOMAS M. BEDELL, 0000
SHAWN B. BELTRAN, 0000
MARK E. BENSON, 0000
ERICH B. BERGIEL, 0000
CHAD J. BERNHOLTZ, 0000
MICHAEL J. BIBLE, 0000
THOMAS BILLUPS, JR., 0000
GARY W. BILYEU, 0000
SUSAN BIRD, 0000
TODD W. BIRNEY, 0000
ANDREW M. BISHOP, 0000
HENRY L. BLACKSHEAR, JR., 0000
WILLIAM E. BLANCHARD, 0000
GREGORY M. BLANTON, 0000
SPENCER S. BLODGETT, 0000
TODD M. BOEDING, 0000
DANIEL J. BOERSMA, 0000
JEFFREY M. BOLDUC, 0000
VINCENT BOSQUEZ, 0000
JAMES E. BOTTRELL, 0000
JAMES Y. BOUNDS II, 0000
ERIC A. BOWEN, 0000
MICHAEL A. BOWERS, 0000
BONNIE L. BOYETTE, 0000
JONATHAN L. BRADLEY, 0000
ROBB R. BREEDEN, 0000
HENRY J. BREZILLAC, 0000
CLIFFORD N. BROWN, JR., 0000
VINCENT R. BRYAN, 0000
ADAM W. BRYSON, 0000
ANDREA S. BURNS, 0000
MICHAEL K. CAGLE, 0000
RICHARD D. CALLAHAN, 0000
RYAN B. CANTOR, 0000
SAMUEL H. CARRASCO, 0000
GEORGE T. CARROLL, 0000
ROMAN K. CASON, 0000
CHARLES R. CASSIDY, 0000
MICHAEL S. CASTELLANO, 0000
PAMELA J. CASTELLANO, 0000
THOMAS H. CHALKLEY, 0000
JAMES F. CHERRY, JR., 0000
LESLEY W. CHIU, 0000
WILLIAM H. CHRONISTER, 0000
MATTHEW CIANCARELLI, 0000
SALVATORE A. CINCOTTA, 0000
RUTH E. CISNEROS, 0000
THEODORE A. CISOWSKI, 0000
BRETT A. CLARK, 0000
KEVIN E. CLARK, 0000
TREVOR B. CLARK, 0000

JOSHUA S. CLOVER, 0000
MICHAEL P. CODY, 0000
RONALD D. COLLETT, 0000
ANNETTE CONFORTI, 0000
TERENCE M. CONNELLY, 0000
JAMES B. CONWAY, 0000
SUSANNA R. COOPER, 0000
JOSEPH R. CORNELL, 0000
ROBERT E. CRANSTON, 0000
PHILIP D. CUSHMAN, 0000
JOHN C. DANKS II, 0000
JASON K. DARLEY, 0000
BRADLEY T. DAVIN, 0000
NELSON I. DELGADO, JR., 0000
ARMANDO R. DELSI, 0000
ROBERT H. DENCKHOFF III, 0000
JOHN J. DEPINTO, JR., 0000
ENRIQUE DIAZ, 0000
MICHAEL F. DODD, 0000
STEVEN R. DOUGLAS, 0000
DOUGLAS D. DOWNEY, 0000
MATTHEW A. DUMENIGO, 0000
ALEXANDER J. ECHEVERRIA, 0000
MICHAEL N. ESTES, 0000
GORGE F. ETMON, 0000
DAVID R. EVERLY, 0000
RYAN M. EYER, 0000
HOWARD C. EYTH III, 0000
STEPHEN V. FISCUS, 0000
DANIEL J. FLANNERY, 0000
JOHN D. FLEMING, 0000
JOHN P. FLYNN, 0000
ANDREW J. FOREMAN, 0000
PETER T. FORSYTHE, 0000
MARCUS C. FOWLER, 0000
ALFREDO E. FRANCO, 0000
SHAWN T. FREEMAN, 0000
CALVIN M. GADSDEN, 0000
TRAVIS T. GAINES, 0000
JORGE L. GALLEGOS, 0000
FRED C. GALVIN, 0000
ERIC J. GANSER, 0000
THOMAS H. GARNETT, IV, 0000
JOSH B. GARRISON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. GIBSON, 0000
MARCUS A. GILKESON, 0000
CLIFFORD W. GILMORE, 0000
MITCHELL L. GOLD, 0000
JOHN F. GOODMAN II, 0000
CAMERON L. GRAMS, 0000
NATHAN A. GRAY, 0000
TIMOTHY E. GREBOS, 0000
JAMES E. GRIFFIN, JR., 0000
TAYLOR L. GRIMES, 0000
ERIC J. GRIMM, 0000
WILLIAM H. GRUBE, 0000
THOMAS D. GUALANDI, 0000
GALO F. GUERRERO, 0000
JASON A. HAMILTON, 0000
MYLE E. HAMMOND, 0000
JEFFREY D. HANSON, 0000
BRENDON G. HARPER, 0000
TIFFANY N. HARRINGTON, 0000
JOHN E. HARRIS, 0000
KELLY K. HASTINGS, 0000
BRENDON J. HEATHERMAN, 0000
BRIAN G. HEATHERMAN, 0000
MONROE H. HENDERSON, 0000
BERNARD HESS, 0000
TWAYNE R. HICKMAN, 0000
THOMAS S. HINKLE, JR., 0000
TIMOTHY A. HITZELBERGER, 0000
CHAD E. HOARE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. HOBSON, 0000
JOEL M. HOFFMAN, 0000
CHARLOTTE J. HOLDEN, 0000
STEPHEN R. HORAN, JR., 0000
BRADLEY W. HORTON, 0000
DAVID T. HUDAK, 0000
DAVID E. JAMIESON, 0000
SCOT C. JAWORSKI, 0000
TIMOTHY J. JENT, 0000
CHRISTIAN F. JOHNSON, 0000
SHANNON L. JOHNSON, 0000
DARREN B. JONES, 0000
MICHAEL C. KAMIN, 0000
MICHELE I. KANE, 0000
KEVIN J. KEATING, 0000
JOHN K. KELLEY, 0000
ASLAM G. KHAN, 0000
STEPHEN N. KLOTH, JR., 0000
JANA S. KOFMAN, 0000
HOLLY N. KORZILIUS, 0000
MATTHEW H. KRESS, 0000
GREGORY L. KUNI, 0000
MICHAEL M. KWOKA, 0000
SAMUEL LABOY, 0000
LUIS F. LARA, 0000
VELVETH S. LEE, 0000
JEFFREY D. LEROM, 0000
BRENT E. LILLY, 0000
MARK R. LISTON, 0000
JAMES W. LIVELY, 0000
JONATHAN P. LONEY, 0000
JOSE M. LOPEZ II, 0000
NARCISO LOPEZ III, 0000
TODD J. LUCHT, 0000
HENRY K. LYLES, 0000
SEAN J. LYNCH, 0000
ERIC C. MALINOWSKI, 0000
JOHN A. MARCINEK, 0000
GABRIELLE MARGULASCHAPIN, 0000
CORY J. MARTIN, 0000
KURT P. MARTIN, 0000
KRISTIN L. MCCANN, 0000
PATRICK W. MCCUEN, 0000
SCOTT D. MCDONALD, 0000
DAVID S. MCELLIOTT, 0000
SCOTT M. MCFADDEN, 0000
ROBERT T. MEADE, 0000
JEFFREY J. MEISENGER, 0000
RAMON J. MENDOZA, JR., 0000
PAUL C. MERIDA, 0000
DOUGLAS W. MEYER, 0000
GUY J. MILLER, 0000
ODELL MILLER III, 0000
DARON M. MIZELL, 0000
MICHAEL J. MONROE, 0000
ANDREA A. MONTECCHI, 0000
PERCY T. MOORE, 0000
RICHARD K. MORRIS, 0000
JEFFREY V. MUNOZ, 0000
KENNETH C. MUSIAL, 0000
MATTHEW R. NATION, 0000
LUCAS J. NICHOLS, 0000
PAUL D. NOYES, 0000
AARON B. O'CONNELL, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. O'CONNOR, 0000
MICHAEL F. OLNESS, 0000
DOUGLAS A. OLSON, 0000
JEFFERY M. OPSITOS, 0000
MATTHEW W. OSBORNE, 0000
ED K. OTA III, 0000
KENNETH G. OWENS, 0000
JOSEPH M. PARKER, 0000
TOBY D. PATTERSON, 0000
WADE A. PATTON, 0000
EDWARD J. PAVELKA, 0000
BRADLEY S. PENNELLA, 0000
JOHN M. PICUDELLA, 0000
JOSEPH M. PLENZLER, 0000
AMY A. POLAK, 0000
JOHN D. QUINTANA, 0000
HEATH M. REED, 0000
ARTHUR J. REGO, 0000
ERIC A. REID, 0000
MATTHEW A. REILEY, 0000
RYAN W. REILLY, 0000
MARK A. RETZ, 0000
ROBERT F. REVOIR, 0000
JERSEY Y. REYES, 0000
STEPHEN C. RIFFER, 0000
BENJAMIN S. RINGVELSKI, 0000
MARK C. ROBINSON, 0000
BRENDAN M. RODDEN, 0000
ERIKA D. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
THOMAS M. ROSS, 0000
WILLIAM A. SABLAN, 0000
GEOFFREY D. SATTERFIELD, 0000
JOEL F. SCHMIDT, 0000
SABRE A. SCHNITZER, 0000
JAMES T. SCOTT, 0000
JEFFREY L. SEAVY, 0000
BRIAN P. SHARP, 0000
CHAD W. SIMMONDS, 0000
AMY R. SMITH, 0000
PHILLIP J. SMITH, 0000
DAVID E. STANDING, 0000
MARTIN V. STARTA, 0000
ERICH I. STEFANYSHYN, 0000
JARROD W. STOUTENBOROUGH, 0000
TERRI M. SUMNER, 0000
JAMES G. SWEENEY, 0000
BRYAN G. SWENSON, 0000
MATTHEW C. SWINDLE, 0000
JAMES R. THIES, JR., 0000
KELSEY R. THOMPSON, 0000
WINSTON S. TIERNEY, 0000
JAVIER A. TORRES, 0000
KEVIN M. TROY, 0000
DUANE P. VILA, 0000
JASON C. VOSE, 0000
BRIAN R. VOSS, 0000
DANIEL C. WAGNER, 0000
WILLIAM F. WAHLE, 0000
ERIC G. WALTERS, 0000
TERRANCE D. WARDINSKY, JR., 0000
GEOFFREY F. WARLOCK, 0000
ANDREW B. WARREN, 0000
DALE O. WARREN, 0000
BRENDA L. WASSER, 0000
JOHN M. WASSMER, JR., 0000
ANITA L. WEISSFLACH, 0000
SIDNEY R. WELCH, 0000
ROGER R. WILKINS, 0000
CHARLES P. WINCHESTER, 0000
DAVID K. WINNACKER, 0000
SHAWN P. WONDERLICH, 0000
THOMAS D. WOOD, 0000
AVI J. YOLOFSKY, 0000
ERIC W. YOUNG, 0000
GERALD K. YOUNG, 0000
KIRA K. ZIELINSKI, 0000
RUTH A. ZOLOCK, 0000
NOAH E. ZUCKERMAN, 0000

To be second lieutenant

CHRISTIAN J. BROADSTON, 0000
SAMUEL G. BRYCE, 0000
ANDREW CHRISTIAN, 0000
CHAD W. DARNELL, 0000
BRIAN P. DENNIS, 0000
ADRIENNE R. DEWEY, 0000
JEFFREY L. DYAL, 0000
BRIAN J. GILBERTSON, 0000
PERRY E. HARALSON, 0000
DAVID J. HART, 0000
BRYAN C. HATFIELD, 0000
SEAN E. HYNES, 0000
LANCE J. LANGFELDT, 0000
RAYMOND W. MAGNESS, 0000
RANDALL M. MAULDIN, 0000
ELVINO M. MENDONCA, JR., 0000
CLINTON L. ROBINS, 0000
MICHAEL D. SKAGGS, 0000
MICHAEL J. TAYLOR, 0000
MICHAEL P. WARD, 0000
JOHN F. WARREN, 0000
ROBERT L. WILLIAMS, 0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30, 1999:

THE JUDICIARY

KEITH P. ELLISON, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

GARY ALLEN FEESS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

STEFAN R. UNDERHILL, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT.

W. ALLEN PEPPER, JR., OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI.

KAREN E. SCHREIER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 1552 AND 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. EDWARD W. ROSENBAUM (RETIRED), 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN A. BRADLEY, 0000.
BRIG. GEN. GERALD P. FITZGERALD, 0000.
BRIG. GEN. EDWARD J. MECHENBIER, 0000.
BRIG. GEN. ALLAN R. POULIN, 0000.
BRIG. GEN. LARRY L. TWITCHELL, 0000.

To be brigadier general

COL. THOMAS L. CARTER, 0000.
COL. RICHARD C. COLLINS, 0000.
COL. JOHN M. FABRY, 0000.
COL. HUGH H. FORSYTHE, 0000.
COL. MICHAEL F. GJEDE, 0000.
COL. LEON A. JOHNSON, 0000.
COL. HOWARD A. MC MAHAN, 0000.
COL. DOUGLAS S. METCALF, 0000.
COL. JOSE M. PORTELA, 0000.
COL. PETER K. SULLIVAN, 0000.
COL. DAVID H. WEBB, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

ARCHIE J. BERBERIAN, II, 0000
VERNA D. FAIRCHILD, 0000
DANIEL J. GIBSON, 0000

To be brigadier general

GEORGE C. ALLEN II, 0000
ROGER E. COMBS, 0000
MICHAEL A. CUSHMAN, 0000
THOMAS N. EDMONDS, 0000
JARED P. KENNISH, 0000
PAUL S. KIMMEL, 0000
VIRGIL W. LLOYD, 0000
ALEXANDER T. MAHON, 0000
MARVIN S. MAYES, 0000
DAVID E. MCCUTCHIN, 0000
CALVIN L. MORELAND, 0000
MARK R. MUSICK, 0000
JOHN D. RICE, 0000
ROBERT O. SEIFERT, 0000
LAWRENCE A. SITTIG, 0000
JAMES M. SKIFF, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. WILLIAM J. BEGERT, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES R. HOLLAND, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MAXWELL C. BAILEY, 0000.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ALAN D. JOHNSON, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DONALD L. KERRICK, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES M. COLLINS, JR., 0000.
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT W. SMITH III, 0000.

To be Brigadier General

COL. DENNIS J. LAICH, 0000.
COL. ROBERT B. OSTENBERG, 0000.
COL. RONALD D. SILVERMAN, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

ROBERT E. ARMBRUSTER, JR., 0000
JOSEPH L. BERGANTZ, 0000
WILLIAM L. BOND, 0000
COLBY M. BROADWATER III, 0000
RICHARD A. CODY, 0000
JOHN M. CURRAN, 0000
DELL L. DAILEY, 0000
JOHN J. DEYERMOND, 0000
LARRY J. DODGEN, 0000
JAMES M. DUBIK, 0000
RICHARD A. HACK, 0000
RUSSEL L. HONORE, 0000
RODERICK J. ISLER, 0000
TERRY E. JUSKOWIAK, 0000
Geoffrey C. Lambert, 0000
James J. Lovelace, Jr., 0000
Wade H. McManus, Jr., 0000
William H. Russ, 0000
Walter L. Sharp, 0000
Toney Stricklin, 0000
John R. Vines, 0000
Robert W. Wagner, 0000
Craig B. Wheldon, 0000
R. Steven Whitcomb, 0000
Robert Wilson, 0000
JOSEPH L. YAKOVAC, JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general, Chaplain Corps

COL. DAVID H. HICKS, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. THOMAS N. BURNETTE, JR., 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BILLY K. SOLOMON, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

HARRY B. AXSON, JR., 0000
GUY M. BOURN, 0000
Ronald L. Burgess, Jr., 0000
Remo Butler, 0000
William B. Caldwell, IV., 0000
Randal R. Castro, 0000
Stephen J. Curry, 0000
Robert L. Decker, 0000
ANN E. DUNWOODY, 0000
WILLIAM C. FEYK, 0000
LESLIE L. FULLER, 0000
DAVID F. GROSS, 0000
Edward M. Harrington, 0000
Keith M. Huber, 0000
Galen B. Jackman, 0000
Jerome Johnson, 0000
Ronald L. Johnson, 0000
John F. Kimmons, 0000
William M. Lenaers, 0000
Timothy D. Livsey, 0000
James A. Marks, 0000
Michael R. Mazzucchi, 0000
Stanley A. Mc Chrystal, 0000
David F. Melcher, 0000
Dennis C. Moran, 0000
Roger Nadeau, 0000
Craig A. Peterson, 0000
James H. Pillsbury, 0000
Gregory J. Premo, 0000
Kenneth J. Quinlan, Jr., 0000
Fred D. Robinson, Jr., 0000
James E. Simmons, 0000
Stephen M. Speakes, 0000
Edgar E. Stanton III, 0000
Randal M. Tieszen, 0000
Bennie E. Williams, 0000
JOHN A. YINGLING, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. CARLTON W. FULFORD, JR., 0000.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

DAVID J. ANTANITUS, 0000
DALE E. BAUGH, 0000
RICHARD E. BROOKS, 0000
EVAN M. CHANIK, JR., 0000
BARRY M. COSTELLO, 0000
KIRKLAND H. DONALD, 0000
DENNIS M. DWYER, 0000
MARK J. EDWARDS, 0000
Bruce B. Engelhardt, 0000
Tom S. Fellin, 0000
James B. Godwin III, 0000
Charles H. Johnston, Jr., 0000
John M. Kelly, 0000
Steven A. Kunkle, 0000
Willie C. Marsh, 0000
George E. Mayer, 0000
John G. Morgan, Jr., 0000
Dennis G. Morral, 0000
Eric T. Olson, 0000
James J. Quinn, 0000
Ann E. Rondeau, 0000
Frederick R. Ruehe, 0000
Lindell G. Rutherford, 0000
John D. Stufflebeem, 0000
William D. Sullivan, 0000
Gerald L. Talbot, Jr., 0000
Hamlin B. Tallent, 0000
Richard P. Terpstra, 0000
Thomas J. Wilson III, 0000
JAMES M. ZORTMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RAYMOND A. ARCHER III, 0000.
REAR ADM. (LH) JUSTIN D. MC CARTHY, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAROLD F. BIGGER, 0000.
CAPT. FENTON F. PRIEST III, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DONALD C. ARTHUR, JR., 0000.
CAPT. LINDA J. BIRD, 0000.
CAPT. MICHAEL K. LOOSE, 0000.
CAPT. RICHARD A. MAYO, 0000.
CAPT. JOSEPH P. VANLANDINGHAM, JR., 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ROBERT M. CLARK, 0000.
CAPT. MARK M. HAZARA, 0000.
CAPT. JOHN R. HINES, JR., 0000.
CAPT. JAMES MANZELMANN, JR., 0000.
CAPT. NOEL G. PRESTON, 0000.
CAPT. HOWARD K. UNRUH, JR., 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. VERNON E. CLARK, 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. THOMAS B. FARGO, 0000.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING *RAAN R. AALGAARD, AND ENDING STEVEN R. ZWICKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 1999.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MICHAEL R. COLLYER, AND ENDING RENEE M. PONCE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 19, 1999.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS A PERMANENT PROFESSOR OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 4333(B):

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL L. MC GINNIS, 0000.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUAL FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 211:

To be lieutenant

JAMES W. SEEMAN, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

LOSTON E. CARTER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JACK A. MABERRY, 0000

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING SYLVESTER P. ABRAMOWICZ, JR., AND ENDING SHELLEY W. S. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 21, 1999.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING BRUCE A. ABBOTT, AND ENDING BERTRAND L. ZELLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 21, 1999.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING THOMAS ABERNETHY, AND ENDING PAUL M. ZIEGLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 21, 1999.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING SEVAK ADAMIAN, AND ENDING JOHN E. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 1999.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

THEODORE H. BROWN, 0000

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING RICHARD W. BAUER, AND ENDING DEREK K. WEBSTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 1999.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ROBERT A. YOUREK, AND ENDING LORENZO D. BROWN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 1999.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DOUGLAS G. MAC CREA, AND ENDING MLADEN K. VRANJICAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 1999.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JAMES N. FRAME, 0000

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING NILS S. ERIKSON, AND ENDING EDWARD C. ZEIGLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 1999.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING THOR D. AAKRE, AND ENDING MARY M. ZUROWSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 1999.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING SHEILA A. R. ROBBINS, AND ENDING DANIEL E. WILBURN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 1999.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1999

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Private Activity Bond Clarification Act of 1999. This legislation, which will clarify existing law with respect to the use of tax exempt bonds, is needed to protect taxpayer dollars from being used to subsidize essentially private activities. The bill will also ensure a level playing field for other businesses which are excluded from, or do not seek, subsidies from the American taxpayer through tax-exempt bond financing.

As most of our colleagues know, interest on bonds issued by State and local governments is generally exempt from federal income tax. The federal tax exemption allows the bonds to carry lower interest rates, which in turn lowers the cost of borrowing. State and local governments are then better able to finance schools, roads, public transportation and other public infrastructure projects.

At the same time, federal tax law and regulations issued by the Treasury Department have been carefully tailored—as they should be—to ensure that this tax exemption is not abused for private gain. Tax-exempt bonds should not be used to give private individuals or businesses a preferential benefit at the expense of the American taxpayer.

For example, under current law, if facilities financed with State and local government bonds are used more than 10 percent of the time directly, or indirectly, in a trade or business by a private person or business, the IRS may consider the bonds ''private activity bonds'' and interest paid on them generally will not be excluded from a bondholder's taxable income. For purposes of determining whether this 10 percent test is met, use of a financed facility is treated as a direct use of the proceeds, and any activity carried on by a private person is treated as a trade or business. When a financed facility is used by several private persons, use by all private entities is aggregated for purposes of determining whether the 10% private business use threshold is met.

For the most part, private business use of a facility is only deemed to occur if a private person, group, or business has a special legal entitlement to the use of the financed facility under an arrangement with the state or local government that issued the bonds. Typically, such an arrangement would involve the ownership or lease of the facility, or a management contract involving the facility, that grants priority rights in using the facility.

Although it appears that existing tax law, as interpreted by the Treasury regulations, may be adequate to assure that all businesses and members of the general public are treated fairly in matters involving the use of facilities constructed with tax-exempt bonds adoption of the legislation I introduce today to codify key elements of the regulatory rules will help to ensure that this valuable—and costly—tax subsidy is not misused for the benefit of private individuals instead of the taxpayers. I emphasize that the bill leaves the ultimate determination as to whether the law has been violated in a specific case up to the IRS as it is under current law.

You see, Mr. Speaker, while tax-exempt bond financing is largely carried out in a manner consistent with the purposes set forth in the tax law and regulations, as with just about any federal program in which a tax subsidy is involved, there are always those who are looking for ways to ''push the envelope'' to gain the benefit of a tax subsidy for their own private business purposes.

The impetus for this legislation was prompted by press reports of a proposal to build, with tax-exempt bonds, a massive new Convention Center in Las Vegas. However, my concern is not with that community per se, but rather with the potential implications for all American taxpayers, and the potential precedent which could be established, should financing of this facility go forth in the face of statutes and regulations which suggest it should be ineligible for tax-exempt treatment.

According to press reports, a group of private businesses referred to as the Consortium, is currently seeking to take advantage of tax-exempt bond financing to promote construction in Las Vegas of a new 1.3 million square foot convention center, which when completed, will be one of the largest such facilities in the country. It will be larger than the Astrodome, the George R. Brown Convention Center, the Dallas Convention Center and even the Javits Center in New York.

I understand that once ground is broken for this facility, the members of the Consortium who have worked with local authorities to develop this facility will be provided with preferential rights to lease the facility for the purpose of putting on money-making trade shows. These preferential rights will allow Consortium members to ''lock up'' more than 60 percent of the available rentable days for the new facility each year through 2009. Furthermore, from a business standpoint, the specific dates to be ''locked up'' by the Consortium are more valuable than those that will be left over for use by others. In effect, the benefits of the federal subsidy utilized in financing this facility are being largely transferred to the handful of businesses comprising this Consortium.

The situation in Las Vegas raises the possibility that the lack of a specific definition of ''related parties'' may lead bond issuing authorities and their counsel to mistakenly conclude that only those business users related by law (e.g., corporations and their wholly-owned subsidiaries) are to be treated as ''related parties.'' Such a narrow, legalistic interpretation could result in bonds being wrongfully issued in instances where, as in this case, a principal purpose for which the facility is being financed is for the use of a group of private parties who are related in fact. Parties that are not related by law can nevertheless by agreement act in such concert that they should, and presumably would, be treated by the IRS as related parties.

Mr. Speaker, allow me at this point to reiterate that my concern here is not Las Vegas per se. However, I will point out that the new facility financed with the use of these federally tax-exempt bonds will both compete with convention facilities in Houston, and ''lock in'' to Las Vegas through 2009 these trade shows, effectively denying Houston and other communities the opportunity to attract these conventions to our region.

In any event, it should be obvious that Congress did not intend to provide carte blanche to private businesses to band together to facilitate construction of a tax-exempt financed facility—which would then be largely made available to those businesses for their own commercial purposes. The legislation I introduce today will protect the taxpayer's interest in this regard by simply clarifying the definition of ''related parties'' already found in the Treasury regulations that implement the ''private business use'' limitations in the tax code.

My bill would enable the IRS, acting on a case-by-case basis, to determine that parties should be treated as ''related parties'' if they have at any time acted in concert to negotiate an arrangement to facilitate the financing of a property financed with tax-exempt bonds, and enter into preferential arrangements for the use of such property. The collective use of a facility by related parties would be aggregated when applying the 30 and 90 days safe harbors (and the 180 days general limitation) found in the IRS' current regulations.

I will point out that local governments can of course continue to avoid any potential uncertainty about the rules on ''related parties'' by applying for an advance ruling by the IRS that the limitations on ''related parties'' do not apply to their particular proposals.

To protect the interests of the American taxpayer, and to assure a level playing field for private business, it is important that Congress act to clarify the rules governing tax-exempt bond financing so that potentially hundreds of millions of dollars in of tax-exempt bonds are not mistakenly issued—whether in Las Vegas or elsewhere. So as to put the public on notice, and to help prevent any bond from being issued based on a mistaken interpretation of the rules governing private activity bonds, the legislation would apply to bonds issued after July 1, 1999.

PROBLEMS IN PANAMA

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform our colleagues and our great Nation of important, recent developments in Latin America.

As you may be aware, Mr. Speaker, the country of Panama held its elections on May 2, 1999, which resulted in the selection of Panama's first female president, the Honorable Mireya Moscoso. President-elect Moscoso will be inaugurated into office this September 1st.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very positive development in Panama's progression to true democratic governance, for which the good people of that nation should be deeply congratulated. However, Mr. Speaker, the good news is overshadowed by the fact that the influence and policies of Panama's current president, Ernesto Perez Balladares, will likely continue for some time to control key government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I find it troubling that Mr. Balladares wields a shadowy influence over the Moscoso administration through his control of political appointees he has selected for critical positions in the government—appointees whose terms of office will continue long after Mr. Balladares has stepped down as Panama's President.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues should understand this is crucial because the recent election results are a positive sign that may significantly influence the future course of U.S.-Panamanian relations as Washington enters a critical time, the final transitional period for relinquishing control over the Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, President-elect Moscoso should be allowed to represent the will of the good people of Panama, unhindered by political handcuffs from prior administrations.

On that subject, Mr. Speaker, I recommend the following research memorandum which was authored by Dr. Brittmarie Janson Perez, a Panamanian anthropologist who is a fellow at the Institute of Latin american Studies at the University of Texas.

Dr. Perez also holds a senior research fellowship at the prestigious Council of Hemispheric Affairs (COHA), which is based in Washington under the leadership of Director Larry Birns, a respected, longtime advocate for democracy and human rights in Latin America. The attached article represents an updated version of Dr. Perez' work, which originally appeared in COHA's biweekly publication, the Washington Report on the Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to read this timely article which addresses the need to observe upcoming events in Panama to ensure that the Moscoso administration is able to constructively impact the direction in which Panama develops, despite strong and likely non-productive opposition from pro-Perez Balladares partisans.

PANAMA ELECTIONS DO NOT SEND A CLEAR SIGNAL

(By Dr. Brittmarie Janson Pérez)

A few days before Panama's May 2 presidential elections, a cartoon in a local newspaper depicted President Ernesto Pérez Balladares squirming on a throne and moaning, ''Nobody is looking at me.'' On election day, the man whose regime has been labeled a ''civilian dictatorship,'' tried to steal the limelight by telling the French news agency AFP that he wanted to be president again. However, his ambitions were destined to be postponed for at least 10 years when Pérez Balladares' move amending the constitution which would allow him to immediately run again, was resoundingly defeated in a referendum last year.

Nevertheless, he will cast a long shadow on the administration of president-elect Mireya Moscoso, the victorious opposition candidate. Through is appointees, known for their eagerness to comply with his wishes, Pérez Balladres, on a de facto basis, will be able to control the Supreme Court, the Attorney General's office, the Electoral Tribunal and the Technical Judicial Police during the Moscoso administration. To make matters worse, thanks to millions of dollars supplied by his regime over the past five years to legislators of ruling Revolutionary Democratic (PRD) to spend in their respective districts, Pérez Balladares' party has retained its majority in the National Assembly.

PRESENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

The lame duck leader's ongoing influence within the government structure could bode no good for any hopes of the new leadership to blunt the costly neoliberal reforms he vigorously implemented while in power. As elsewhere in the hemisphere, economic globalization has tended to benefit foreign investors and the local elite, but does not appear to be arresting the impoverishment of the rural campesinos as well as the urban lower and middle sectors. For example, while non-traditional agricultural exports such as melons and watermelons was increasing, the market for local beef, potatoes, vegetables and other traditional products was shrinking due to cheap competitive imports. The power of labor unions was also being seriously undercut by restrictive reforms enacted by Pérez Balladares. His privatization of the state-run telephone company resulted in higher rates for the lower and middle urban sectors, which has caused an appreciable hardship on their lifestyle.

In the recent electoral campaign, expectations were raised that the worst effects of Pérez Balladares' policies could be remedied at the polls. All three presidential candidates—Moscoso as head of the Amulfista Party in the Union for Panama coalition; Martin Torrijos, the son of the late authoritarian ruler, who became the PRD candidate in the New Nation coalition after Pérez Balladares' referendum bid to allow him to run again had failed; and Alberto Vallarino, a banker who split from the Amulfista Party and formed the Opposition Action coalition with the support of the Christian Democrats—addressed economic issues from different perspectives, and made numerous promises aimed at ending the dreary status quo.

Already educators are warning Moscoso that if she now decides to implement policies that are harmful to the poor (who made up the bulk of her supporters), she can except street protests once she is inaugurated. Yet, Moscow's power to implement important economic pallatives is limited by overseas accords signed by Pérez Balladares with the international lending agencies. Also, prospective social investments by her administration likely have been jeopardized due to the legacy of profligate spending by Pérez Balladares in order to curry political favor. Her power to govern, even to maintain fundamental public order, will be restricted by his lingering influence over critical government institutions whose proper functioning could have made a difference.

DIVIDING UP THE SPOILS

Pérez Balladares' inaugural speech, which contained promises of austerity in public spending and transparency in government were given short shrift, eventually producing widespread mistrust of him among the citizenry, who nicknamed him ''Pinocchio.'' He had resurrected Manuel Noriega's discredited political vehicle, the PRD, with the aid of some of the more notorious members of the now Miami-jailed dictator's coterie. Upon taking office in 1994, Pérez Balladares pardoned hundreds of PRD members and military personnel who were facing charges of murder, torture, and embezzling state funds during the Noriega era. Some individuals were even appointed to his cabinet. He also made questionable appointments to the boards of independent government agencies, including the Panama Canal Authority (ACP) and the Administration of the Interoceanic Region (ARI), the last-named body using entrusted with the disposition of canal properties transferred to Panama as the U.S. relinquishes control over the facility.

Pérez Balladres is particularly vulnerable to accusations of malfeasance regarding the process used to dispose of former canal properties. Thanks to his party's legislative steamroller, he was able to change the ARI's charter, stripping the institution of its all-important independence. Increasing the ARI's board of directors to his personal satisfaction, Pérez Balladres ousted an ARI administrator known for his honesty and firm hand, and Nicholás Ardito Baletta, a highly controversial World Bank official who was ''elected'' president of Panama through a Noriega-orchestrated electoral fraud in 1984. In this way, he was able to obtain oversight of the transfer of the ''treasure of Panama,'' the properties, installations and land adjacent to the Canal, whose value has been conservatively estimated at over $4 billion by the U.S. ambassador to Panama.

Nevertheless, it is unlikely that he or his agents will be held accountable for their questionable actions involving numerous allegations of moral turpitude. On the contrary, the institutions and offices over which Pérez Balladares and his party will continue to exercise influence, likely will be used to harass the president-elect at every turn.

CHANGES TO BE PURSUED UNDER THE NEW GOVERNMENT

There is a widespread clamor in Panama to significantly alter or replace the 1972 Constitution imposed during the dictatorship of Gen. Torrijos, and amended under the aegis of the two military leaders who followed him, Generals Rubén D. Paredes and Manuel Noriega. Critics charge that it grants excessive powers to the executive branch at the expense of the legislature. Paradoxically, the PRD's predictably obstructionist legislative majority will oblige the president-elect to renege on her campaign promise to democratize Panama through giving more power to the national assembly. Observers note that if she does not make ample use of the range of powers with which the military dictatorships purposively endowed the executive branch, she will, in effect, be unable to govern the country.

President-elect Moscoso has outgrown the charges made against her of being a decorative figure who inherited a titular role in the party because of her late husband, Pres. Arnulfo Arias. This image along with other factors marred her prospects in the 1994 presidential campaign, which she lost to Pérez Balladares. Since then, she has made herself known throughout Panama by waging a tireless grassroots campaign, touring city and countryside to keep in touch with Panamanians of all stations. She proved her grit in intra-party squabbles when she snuffed out Alberto Vallarino's 1998 challenge her rule in her party's presidential primaries.

It is unfair to her and the Panamanian people that the country is almost doomed to remain a victim of the baleful and corrupt legacies of past dictatorships, and that Pérez Balladares and his PRD could jeopardize the administrative of the first woman president of Panama, who will also assume, in the name of her country, responsibilities of running the Panama Canal.

CELEBRATING THE RICH HISTORY OF NORTHPORT, MICHIGAN

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call your attention to the small community of Northport, a unique and rustic village on the beautiful Leelanau Peninsula in northwestern Lower Michigan. This richly diverse community, which draws its heritage from Native Americans and many other cultures, is currently celebrating its 150th birthday with a schedule of festivities that will last more than a month.

The celebration began on June 11 with a reenactment of the event that would lead to the creation of the village, the 1849 landing of Rev. George and Arvilla Smith, accompanied by Chief Peter Wakazoo and more than 40 families, most of them Native American.

As local lore relates, the town experienced a population boom in the mid-1800s after Deacon Joseph Dame wrote to the New York Tribune, extolling the benefits of the area. By 1859, according to the Sesquicentennial brochure, ''Northport was the largest community in northwest Michigan, with 400 residents, two wharfs, five general stores, three hotels, several saloons, a sawmill and the first organized school district in Leelanau County.''

As part of the festivities, residents and visitors can take a walking tour of the community, viewing the homes of early settlers whose lives were intertwined with Northport's 15 decades of history. Typical of such homes is that of the Eli Bordeaux family, which was on its way to Frankfort, Mich., by boat in 1867 when a storm forced them to take shelter in the Northport Harbor. As the guide books relate, family members liked what they saw and decided to stay. Eli, a farmer, built the home, which remains today.

This story and this home, Mr. Speaker, are just a small part of the rich heritage of the community represented in this walking tour. Many other events, including an original drama, a powwow presented by the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, and an ongoing exhibit of community artifacts in a rehabilitated civic building are just part of the many weeks' activities.

When communities like Northport hold such celebrations, they certainly have in mind a goal of promoting the event to attract visitors, many of them perhaps visiting for the first time. Northport's events, however, are a true celebration for the residents themselves of a rich and unique heritage on a peninsula whose name means ''delight of life.'' The name reflects not only the picturesque community and the surrounding area, but also the wonderfully moderated temperatures caused by the surrounding water. In fact, despite its location more than halfway to the North Pole, both tourism and fruit production are vital parts of the area's economy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my House colleagues to join me in congratulating this special community in my district, the 1st Congressional District of Michigan, and in wishing its residents joy in their celebration and a future that continues rich in those intangibles that have created its wonderful quality of life.

IN RECOGNITION OF WILLIE LEE GLASS

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly fine American—Mrs. Willie Lee Glass of Tyler, TX—who died May 2, 1999. In honor of her tireless efforts in the East Texas area, Mrs. Glass received many awards and accolades including, the People of Vision award and induction into the Texas Women's Hall of Fame.

Mrs. Glass was born August 24, 1910, in Nacogdoches, TX, to the late E.J. and Mary Campbell, both educators. She left Nacogdoches to attend Prairie View A&M and later received her master's degree from Iowa State. As a result of her strong family background in education, Willie returned to East Texas to serve as a homemaking consultant for the Texas Education Agency. She was also an active member of the Texas College Board of Trustees, the American Red Cross, the University of Texas at Tyler Foundation, and the Stephen F. Austin University Foundation. She was presented numerous tributes from the people of East Texas such as induction into the Nacogdoches Heritage Festival Hall of Fame and recognition as a Philanthropy Day Awards Outstanding Volunteer honoree.

Mrs. Glass was preceded in death by her husband, Dr. D.R. Glass, a 30-year president of Texas College. They were both members of the St. Paul CME Church. Willie's passion for education still runs deep even after her death, as a memorial scholarship has recently been established in her name at Texas College.

Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn today, let us do so in honor and in respect for this truly outstanding American—Mrs. Willie Lee Glass.

HONORING BRUNDIDGE VFW POST 7055 FOR EXEMPLARY SERVICE TO VETERANS

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to spotlight public service efforts of a veterans organization in my Southeast Alabama congressional district which I feel are truly exemplary.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 7055 in Brundidge, Alabama has volunteered its time, talents and resources to construct a fitting memorial on the grave site of a deceased veteran renowned in life for his generosity and selflessness.

When the members of VFW Post 7055 learned that the grave site of former veteran and Presidential ''Point of Light,'' J.D. Williams, was largely ignored, they sprang into action.

To honor the late veteran who before had spent decades selflessly decorating the graves of other veterans, VFW Post 7055 placed new coping and chipped marble on his humble Pike County, Alabama grave site and topped it off with a permanent American flag pole.

Their future plans include adding a bronze plaque to honor the memory of this remarkable veteran who was known for decorating at his own expense literally thousands of Southeast Alabama veteran graves with flags and white wooden crosses

The late J.D. Williams' selflessness earned him national recognition some ten years ago as one of President George Bush's ''Points of Light.'' He passed away in July of 1994 and was buried in Union Hill Cemetery near Troy, Alabama.

According to a recent article in The Pike County News, ''the Brundidge VFW Post has made it a perpetual organizational project to upgrade, beautify and maintain Mr. Williams' grave site.''

I join the U.S. House of Representatives in commending the membership of the Brundidge, Alabama VFW Post 7055 for their generosity and patriotism.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF NACOGDOCHES COUNTY ELECTED OFFICIALS

HON. JIM TURNER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of three extraordinary East Texans: Robert Spencer, Dorothy Tigner and Eddie Upshaw, all elected law officials in Nacogdoches County which I represent as part of Texas' Second Congressional District.

In an age where community action and politics are often, unfortunately, viewed with an indifferent or cynical eye, it is both uplifting and inspiring to encounter instances where public servants, through their professional efforts in and for the community, earn for themselves the gratitude and high regard of their fellow citizens. This is certainly true in the case of these three public officials who were recently awarded recognition by their peers and colleagues in the Commissioners' Court of Nacogdoches County.

County citizens are fortunate to have working on their behalf individuals such as Mr. Robert Spencer, who as the first African-American Justice of the Peace in Nacogdoches County, has played an integral role in educating the community's children on the dangers of drug use and school truancy. Prior to his election to this post, Mr. Spencer also served as a Deputy Sheriff in Nacogdoches County. His colleagues in the community have duly recognized his valuable work to establish and facilitate improved communication between the court system and law enforcement centers in the area.

Nacogdoches County organizations and boards truly have a friend in Dorothy Tigner, who was elected last year to serve as Justice of the Peace. As such she is the first woman to serve in this post. Prior to this, Ms. Tigner served for 5 years as the Administrative Court Assistant for the 145th Judicial District Court. In what must be limited free time, Dorothy Tigner plays an active role in the community, serving in several public service organizations including the Nacogdoches County Child Welfare Board and the Nacogdoches County Community Justice Counsel.

A graduate of the East Texas Police Academy, Mr. Eddie Upshaw plays an integral role

in the daily law enforcement activities of Nacogdoches County. Following 9 years spent with the Nacogdoches Police Department, Mr. Upshaw went on to work for the Nacogdoches County Sheriff's Department. In 1992, voters made evident their support of his efforts by electing Eddie Upshaw to the post of County Constable. He is the first African-American to serve in this post and continues in his important work to reduce truancy in County schools. In addition, Mr. Upshaw's numerous articles regarding the civil aspect of law enforcement have been published in local newspapers.

I'm sure my Texas colleagues join me in paying tribute to these three individuals. Their past experience and continuing accomplishments in the public service realm are a credit to the community in which they serve, and we wish them well in the journey and challenges which surely lie on the path ahead.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, twenty-two years ago, the U.S. Congress voted to enact the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA). Since that time, the provisions of CRA have provided unparalleled economic opportunity in the poorest of our country's communities. In the inner-city neighborhoods of Cleveland, families are realizing the dream of homeownership, real estate markets are rising and small businesses are breathing new life into areas once redlined and hopeless. With the investments sparked by CRA, Cleveland has leveraged a higher quality of life in these neighborhoods and established a solid infrastructure to support economic growth throughout the area. It is estimated that CRA has resulted in investment commitments of $3.1 billion for community development efforts in Cleveland. Nationally, CRA has spurred investments totaling more than one trillion dollars in cities and rural areas across the country. Today, I urge my colleagues to continue our commitment to growth and stability in the underserved communities of America by protecting and strengthening CRA through the financial modernization legislation. In this time of great economic prosperity, it is our sacred trust to guarantee that hope and opportunity are extended to all Americans, in every community and in every neighborhood.

VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1568, a bill to establish an office of Veterans Business Development within the Small Business Administration.

Mr. Speaker, our nation again finds itself in a position of being unable to meet the recruiting goals of its armed services. To make matters worse, the military departments are also finding it difficult to retain service members in sufficient numbers to meet authorized manpower requirements to preserve our national defense.

The causes of these personnel shortages are many, but they fall into the general category of low pay, long hours, and too much time away from home. Many service members who do stay in the service long enough to be eligible for veterans benefits find it difficult to obtain meaningful employment when they get out of the service.

This bill will provide some help in this area. The legislation will direct the SBA and VA to work together to establish a program to assist veterans, including service-disabled veterans, through small business development centers. These centers would provide training and counseling to veterans concerning the formation, management, financing, marketing and operation of small business concerns, provide assistance and information regarding procurement opportunities with federal, state and local agencies, and compile a list of small businesses owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans which provide goods or services which could be procured by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent bill which addresses an immediate need, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

KINROSS TOWNSHIP CELEBRATES ITS CENTENNIAL AND ITS ECONOMIC RECOVERY

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to residents of the Charter Township of Kinross, who are celebrating their centennial with a spirit of optimism. The celebration and the optimism of this northern Michigan community is especially inspiring, Mr. Speaker, because Kinross Township continues to struggle economically to recover from the Air Force decision to turn out the lights and turn the key on Kincheloe Air Force Base in September 1977. This military departure, which occurred far before the formal base closure program of the early 1990s, left a shell of an economy, a ghost of a community, and infrastructure and pollution problems that still must be dealt with today.

Kinross Township is working hard on its own recovery. The Centennial Ceremonies are an affirmation of that effort and a rededication to its fulfillment. The Centennial lets many township residents look back to their roots in the Eastern Upper Peninsula of Michigan, where their ancestors settled as lumbermen and farmers after the railroad opened up the territory.

Quilting has knit the community together for generations, and a special community quilt and a community blanket highlighting the area's history are among the Centennial activities.

The proximity of the Soo Locks guaranteed a U.S. military presence somewhere near Sault Ste. Marie to guard this vital facility. The locks were an essential link between the Great Lakes of Superior and Huron in bringing Great Plains wheat and iron ore from Minnesota and northern Michigan to lower Midwest ports and steel mills. The airport at Kinross was designated in June 1941, eventually growing to become a Strategic Air Command base and serving as home to B–52H bombers and KC–135 tankers. The base was named Kincheloe for Air Force Capt. Ivan C. Kincheloe Jr., a Michigan native, Korean War ace, and test pilot killed in an accident over the Mojave Desert in 1956.

An impact study prepared by the Air Force at the time of the closing noted Kincheloe was a $55 million per year operation, with a significant portion of that funding spent in the local area. The impact of the loss of this income on the businesses and permanent residents of this largely rural area can only be imagined.

I have worked closely with community officials in Kinross, Mr. Speaker. Unlike our most recent base closing, which have included environmental cleanup of military sites before their turnover to civilian ownership and operation, and which have included large infusions of economic aid, the recovery of Kinross has been to a large extent a bootstrap effort. We have had some joint successes, such as the designation of the former base as the nation's first rural site to be designated a ''brownfield,'' and we have worked to obtain funding for the former airport, now Chippewa County International Airport.

It should be noted that, although Kinross already had its name in the 1880s and had a post office for a short time in 1898, it was not an established township until a Mr. Albert Curtis, a man with vision and foresight, went to the Chippewa County Board of Supervisors in Sault Ste. Marie with a request to create a township. His proposal rejected, Mr. Curtis caught a train for Lansing, where he caught the state legislature in session and made the same request. Successful in this effort, he returned to Kinross, where he was elected supervisor in the township's first election, April 3, 1899. Mr. Curtis was to hold that office on and off for 24 of the next 36 years, part of his remarkable record of service to his community.

I have confidence, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Charter Township of Kinross will one day view the closing of the air base as merely another step, albeit a painful one at the time, in the unique history of this area. The recent development of extensive snowmobile trails, five Michigan Corrections Department facilities and thriving area businesses signal a resurgence.

Like the community quilts, the essential fabric of Kinross Township remains intact, and new elements continue to be woven into the area's rich history. Mr. Speaker, I invite my House colleagues to join me in wishing the best for the people of Kinross Township on the occasion of their centennial.

IN RECOGNITION OF DAVIDA MOUNT EDWARDS

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to a truly fine American—Mrs. Davida Mount Edwards of Tyler,

Texas—who died on Sunday, May 16. Davida was a devoted wife and mother, and will be dearly missed by those she touched in the East Texas area.

Mrs. Edwards was born September 19, 1921, in Chico, Texas. Her family later moved to Houston where she graduated from Reagan High School, in 1939, and later taught home economics. She expanded her extensive work in education by teaching Adult Homemaking Education classes for the Houston Independent School District. She also worked with the Texas Education Agency as a homemaking supervisor, covering 14 counties throughout the great state of Texas.

Mrs. Edwards' loving and caring ways touched every aspect of her community. She was instrumental in forming the East Texas School of Nursing through her extensive travel within the East Texas area recruiting members to fill the first classes. She also assisted in the formation of the Robert Craig School of Nursing at East Texas Baptist University in Marshall, Texas. In addition, Mrs. Edwards served in organizations such as the American Association of University Women, the Deborah Bible Club, Tyler Women's Forum, and was a 48 year member of First Baptist Church where she conducted Sunday School classes for many years. I always felt a kinship to Davida in that her husband, Welby, and I are alongtime friends. We are both from Fate, Texas, and John Payne and I have kept in touch with the Edwards through the years.

Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn today, let us do so in honor and respect for this truly great lady, Mrs. Davida Mount Edwards.

TRIBUTE TO MR. J.D. WILLIAMS, A TRUE PATRIOT AND PRESIDENTIAL ''POINT OF LIGHT''

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, as our nation prepares to celebrate Independence Day, I would like to pay tribute to an American patriot who never forgot this country's veterans.

Mr. J.D. Williams' selfless attention to the memory of America's veterans was recently highlighted by The Pike County Citizen in Troy, Alabama.

As the newspaper noted: ''Anyone who has lived in Pike County . . . no doubt saw the late Mr. Williams honoring the memory of military veterans by placing American flags and white crosses at grave sites of veterans in Pike and six surrounding counties. For decades, practically every day of the week, Mr. Williams would visit cemeteries, locate veterans' graves and, on behalf of his country, pay tribute to their service and sacrifice.''

''Funds to purchase the thousands of flags Mr. Williams left at cemeteries came out of his own pocket. The thousands of wooden crosses he placed near grave markers were constructed and painted with his own hands. Not only did Mr. Williams leave flags and crosses at veterans' graves, he also would clean or repair any unkept grave site.''

Mr. Williams, the article points out, paid no attention to the color of the deceased veteran or even if they had served in the Confederate Army; just so long as they were veterans.

It was this remarkable dedication to his fellow man and our nation that earned Mr. Williams national recognition as a ''Point of Light'' from President George Bush some ten years ago.

J.D. Williams passed away in July of 1994, but his self sacrifice is now being honored by the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 7055 who have recently placed a permanent American pole on his grave.

At a time in this nation's history when many of our national veterans cemeteries are neglected by our own government, we need more people like J.D. Williams. This House owes him its thanks.

THE NATIONAL PRESS PHOTOGRAPHERS ASSOCIATION'S DAN COOKE PIO AWARD OF EXCELLENCE

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1995, I addressed the House to salute the achievements of the National Press Photographers Association on its 50th anniversary. I said, in part:

''Through their experience, they know of the necessity for a harmonious working relationship between the public safety and the journalistic communities so that accurate, even lifesaving information can be passed on very quickly to the waiting public. It is through this goal that they created the 'National Media Guide for Emergency & Disaster Incidents.' ''

Our nation has continued to face earthquakes, floods, fires, tornadoes, and human tragedies over these past years. Emergency information continues to flow from the scene through media representatives to the public with life-saving instructions and information.

Now, two individuals and their Information Teams are being honored by the National Press Photographers Association. The NPPA Government/Media Relations Committee is pleased to announce the first recipients of the ''NPPA Dan Cooke PIO Award of Excellence'': Deputy Sheriff Steve Davis of the Jefferson County, Colorado, Sheriff's Department and Assistant Chief Jon Hansen of the Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, Fire Department.

Deputy Sheriff Davis is being honored for his work in keeping the public informed during the Columbine High School shootings in Colorado. Hansen is cited for his consistent dissemination of information over the years, most notably during the Oklahoma City Federal Office Building bombing and the recent tornadoes that killed and injured many people.

This award is named in memory of Lt. Dan Cooke, a Los Angeles Police Department Press Relations Officer for 22 years. He retired in 1988 after spending 35 years with the department. Cooke was the department's most frequent spokesman on major stories, from Presidential visits to infamous crimes that made headlines worldwide. In addition, he was a technical advisor on many movies and TV programs such as ''Dragnet,'' ''Badge 714,'' and ''Adam 12.'' He became a personal friend to Jack Webb, and Cooke's Lieutenant's badge is the famous ''714.''

Dan Cooke's high standards are ''the best a Press Information Officer can be'', said Bob Riha, Jr., a contract photographer with USA Today from Long Beach, California, and co-chair of the Government/Media Relations Committee.

Within minutes of the horrifying Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, live broadcasts were sent around the world from the scene. Moments later, information flowed to media representatives from Assistant Chief Jon Hansen and his Public Information Team to a worldwide audience for the next several weeks, 24 hours a day. President Clinton even thanked Chief Hansen for his information updates as Federal and State resources raced to the scene to render aid.

Recently, when tornadoes cut across Oklahoma, devastating communities in their path, Chief Hansen continued to provide emergency public information to his community, our nation, and the world, despite losing his own home to the tornadoes.

The Columbine High School shootings were perhaps the most gripping tragedy in our nation in the past several years. As emergency responders arrived at the scene, so did Deputy Sheriff Steve Davis. Once a Media Information Center was established, Deputy Davis and PIO Team members provided updates and information to media representatives as often as necessary to keep his community, our nation, and the world informed.

''Public Information Officers like Davis and Hansen have set new standards for levels of cooperation between the media and public safety providers,'' said co-chair David Handschuh, staff photographer with the New York Daily News. ''The ultimate benefactor of this cooperation is the public, who stays updated and informed in times of crisis.''

National Press Photographers Association President Linda Angelle said, ''Media, police and fire personnel work in jobs that require them to deal with both traumatic and tragic situations. Davis and Hansen have been recognized for outstanding work in exceptional circumstances and will be presented the Cooke PIO Award of Excellence at our National Convention in Denver July 2, 1999.''

Media representatives and Public Information Officers serve a vital role in keeping our communities and the nation informed in times of crisis. I hope that Congress and State Legislatures continue to work together to keep that free flow of information open to the public through media representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF COLONEL M.B. ETHEREDGE

HON. JIM TURNER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American, a wonderful patriot and fellow Texan, Colonel M.B. Etheredge, who after more than 80 years of dedicated service to his community, to the State of Texas and to this entire Nation, will be honored by his friends and family members at the Family Faith Church in Huntsville, TX, on Sunday, July 4, 1999.

Born in Weldon, TX, Mr. Etheredge graduated from Huntsville High School in 1933. Four years later, he received a bachelor of

Arts Degree from Sam Houston Teacher's College, where he was an active member of the Student Council, Captain of the Track Team and President of his Senior Class.

Following graduation from Sam Houston, he taught in Sugar Land from 1937 to 1941 and then went on to serve as Brazoria County's Superintendent of Schools. In the summer of 1942, Mr. Etheredge enlisted in the United States Army and spent the next four years in Africa, Italy and France. Amazingly, but not surprising to those who knew him, he earned two battlefield promotions and was advanced in rank from second lieutenant to captain in only 6 days. For his dedication and commitment, he has been awarded three Silver Star medals for gallantry in action, two Bronze Star medals for heroism and two Purple Heart medals, making him one of the most decorated heroes of World War II. He was mustered out of the Army with the highest efficiency index of any officer in the Fourth Army Area and now carries the high honor of colonel (Retired) of the United States Army.

After world War II, Mr. Etheredge completed his Master of Arts Degree at Sam Houston Teachers College in 1947. He received a Peabody Scholarship and did postgraduate work at the University of Texas in Austin. Lieutenant Colonel Etheredge was elected to three terms in the Texas House of Representatives, where he served as Chairman of the Education Committee. He also served two terms as a board member of the Huntsville Chamber of Commerce, is a past President of the Huntsville Rotary Club, taught at Sam Houston State University as a Associate Professor of Education, and chartered the American Bank of Huntsville and the Lake Area Bank of Trinity, where he served as Chairman of the Board.

Mr. Etheredge has made a positive impact on the lives of many Americans and personifies the definition of a true and loyal American who sets the standard for all citizens to live by. He is an outstanding example to his family and friends, and has been an asset to the many communities, states and nations that he has touched over the years.

Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere gratitude and the utmost respect that I rise today to ask that you join me and our colleagues in recognizing the selfless service of Colonel M.B. Etheredge and in saluting the honor and dedication of all American servicemen and women on July 4th, the birthday of our Nation.

HONORING CAPTAIN JUAN TUDELA SALAS

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to commend a man who has dedicated over three decades of faithful service to the United States Coast Guard. Captain Juan Tudela Salas, the first Chamorro selected to attend and graduate from the United States Coast Guard Academy, is slated to retire at the end of this month.

For over thirty years, Captain Salas distinguished himself as one of Guam's top military service members. Having earned a Bachelor of Science degree in General Naval Engineering from the Academy in 1968, he was awarded a Coast Guard scholarship that enabled him to earn a Master's Degree in Public Administration from the George Washington University.

In his three decades with the United States Coast Guard, Captain Salas amassed an extensive seagoing record. In addition, he demonstrated expertise in the field of recruiting and marketing. He was assigned to the USCGC *Basswood* from 1972 to 1974. Prior to being appointed Chief of the Military Recruiting Branch of the Twelfth Coast Guard District in San Francisco, Captain Salas served on the USCGC *Red Birch* from 1970 until 1972. In 1974, he was once again assigned to sea duty with the USCGC *Resolute.* From the *Resolute,* he moved on to Washington, D.C., in 1976, to serve as Chief of the Minority Recruiting Branch at the Coast Guard Headquarters. In 1981, he was out at sea once again with the USCGC *Ute.*

From 1983 until 1986, Captain Salas served as the Officer in Charge of the Interdiction Operations Intelligence Center for the Vice President's National Narcotics Border Interdiction system in Miami, Florida. In 1986, he assumed command of the USCGC *Lipan.* While commanding the *Lipan,* he successfully directed the interdiction of four vessels and the seizure of a total of over 20,000 lbs. of marijuana and 5,500 lbs. of cocaine.

Captain Salas was back to recruiting in 1989. He served his last assignment in this field as chief of Recruiting and Job entry Division at coast guard Headquarters in Washington, D.C. As chief, he was responsible for the nation's Coast Guard recruiting programs, directing a nationwide force of 280 recruiters. He served in this capacity until 1992 when he assumed command of the Coast Guard Marianas Section and Marine Safety Office Guam. As commander, he has discharged his duties in such an exemplary manner that his Operations Center staff won the Controller of the Year Award for the entire coast guard in April, 1993. He is currently the Deputy Assistant Commandant for Coast Guard Civil Rights, assuming the position in 1996 after serving as Deputy Commander of the Coast Guard Personnel Command.

Throughout his career, Captain Salas had been awarded 3 Meritorious Service Medals, 2 Coast Guard Commendation Medals, the Coast Guard Achievement Medal, in addition to numerous unit and operational awards. Outside of the military, he has served on different occasions as president of the Guam Society of America in Washington, D.C. He has also been appointed Honorary Ambassador-at-Large for the island by the governor of Guam.

Captain Salas is married to May Camacho Sanchez Salas, formerly from the village of Barrigada. They have four children. The eldest, LTJG Matthew Salas, followed in his father's footsteps by graduating from the Coast guard Academy in 1996.

Captain Salas' distinguished military career is a great source of pride for the people of Guam. I congratulate him on his outstanding achievements. Together with the people of Guam, I join his family in proudly celebrating his great accomplishments. I hope that he enjoys his well-earned retirement and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

INDIA CELEBRATES NUKES AND DEMONSTRATES INTOLERANCE

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, while our attention has been grabbed by Kosovo and China, the situation in India has dropped off our radar screen. While we weren't looking, India has been very busy.

The Indian election campaign began with the ruling party celebrating the anniversary of its nuclear weapons tests last year. These weapons were built out of India's development budget, as the people's health and education continue to decline and the population outside of the Brahmin caste lives in abject poverty.

Meanwhile, the Indian Defense Minister held a meeting looking to find ways to ''stop the U.S.,'' which he called ''vulgarly arrogant.'' Remember that we provide millions of dollars each year to help India pay its bills. How ''vulgarly arrogant.'' of us! Other countries whose representatives attended this meeting included Serbia, China, Cuba, Russia, Libya, and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a country in which there is little respect for religious freedom. On May 20, the government placed the Jathedar of the Akal Takht, Bhai Ranjit Singh, under house arrest. Since Christmas, there has been a wave of violence against Christians. A missionary has been burned to death along with his two young sons, nuns have been raped, priests have been murdered, and Christian churches, prayer halls, and schools have been burned to the ground by allies of the Indian government.

As if all that weren't enough, we have received word that Indian intelligence officers interrogated a journalist named Sikhbir Singh Osan for 45 minutes. For him to have been grilled and harassed by police would have been bad enough, but he was harassed by intelligence officers after he returned from the U.S., Canada, and the U.K., where he covered the recent Sikh 300th anniversary marches and gave a speech on the persecution of Christians.

The government of India is intolerant and anti-American. They do not allow freedom of religion or, apparently, of the press. I am proud to have joined several of my colleagues of both parties in co-sponsoring a resolution that calls for a free and fair plebiscite in Punjab, Khalistan on the question of independence. Freedom is America's mission. By taking steps against the anti-American government of India, we can help promote and extend the blessings of liberty to another corner of the world. We must get started.

DESIGNATION OF EL CAMINO REAL DE LOS TEJAS AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to introduce legislation that would designate the Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail. This camino real, or

royal highway, forged the way for the early development of Texas into a Spanish colony, an independent Republic, and a state in the United States. As the first great highway into Texas, this camino real opened the door to trade and cultural exchange which continues to impact our lives today.

The State of Texas recognized the critical importance of these royal highways in 1929 when the state legislature designated portions of El Camino Real de los Tejas, later known as the Old San Antonio Road, as one of Texas historic trails. State Highway 21 marks the trail's pathway in many parts of the state as do state historical markers. Designation as a National Historic Trail would greatly enhance the resources available for trail preservation and public education of its unique and important history.

The National Park Service completed its feasibility study in July 1998 pursuant to PL 103–145. The study concluded that the proposed trail met all applicable criteria in the National Trails System Act (PL 90–543). Last Congress, the Senate passed similar legislation, the Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Act of 1998 (S. 2276). The House did not consider this bill nor a companion bill which I introduced in the House (HR 4724).

The bill I am introducing today contains a number of important changes from last year's version. In an effort to clarify the intent of the legislation and to respond to concerns raised during the bill's consideration last Congress, I have worked with the National Park Service to add language addressing the concerns of private property owners. The bill now states unambiguously that no land or interest in land can be acquired by the federal government without the willing consent of the owner, that the federal government has no authority to condemn or appropriate land for the trail, that the trail will not be established on the ground unless a private property owner voluntarily requests to participate, and that designating the trail does not confer any additional authority to apply other, non-trail federal laws. These provisions reflect my desire to assuage any concerns that a national historic trail in Texas would negatively impact private property owners. In fact, the experience of the other existing national historic trails suggests just the opposite—private property owners can and do benefit from participating in the trail program, but only if they want to do so.

The Camino Real de los Tejas as defined in this legislation collectively represents a series of roads and trails extending for more than 1,000 miles from Mexico City through Saltillo and Monclova in Mexico to Guerrero and Laredo along the Rio Grande, converging in San Antonio, the provincial capital of Texas from 1772 to 1821, and then heading north and east to Los Adeas, the earlier provincial capital of Texas from 1721 through 1772, now located in Louisiana. Beginning as Indian trails from the earliest days of human activity in the Americas, the trails developed under the Spanish as routes of exploration, missionary work and colonization. The earliest Spanish route stems back to the travels of Alonso de León in 1689 and Terán de los Ríos in 1691. During the next 150 years, explorers, traders, ranchers, armies and missionaries blazed a series of trails through South Texas to San Antonio and from San Antonio through East Texas and Louisiana. Immigration, from both the east and south, traveled along this transportation system.

These trails gained different names over time. In South Texas, beginning at the Presidio del Rio Grande and ending in San Antonio, we find the Lower Presidio Road, or El Camino de en Medio; the Camino Pita; and the Upper Presidio Road. A separate Laredo Road linked Laredo to San Antonio and the Camino Real system. Two major arteries extended northeastward from San Antonio: the Camino de los Tejas along the Balconies Escarpment; and the Camino Arriba through the Post Oak Savannah. Both of these routes converged again in Nacogdoches, Texas.

All told, various portions of the Camino Real de los Tejas now in the United States extend for some 550 miles and together make up approximately 2,600 miles in combined length. They served as critical trade routes, post roads, cattle trails, and military highways and opened Texas to the world.

The Camino Real de los Tejas linked the Spanish in Mexico to their new outposts in East Texas in the late 17th and early 18th Centuries. These early settlements provided a Spanish presence to counter early French exploration of Texas. The Mission San Antonio de Valero, later known as the Alamo, was established along the Camino real route and later served as a focal point in the military battle for Texas independence. Critical supplies made their way to the American Colonies during the War of Independence via the Camino Real de los Tejas trail system. The Camino Real de los Tejas road system provided the main transportation route for Mexican and Texan armies during the Texas Revolution and continued to play a major role in future military actions.

Recognizing the significance of the Camino Real de los Tejas and its historical importance grounds us for the future and provides opportunities for today. Trail designation will help enhance tourism and economic development in the many cities and towns along the trail system. Local museums and historical sites will be given new opportunities for growth. The San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, an important and beautiful network of missions in the San Antonio area, can provide a base of operations for trail activities. A number of public roads, state parks and national forests can provide public access to this important piece of our history. As we strive to boost international trade, develop our local communities, and enhance educational opportunities, we only have to look to El Camino Real de los Tejas for inspiration.

COMMEMORATING THE PECOS RODEO

HON. HENRY BONILLA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Pecos, Texas, a community which hosts the world renowned rodeo every 4th of July week. Folks from all across Texas and other states flock to Pecos for this annual event.

In the mid 1800's in cow towns across the state of Texas, a new sport, the Rodeo was created. By 1883, a little town in West Texas, Pecos, launched the first full fledged rodeo. This annual event occurs during the week of our celebration for independence, July 4th.

Tomorrow, July 1, 1999, the tradition continues as the annual Pecos Rodeo begins with several fun filled activities and events. The first Pecos rodeo was held near the town courthouse. What used to be the old rodeo grounds is now the Pecos Community Center, Civic Auditorium, and the Texas Highway Patrol. At one time the audience would use the bumpers and hoods of their Model ''T's'' and ''A's'' as position for viewing the Rodeo. The national western pastime, marks an era of dust, cow hide, and leather popping for the traditional cowboy who utilizes his talents and abilities to entertain all citizens of the western country.

The annual event for Pecos was actually the first ''true'' rodeo ever held, with full fledged advertising and an array of different prizes and contestants. During that time, Pecos was proud to have the most saloons in West Texas. As legend tells us, every saloon comes with rowdy cowboys. These cowboys would compete in the Pecos rodeo to prove their ''excellence'' by competing for the grand prize. The winning cowboy would have the ultimate bragging rights.

However, as time changes, so do the participating cowboys. The average cowboys now include college and high school students who compete on a regular basis. As the weekend events begin, we must remember that even though cowboys and horses are the main attraction for the rodeo, the true life and blood of this spectacular event are the volunteers and spectators who make this a true success for the Pecos community. The rodeo has definitely established extensive contributions to the quality of life in Pecos.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. MARTIN P. DOOLAN

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a fine American, Mr. Martin P. Doolan, recipient of the prestigious 1999 Ellis Island Medal of Honor.

Following a distinguished and highly-decorated military career, Mr. Doolan retired as captian in July of 1997, after 7 years active duty in the U.S. Coast Guard and 30 years of service in the reserves. His military career is augmented by an equally successful business career, which spans a quarter of a century of executive management of corporate turnarounds with return to long-term profitability of numerous sizable corporations. Mr. Doolan's ability to salvage the equity value in these corporations has enabled their continual growth for both shareholders and the thousands of Americans employed within these firms.

Currently, he serves as President/CEO of Value City Department Stores and DSW Shoe Warehouse, a $1.6 billion off-price retail department store and shoe chain. His accomplishments have been chronicled in nationally recognized publications such as the Wall Street Journal, Fortune, Business Week, and many others. Recently he was featured on ''CEO Call'' which airs on CNBC Live.

Established in 1986 by the National Ethnic Coalition Organization, Ellis Island Award Recipients embody exceptional humanitarian efforts and contributions to fellow Americans. Previous awardees have included six United States Presidents, Governors, community advocates, and members of both the Senate and House of Representatives. Along with Mr. Doolan, other 1999 Ellis Island Award recipients include: First Lady Hillary Clinton, Chief Justice William Rehnquist, and Senator John Glenn.

Mr. Doolan was joined at the awards ceremony by his lovely wife of 36 years, Grace Ann Doolan and his three daughters, Theresa Doolan, Jennifer Doolan Patty and Jeanne Doolan Cunningham. A former resident of Duncanville, TX, the Doolans currently reside in the quiet suburb of Heath, located on the outskirts of Dallas.

Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn today, let us do so in honor and respect for this great American, Mr. Martin P. Doolan.

CELEBRATING THE UNIQUE HISTORY OF MASS CITY, MICHIGAN

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call your attention to the 100th birthday of Mass City, a small community in the western part of the Upper Peninsula in Michigan's 1st Congressional District. Although it is a small dot on the map, like many Midwest communities Mass City has its own rich and unique history. On this centennial occasion, I'd like to share a few highlights of that history with my House colleagues.

As a local writer noted, it was the great continental glaciers 10,000 years ago that gave final shape to the topography of northern Michigan, but it was geologic activity hundreds of millions of years earlier that planted in the area rich deposits of copper. This ore would sustain a long copper culture among the earliest settlers in the region, and it would serve as one of the powerful attractions for later European settlers.

Timber was the second attraction, and land for agriculture was the third, especially for many Finnish immigrants who settled in the area in the early 1900s.

Mass City was born in 1899 in this burst of economic activity, but today's guardians of local lore are left with the mystery of the community's name. Is it an abbreviation for ''Massachusetts City,'' since five members of the board of directors of the Mass Consolidated Mining Company were from that state?

Maybe it was named for the Mass Mine, discovered by Noel Johnson, an early African-American settler in the area. The prevailing sentiment, however, is that the name comes from the mass copper in the surrounding hills. As late as the 1990s, chunks of native copper weighing more than a ton were found in the community's Caledonia Mine.

The boom days of mining are gone now, Mr. Speaker, and only a few farms are still active. Lumbering is still important to the regional economy, but it takes a back seat to what I believe is the region's greatest asset—its remarkable quality of life. A belief in the value of hard work and the importance of family are reinforced by the beauty of the natural surroundings. This is the North Woods, where crisp, star-filled winter nights or summer breezes rustling the pines are gentle reminders of the Presence of the Almighty.

Mass City will hold its reunion and centennial celebration July 2–4. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the real celebration of this region will continue as long as there are men and women living there who continue to add to its history and treasure its heritage and values.

INTRODUCING THE SCHOOL AND LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION AFFORDABILITY ACT

HON. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the School and Library Construction Affordability Act to make high-quality construction and repairs less costly for our nation's communities, schools and citizens.

This measure would exempt public schools and libraries from the inflationary and costly effects of the federal Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws.

I am offering this legislation specifically to address three issues.

First, 22 States have chosen not to impose state Davis-Bacon laws or have specifically exempted schools from coverage, so it is wise for us to make the federal laws to be more harmonious with state laws in this area.

Second, it is well-known that the AFL–CIO wants to use the President's school construction bond initiative as a vehicle to expand federal Davis-Bacon laws over a much larger number of local public schools than must abide by it today. At this time, the federal Davis-Bacon Act applies to public school construction in cases where the public school receives federal funds as general revenue. Impact Aid, for example, is such a general revenue program. By contrast, ''categorical'' programs like Title I, designated for a specific purpose, are not general revenue to a school, and do not trigger Davis-Bacon coverage of school construction and repair. Rather than to add to the immense federal regulatory burden on our schools, we need to work to reduce that burden so that they can focus their scarce resources on educating their children.

And third, Davis-Bacon increases construction cost 5–38 percent. Each year, the General Accounting Office makes note that eliminating the federal Davis-Bacon Act would save federal taxpayers billions of dollars. The federal Davis-Bacon Act is also well-known to be prone to extensive waste and abuse. With this legislation we will help ensure that each citizens' school bond dollar buys a dollar's worth of building and repairs.

The School and Library Construction Affordability Act allows schools and libraries to get more school buildings, and more school repairs, for their scarce taxpayer dollar. It respects the right of states and localities to establish their own labor practices, without imposing unnecessary regulations from Washington, D.C. It is neither pro-union or anti-union, for under this measure everyone will be able to compete fairly and equitably for school and library construction and repair work. It may not be construed to diminish the high quality of construction and repairs that the purchasers of these services—our communities and our local taxpayers—always and rightfully insist upon. This bill is simply in the best interests of America's children.

This legislation is supported by the Associated Builders and Contractors, and the National School Boards Association. I have attached below the texts of their letters of support. In introducing this measure, I am joined by a dozen original cosponsors from across the country.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of our local schools and public libraries, in support of regulatory relief for our communities, and in support of our children by cosponsoring the School and Library Construction Affordability Act, and moving to enact it.

ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS,
Rosslyn, VA, June 15, 1999.

Hon. DUKE CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: On behalf of Associated Builders and Contractors (ABC), and its more than 20,000 contractors, subcontractors, suppliers and related firms across the country, I would like to express our strong support for the ''School and Library Construction Affordability Act.'' This is much needed legislation to exempt public schools and libraries from the inflationary and costly effects of the federal Davis-Bacon Act.

By eliminating Davis-Bacon requirements for school and library construction, Congress will help lift outdated burdens and federal restrictions and help improve local control and flexibility in leveraging education dollars. It will give local school districts the ability to spend resources where they will most effectively meet students' educational needs.

As you know, Davis-Bacon inflates the cost of construction anywhere from 5 to 38 percent, thus hurting those who fund, provide, and receive public education by forcing school districts to pay more to provide students with less. Davis-Bacon siphons tax dollars which could be better spent on real efforts to help education—such as additional school repairs, more facilities, books, computers, and other services that actually improve classroom learning and benefit school children.

Twenty-two states have recognized the waste associated with federal restrictions like Davis-Bacon and have chosen *not* to have similar state restrictions on schools. Ohio, for example, exempted school construction and repair from the state's ''little Davis-Bacon Act'' in 1997, and has since found preliminary savings have averaged 10 percent lower costs. Davis-Bacon serves as an ''unfunded mandate'' on those states, by forcing them to work under a Depression-era labor law that mandates inefficient practices and inflates construction costs.

Additionally, eliminating Davis-Bacon restrictions will help give local residents entry-level job and training opportunities on projects in their own neighborhood, by allowing contractors to hire ''helpers,'' as they do for schools not hindered by Davis-Bacon. This will be an important step toward ensuring job opportunities for many low-skilled minorities, at-risk youth, and displaced workers to ''earn while they learn'' in their community.

ABC applauds your leadership in introducing the ''School and Library Construction Affordability Act'' to help improve use

of our nation's tax dollars and ensure real educational improvements.

Sincerely,

JENNIFER BOUCHER,
Director, Government Affairs.

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, June 14, 1999.

Hon. DUKE CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposed legislation that would exempt schools and libraries from federal Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provisions. We strongly support the intent of your legislation to keep federal support for school and library construction free from the constraints of Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements. The National School Boards Association, representing 95,000 school board members through its federation of 53 states and territories, believes that in both direct federal funding for school and library construction and indirect support through federal tax credits must be unencumbered by the inflationary factors associated with the Davis-Bacon law.

Throughout the United States public school students find themselves coping with intolerable conditions in school facilities. Many students attend schools with overcrowded classrooms, obsolete equipment, classrooms not wired for current computing technology, and other structural obstacles that impact student safety and learning.

According to a 1996 General Accounting Office report, 38 percent of urban schools, 30 percent of suburban schools, and 30 percent of rural schools have at least one building that needs extensive repair or total replacement. More than one-third of all public school students attend classes in school buildings that need serious repair or replacement. The estimated costs of these repairs and replacements are $112 billion.

Several proposals have been introduced, such as America's Better Classrooms Act of 1999 (H.R. 1760) by Congresswoman Nancy Johnson of Connecticut, to help local municipalities obtain funding to build desperately needed new schools and renovate outdated and unsafe classrooms. This legislation will provide tax credits for the interest of $25 billion in new public bonds for school construction and renovation. NSBA believes that this and similar legislation begins to address the magnitude of the school construction crisis. However, we are concerned that the inclusion of Davis-Bacon would severely undermine the real impact of such initiatives.

For instance, if Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements were explicitly applied to this tax provision, it would impact 38 states that either have no state prevailing wage laws, or have prevailing wage requirements substantially less intrusive than federal requirements. That means, for the most impoverished rural and inner-city school districts, construction and renovation costs would increase as much as 15 percent over current costs minimizing the assistance provided by the underlying tax credit.

In this light, we strongly support the intent of your proposed legislation to explicitly state that federal Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements will not be applied to school construction tax credits or direct funding for construction of schools and libraries.

We appreciate your support for our America's children.

Sincerely,

ANNE L. BRYANT,
Executive Director.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 1, 1999 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 13

2 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 729, to ensure that Congress and the public have the right to participate in the declaration of national monuments on federal land.

SD–366

JULY 14

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold joint oversight hearings on the General Accounting Office report on Interior Department's trust funds reform.

SH–216

JULY 15

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings on S. 161, to provide for a transition to market-based rates for power sold by the Federal Power Marketing Administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority; S. 282, to provide that no electric utility shall be required to enter into a new contract or obligation to purchase or to sell electricity or capacity under section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; S. 516, to benefit consumers by promoting competition in the electric power industry; and S. 1047, to provide for a more competitive electric power industry.

SH–216

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings on the nomination of F. Whitten Peters, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of the Air Force; and the nomination of Arthur L. Money, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

SR–222

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 985, to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

SR–485

JULY 27

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 1052, to implement further the Act (Public Law 94–241) approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America.

SD–366

JULY 28

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 979, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes.

SR–485

AUGUST 4

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 299, to elevate the position of Director of the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services to Assistant Secretary for Indian Health; and S. 406, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to make permanent the demonstration program that allows for direct billing of medicare, medicaid, and other third party payors, and to expand the eligibility under such program to other tribes and tribal organizations; followed by a business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SR–485

SEPTEMBER 28

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the American Legion.

345 Cannon Building

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill.

House Committees ordered reported 15 sundry measures.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7835–S7972

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1304–1311 and S. Res. 128–131. **Pages S7931–32**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 376, to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–100)

H.R. 1175, to locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, an American citizen, and other Israeli soldiers missing in action, with an amendment.

H. Con. Res. 35, congratulating the State of Qatar and its citizens for their commitment to democratic ideals and women's suffrage on the occasion of Qatar's historic elections of a central municipal council on March 8, 1999.

S. Res. 109, relating to the activities of the National Islamic Front government in Sudan, with amendments.

S. Res. 119, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES–10/6.

S. Res. 129, authorizing expenditures for years October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000 and October 1, 2000 to February 28, 2001, by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. Con. Res. 36, condemning Palestinian efforts to revive the original Palestine partition plan of November 29, 1947, and condemning the United Nations Commission on Human Rights for its April 27, 1999, resolution endorsing Palestinian self-determination on the basis of the original Palestine partition plan. **Page S7928**

Measures Passed:

Foreign Operations Appropriations: By 97 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 192), Senate passed S. 1234, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S7835–52, S7854–56, S7862–S7911

Adopted:

Wellstone Modified Amendment No. 1123, to combat the crime of international trafficking and to protect the rights of victims. **Pages S7843–44, S7854**

Subsequently, the amendment was further modified. **Pages S7855–56**

McConnell/Leahy Amendment No. 1127, to provide that certain funds from the Economic Support Fund be made available for political, economic, humanitarian, and associated support activities for Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraqi Liberation Act (Public Law 105–338). **Pages S7847, S7852**

McConnell (for McCain) Amendment No. 1128, to strike certain provisions, with regard to the appropriation of funds for the Inter-American Foundation, providing that funds be made available only after the General Accounting Office has completed its current Inter-American Foundation civil and criminal investigations and reported to the Committees on Appropriations. **Pages S7847–48, S7852**

Leahy/McConnell Amendment No. 1129, to provide that funds made available to grantees may be invested pending expenditure for project purposes when authorized by the President of the African Development Foundation; to provide that interest earned shall be used only for the purposes for which the grant was made; to provide that this authority applies to interest earned both prior to and following enactment of this provision; to provide that notwithstanding section 505(a)(2) of the African Development Foundation Act, in exceptional circumstances the board of directors of the Foundation may waive

the $250,000 limitation contained in that section with respect to a project, and to provide that the Foundation shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations before each time such waiver authority is exercised. **Pages S7847–48, S7852**

McConnell (for Coverdell/Stevens) Amendment No. 1130, to provide up to $5,500,000 to establish an International Health Care Center at Morehouse School of Medicine. **Pages S7847–48, S7852**

McConnell/Leahy Amendment No. 1131, to provide that certain funds for assistance for Ukraine be withheld from obligation and expenditure until the Government of Ukraine has undertaken significant economic reforms additional to those achieved in fiscal year 1999, including taking effective measures to end corruption by government officials.

Pages S7847–48, S7852

Leahy/McConnell Amendment No. 1132, to provide that of the funds made available for Ukraine, $3,500,000 shall be made available for the destruction of stockpiles of anti-personnel landmines in Ukraine. **Pages S7847–48, S7852**

Leahy Amendment No. 1133, to provide that the proportion of funds appropriated under Development Assistance that are made available for biodiversity activities should be at least the same as the proportion of funds that were made available for such activities from funds appropriated by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1995 (P.L. 103–306) to carry out sections 103 through 106 and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Pages S7847–49, S7852

Leahy Amendment No. 1134, to modify certain provisions relating to debt restructuring within the Department of the Treasury. **Pages S7847, S7849, S7852**

McConnell (for Roth) Amendment No. 1135, to express the sense of Congress regarding which office in the Department of State is appropriate for managing United States interest in Ukraine.

Pages S7847, S7849, S7852

McConnell (for Helms) Amendment No. 1136, to reduce the amount appropriated for contribution to the International Development Association.

Pages S7847, S7849–50, S7852

McConnell (for Helms) Amendment No. 1137, to provide for congressional notification with respect to acquisition of United States Agency for International Development facilities. **Pages S7847, S7850, S7852**

McConnell (for Helms/DeWine) Amendment No. 1138, to express the sense of Congress regarding assistance to Haiti. **Pages S7847, S7850, S7852**

McConnell/Leahy Amendment No. 1139, to provide that certain funds that are allocated for assistance for the Central Government of Russia, 50 percent shall be withheld from obligation until the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that The Government of Russia has terminated implementation of arrangements to provide Iran with technical expertise, training, technology, or equipment necessary to develop a nuclear reactor, related nuclear research facilities or programs, or ballistic missile capability.

Pages S7847, S7850–52

McConnell Amendment No. 1140, to provide that of the funds made available for Armenia, $15,000,000 shall be available for earthquake rehabilitation and reconstruction. **Pages S7847, S7851–52**

McConnell (for Helms) Amendment No. 1141, to earmark certain Foreign Military Financing funds for the Philippines. **Pages S7847, S7851–52**

McConnell (for Abraham) Amendment No. 1142, to provide that from the Development Assistance and Economic Support Funds, not less than $15,000,000 shall be made available for Lebanon to be used, among other programs, for scholarships and direct support of the American educational institutions in Lebanon. **Pages S7847, S7851–52**

McConnell (for Thomas) Amendment No. 1143, to include notification to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on International Relations regarding free and fair elections in Cambodia. **Pages S7847, S7851–52**

Leahy (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 1144, to earmark funds for the independent states of the former Soviet Union for the REAP International School Linkage Program. **Pages S7847, S7851–52**

McConnell (for Campbell) Amendment No. 1145, to restrict United States assistance for reconstruction efforts in the Balkans to United States-produced articles and services. **Pages S7847, S7851–52**

McConnell (for Voinovich) Amendment No. 1180, relating to the designation of Serbia as a Terrorist State. **Page S7866**

Leahy (for Biden) Amendment No. 1181, to allocate funds for the Iraq Foundation. **Page S7866**

By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 188), Leahy Amendment No. 1179, to urge the President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury to immediately intensify their efforts to prevail upon the Indonesian Government and military to disarm and disband anti-independence militias in East Timor; grant full access to East Timor by international human rights monitors, humanitarian organizations, and the press; allow Timorese who have been living in exile to return to East Timor to campaign for and participate in the ballot; and release all political prisoners.

Pages S7865–67

McConnell (for Smith of Or.) Amendment No. 1125, to express the sense of the Senate on the Citizens Democracy Corps with regard to promoting

economic development and open, democratic countries in the former Soviet Union and Central Eastern Europe. **Pages S7877–78, S7884**

Leahy (for Lautenberg) Amendment No. 1146, to provide substitute language relating to restrictions on assistance to countries providing sanctuary to indicted war criminals. **Pages S7877–79, S7884**

McConnell (for Helms) Amendment No. 1150, to provide assistance to promote democracy in Serbia. **Pages S7877–79, S7884**

McConnell (for Burns) Amendment No. 1151, to allocate funds to continue mycoherbicide counter drug research and development. **Pages S7877–80, S7884**

Leahy (for Dodd) Amendment No. 1158, to require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to provide to the Congress by January 31, 2000 a report on all military training provided to foreign military personnel (excluding sales) administered by the Department of Defense and the Department of State during fiscal years 1999 and 2000, including those proposed for fiscal year 2000. **Pages S7877–78, S7881, S7884**

Leahy (for Boxer) Amendment No. 1162, to increase the commitment to control and eliminate the growing international problem of tuberculosis. **Pages S7877–78, S7881, S7884**

Leahy (for Cleland) Amendment No. 1163, to support an international conference to achieve a durable political settlement in the Balkans. **Pages S7877–78, S7881–82, S7884**

Leahy (for Kerry) Amendment No. 1167, to promote an international arms transfers regime. **Pages S7877–78, S7882, S7884**

Leahy (for Kerry) Amendment No. 1168, to restrict United States aid to Cambodia. **Pages S7877–78, S7882–84**

Leahy (for Biden) Amendment No. 1173, to express the sense of the Senate that the programs contained in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative are vital to the national security of the United States and that funding for those programs should be restored in conference to the levels requested in the President's budget. **Pages S7877–78, S7883–84**

Leahy (for Levin) Amendment No. 1174, to express the sense of the Senate regarding United States commitments under the United States-North Korean agreed framework. **Pages S7877–78, S7883–84**

McConnell (for Domenici) Amendment No. 1175, to make available certain funds to Habitat for Humanity International for the purchase of 14 acres of land on behalf of Tibetan refugees living in northern India, and the construction of a multi-unit development. **Pages S7877–78, S7884**

Leahy (for Schumer) Amendment No. 1177, to express the sense of the Senate that the proposed programs under the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI) are critical and essential to preserving United States national security. **Pages S7877–78, S7884**

McConnell (for Cochran/Lott) Amendment No. 1176, to make available certain funds for the Defense Institute of International Studies to enhance its mission, functioning and performance by providing for its fixed costs of operation. **Pages S7877–78, S7884**

Leahy (for Landrieu) Modified Amendment No. 1159, to provide that $2,000,000 of the assistance for Russia and the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union be used to provide grants for nongovernmental organizations to teach new graduates the skills needed for the job market. **Pages S7884, S7886–87**

Subsequently, the amendment was further modified. **Page S7901**

Brownback Modified Amendment No. 1170, to make available international disaster assistance, humanitarian assistance, and development assistance in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan. **Pages S7863–64, S7884–86**

McConnell (for DeWine) Modified Amendment No. 1171, to express the sense of the Senate regarding Colombia. **Pages S7884, S7887**

Leahy (for Reid) Modified Amendment No. 1172, to express the sense of the Senate that the President and the Secretary of State should raise the need for accountability of Saddam Hussein and several key members of his regime at the International Criminal Court Preparatory Commission. **Pages S7884, S7887**

Bingaman Amendment No. 1165, to express the sense of the Senate regarding assistance provided to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. **Pages S7864–65, S7895**

McConnell (for Lott) Amendment No. 1183, to require annual reports on arms sales to Taiwan. **Pages S7895–96**

Brownback Amendment No. 1118, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to target assistance to support the economic and political independence of the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia. **Pages S7838–43, S7845–46, S7854–55, S7862–63, S7867–77, S7903**

By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 191), McConnell/Abraham/Sarbanes Amendment No. 1119 (to Amendment No. 1118), to strike certain provisions relating to the restriction on assistance for the Government of Azerbaijan. **Pages S7838–43, S7845–46, S7862–63, S7903**

McConnell (for Byrd) Amendment No. 1184, to express the sense of the Senate regarding assistance under the Camp David Accords. **Pages S7901–02**

McConnell (for Nickles) Amendment No. 1185, regarding United States assistance to the Palestinian authority. **Pages S7901–02**

Leahy Amendment No. 1186, to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury may, to fulfill commitments of the United States, (1) effect the United States participation in the fifth general capital increase of the African Development Bank, the first general capital increase of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, and the first general capital increase of the Inter-American Investment Corporation; and (2) contribute on behalf of the United States to the eighth replenishment of the resources of the African Development Fund, the twelfth replenishment of the International Development Association. **Pages S7902–03**

Leahy Amendment No. 1187, to establish a working capital fund for the United States Agency for International Development which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for the expenses of certain personal and non-personal services, equipment and supplies. **Pages S7902–03**

Leahy Amendment No. 1188, to provide for the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees, up to $7,500,000 to be derived by transfer from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and funds appropriated by this Act under the heading, ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic State'', to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. **Pages S7902–03**

Rejected:

Dodd Amendment No. 1157, to terminate prohibitions and restrictions on travel to Cuba. (By 55 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 189), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S7887–95, S7896–S7900**

Subsequently, Leahy Amendment No. 1182 (to Amendment No. 1157), to terminate prohibitions and restrictions on travel to Cuba fell when Amendment No. 1157 (listed above) was tabled. **Pages S7887–95, S7899–S7900**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Senate receives the House companion measure, the Senate strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of S. 1234, as passed, and the House bill, as amended, be read for a third time and passed, that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate. Further, that upon passage of the House bill, passage of S. 1234 be vitiated and then be indefinitely postponed. **Page S7902**

Department of the Treasury/Postal Service Appropriations: Senate began consideration of S. 1282, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, taking action on the following amendments: **Pages S7912–14**

Pending:

Dorgan (for Moynihan) Amendment No. 1189, to ensure the expeditious construction of a new United States Mission to the United Nations. **Pages S7913–14**

Dorgan (for Moynihan) Amendment No. 1190, to ensure that the General Services Administration has adequate funds available for programmatic needs. **Pages S7913–14**

Dorgan (for Moynihan) Amendment No. 1191, to ensure that health and safety concerns at the Federal Courthouse at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York are alleviated. **Pages S7913–14**

Campbell/Dorgan Amendment No. 1192, to provide for an increase in certain Federal buildings funds. **Page S7914**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill and pending amendments, on Thursday, July 1, 1999. **Page S7914**

Appointment:

Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 208 of the 105th Congress, appointed Senator Lugar to the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, vice Senator Collins. **Page S7969**

Budget Process Reform—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for consideration of motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 557, to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as a part of the budget process, on Thursday, July 1, 1999, with a vote on the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to the bill to occur at 10:30 a.m.

Also, that if cloture is invoked, the Senate proceed to the bill, and following the offering of a cloture motion on the pending amendment (Social Security Lockbox), the bill be laid aside until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, July 16, 1999, with a vote on the motion to close further debate on the pending amendment to occur at 10:30 am. **Page S7969**

Y2K Act Conference Report—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for the consideration of the conference report to H.R. 775, to establish certain procedures for civil actions brought for damages relating to the failure of any device or system to process or otherwise deal with the transition from the year 1999 to the year

2000, with a vote on adoption of the conference report. **Page S7969**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

A message from the President of the United States transmitting, title V of the Trade Act of 1974), a Proclamation to Modify Duty-Free Treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences relative to Gabon, Mongolia and Mauritania; to the Committee on Finance (PM–45). **Page S7926**

Nominations Confirmed: By 94 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 190), Senate confirmed the following Nominations:

Keith P. Ellison, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Gary Allen Feess, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Stefan R. Underhill, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

W. Allen Pepper, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Karen E. Schreier, of South Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Dakota.

Also, Senate confirmed the following nominations by voice vote:

39 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

36 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

17 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, Navy.

Pages S7900–01, S7966–67, S7971–72

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Charles A. Blanchard, of Arizona, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army.

Carol DiBattiste, of Florida, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Barbro A. Owens-Kirkpatrick, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger.

3 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

Routine List in the Army and Marine Corps.

Pages S7969–71

Messages From the President: **Page S7926**

Messages From the House: **Page S7926**

Measures Referred: **Page S7926**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S7926**

Communications: **Pages S7926–28**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S7928–31**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S7932–42**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7942–43**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7944–61**

Authority for Committees: **Pages S7961–62**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7962–66**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—192) **Pages S7867, S7899–S7900, S7903, S7911**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 9:02 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 1, 1999. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7969.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

GAMBLING ADDICTION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education concluded hearings on gambling addiction issues, focusing on the health research recommendations of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission, after receiving testimony from Representative Wolf; Steven E. Hyman, Director, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; and Leo T. McCarthy, Commissioner, and Timothy A. Kelly, Executive Director, both of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission; Ken Winters, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; and Leo Tose, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES ACT/ CORAL REEF CONSERVATION ACT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and S. 725, to preserve and protect coral reefs, after receiving testimony from Sally Yozell, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, Michael Crosby, Executive Director, Science Advisory Board, and Ed Lindloff, Acting Manager, Stellwagen Bank, National Marine Sanctuary, all of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; C. Renee Cooper, Caribbean Marine Research Center, West Palm Beach, Florida, on behalf of the Perry Institute of Marine Science; Cynthia Hunter, Waikiki Aquarium, Honolulu, Hawaii; Phillip Dustan, Cousteau Society, Alexandria, Virginia; Michael Connor, New England Aquarium, Boston, Massachusetts; and Michael Collins, Islamorada, Florida.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 501, to address resource management issues in Glacier Bay National Park, Alaska, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 581, to protect the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to authorize a Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R.149, to make technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996, with amendments;

S. 711, to allow for the investment of joint Federal and State funds from the civil settlement of damages from the Exxon Valdez oil spill, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

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, with an amendment;

S. 953, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land in the State of South Dakota to the Terry Peak Ski Area, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1088, 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;

H.R. 15, to designate a portion of the Otay Mountain region of California as wilderness; and

An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

U.S. FOREST SERVICE ECONOMIC ACTION PROGRAMS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management concluded oversight hearings on the United States Forest Service Economic Action programs, focusing on community based approaches to natural resource management, after receiving testimony from Michael T. Rains, Director, Northeastern Area for State and Private Forestry, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Michael Preston, Montezuma County Federal Lands Program, Cortez, Colorado; Bob Moore, Catron County Citizens Group, Glenwood, New Mexico; James Enote, Pueblo of Zuni Department of Natural and Cultural Resources, Zuni, New Mexico; Carl L. Myers, Wood Center, Medford, Oregon; Eric S. Howard, Maine Wood Products Association, South Portland; Betty Riley, Sierra Economic Development District, Auburn, California; Tom Brumm, Oregon Economic Development Department, Salem; Stephen S. Madrone, Redwood Community Action Agency, Eureka, California; and Toby Martinez, New Mexico Forestry and Resources Conservation Division, Santa Fe, on behalf of the National Association of State Foresters.

PENSION REFORM

Committee on Finance: Committee held hearings on S. 646, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide increased retirement savings opportunities, S. 741, to provide for pension reform, S. 659, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require pension plans to provide adequate notice to individuals whose future benefit accruals are being significantly reduced, and S. 60, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equitable treatment for contributions by employees to pension plans, receiving testimony from Senator Harkin; Patrick J. Purcell, Specialist in Social Legislation, Domestic Social Policy Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Rita D. Metras, Eastman Kodak Company, Rochester, New York, on behalf of the Association of Private Pension and Welfare Plans; Scott J. Macey, AT&T/ASA, Inc., Somerset, New Jersey, on behalf of the ERISA Industry Committee; Richard D. Pearce, Alliance Benefit Group of Delaware, Inc., Wilmington, on behalf of the American Society of Pension Actuaries; Ann Combs, American Council of Life Insurance, Washington, D.C.; Lou Valentino, Watson Wyatt Worldwide, New York, New York, on behalf of the National Defined Contribution Council; and Robert F. Hill, Denver, Colorado.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations;

S. Res. 109, relating to the activities of the National Islamic Front government in Sudan, with amendments;

S. Res. 119, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES–10/6;

S. Con. Res. 36, condemning Palestinian efforts to revive the original Palestine partition plan of November 29, 1947, and condemning the United Nations Commission on Human Rights for its April 27, 1999, resolution endorsing Palestinian self-determination on the basis of the original Palestine partition plan;

H. R. 1175, to locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, an American citizen, and other

Israeli soldiers missing in action, with an amendment;

H. Con. Res. 35, congratulating the State of Qatar and its citizens for their commitment to democratic ideals and women's suffrage on the occasion of Qatar's historic elections of a central municipal council on March 8, 1999; and

The nominations of Frank Almaguer, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Honduras, Donald Keith Bandler, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cyprus, Prudence Bushnell, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guatemala, Johnnie Carson, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kenya, Gwen C. Clare, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ecuador, Melvin E. Clark, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, David B. Dunn, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia, M. Michael Einik, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mark Wylea Erwin, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mauritius, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Federal Islamic Republic of Comoros and as Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles, Oliver P. Garza, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua, Christopher E. Goldthwait, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad, John R. Hamilton, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, Lawrence Harrington, of Tennessee, to be United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, Richard Holbrooke, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, as well as to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, John David Holum, of Maryland, to the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, Donald W. Keyser, of Virginia, for rank of Ambassador during tenure of service as Special Representative of the Secretary of State for Nagorno-Karabakh and New Independent States Regional Conflicts, Joyce E. Leader, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea, Joseph Limprecht, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, Michael D. Metelits, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cape Verde, Thomas J. Miller, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bismarck Myrick, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Liberia, Larry C. Napper, of Texas, for rank of Ambassador during tenure of service as Coordinator of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Program, Donald Lee Pressley, of Virginia, to be Assistant Administrator for Europe and the New Independent States of the Agency for International Development, David B. Sandalow, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Peter S. Wood, of California, for promotion to the Class of Counselor, Senior Foreign Service, and Stephen A. Dodson, of Texas, for appointment as a Foreign Service Officer of Class Four, Consular Officer and Secretary in the Diplomatic Service, both of the Department of State, and certain Foreign Service Officer Promotions lists.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions: Committee continued hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, focusing on school facilities, receiving testimony from Dennis Zimmerman, Specialist in Public Finance, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Starla Jewell-Kelly, National Community Education Association, Fairfax, Virginia; Sarah Sinnott, Visiting Nurse Association, H.O. Wheeler Community School, Burlington, Vermont; Ede Valiquette, University of Connecticut Cooperative Extension System, Danbury; and Idella Harter, Maine Education Association, Augusta, on behalf of the National Education Association.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

INDIAN RESERVED WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded hearings on S. 438, to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, after receiving testimony from David J. Hayes, Acting Deputy Secretary of the Interior; Jim Morsette, Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, Box Elder, Montana; and Chris D. Tweeten, Montana Reserved Water Rights Compact Commission, Helena.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

S. 438, to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation; and

S. 225, to provide Federal housing assistance to Native Hawaiians.

NURSING HOME CARE

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded hearings to examine the Health Care Financing Administration's implementation of their nursing home improvement initiative, after receiving testimony from Rachel Block, Deputy Director, Center for Medicaid and State Operations, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; William J. Scanlon, Director, Health Financing and Public Health Issues, Health, Education, and Human Services Division, General Accounting Office; Catherine G. Morris, New Jersey Department of Health, Trenton, on behalf of the Association of Health Facility Survey Agencies; David R. Zimmerman, University of Wisconsin Center for Health Systems Research, Madison; Andrew Kramer, University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, Denver; and Charlene Harrington, University of California School of Nursing, San Francisco.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 2389–2412; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 237, were introduced.

Pages H5177–79

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 234, waiving points of order against the conference report on H.R. 775, to establish certain procedures for civil actions brought for damages relating to the failure of any device or system to process or otherwise deal with the transition from the year 1999 to the year 2000 (H. Rept. 106–213);

H. Res. 235, providing for the consideration of H.R. 10, to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers (H. Rept. 106–214); and

H. Res. 236, providing for consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period (H. Rept. 106–215). **Page H5177**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Walsh to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5095**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Don Borling of Orland Park, Illinois. **Page H5095**

Child Custody Protection Act: The House passed H.R. 1218, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions by a recorded vote of 270 ayes to 159 noes, Roll No. 261. **Pages H5102–23**

Rejected the Jackson-Lee of Texas motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report it back to the House forthwith with an amendment specifying that the prohibitions do not apply with respect to conduct by an adult sibling or grandparent, or by a minister, rabbi, pastor, priest, or other religious leader of the minor by a yea and nay vote of 164 yeas to 268 nays, Roll No. 260. **Pages H5120–22**

H. Res. 233, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to by voice vote.

Pages H5099–H5102

Preserving the Cultural Resources of Route 66: The House passed H.R. 66, to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance.

Pages H5125–29

Agreed to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule.

Page H5128

H. Res. 230, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to earlier by voice vote.

Page H5123

Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail: The House passed H.R. 791, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route of the War of 1812 British invasion of Maryland and Washington District of Columbia, and the route of the American defense, for study for potential addition to the national trails system. **Pages H5129–32**

Agreed to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule.

Page H5132

H. Res. 232, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to earlier by voice vote.

Pages H5123–24

Redesignating World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills: The House passed H.R. 592, to redesignate Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as "World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills". Agreed to amend the title.

Pages H5133–34

Agreed to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule.

Page H5134

H. Res. 231, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to earlier by voice vote.

Pages H5124–25

Late Report: Committee on Education and the Workforce received permission to have until 3:00 p.m. on July 9 to file a report on H.R. 1995, to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to empower teachers, improve student achievement through high-quality professional development for teachers, and reauthorize the Reading Excellence Act. **Page H5133**

Presidential Message—Generalized System of Preferences: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted his determinations with respect to the addition of Gabon and Mongolia to the list of beneficiary developing countries and the suspension of preferential treatment for Mauritania as a beneficiary developing country—referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered printed (H. Doc. 106–88). **Page H5176**

Recess: The House recessed at 7:40 p.m. and reconvened at 10:18 p.m. **Page H5176**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea and nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H5121–22 and H5122–23. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 10:19 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDERS; WATERSHED PLAN

Committee on Agriculture: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 1402, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the Class I milk price structure known as Option 1–A as part of the implementation of the final rule to consolidate Federal milk marketing orders.

The Committee also approved Bexar-Medina-Atascosa Counties Water Conservation Plan.

KOSOVO AIR CAMPAIGN—B–2 BOMBER PERFORMANCE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Procurement held a hearing on the performance of the B–2 Bomber in the Kosovo air campaign. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Air Force: Lt. Gen. Marvin R. Esmond, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff, Air and Space Operations; and Brig. Gen. Leroy Barnidge, USAF, Commander, 509th Bomber Wing, Whiteman Air Force.

UNNECESSARY BUSINESS SUBSIDIES

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on Unnecessary Business Subsidies. Testimony was heard from Representatives Miller of Florida, Sununu, Shadegg, Minge and Hoeffel; former Representative Robert Shamansky, State of Ohio; and public witnesses.

CONSUMER AND INVESTOR ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials held a hearing on H.R. 1858, Consumer and Investor Access to Information Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Annette L. Nazareth, Director, Division of Market Regulation, SEC; and public witnesses.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING AUTHORIZATION ACT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunication, Trade, and Consumer Protection held a hearing on H.R. 2384, Corporation for Public Broadcasting Authorization Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TEACHER EMPOWERMENT ACT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 1995, Teacher Empowerment Act.

TEAMSTER LOCAL 500 TRUSTEESHIP—LESSONS LEARNED

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Lessons Learned from the Teamster Local 500 Trusteeship. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FEHBP DEMONSTRATION PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Civil Service held a hearing on Implementing the FEHBP Demonstration Project for Military Retirees: A Good Faith Effort, or Another Broken Promise. Testimony was heard from Representatives Cunningham, Moran of Virginia and Romero-Barceló; William E. Flynn, III, Associate Director, Retirement and Insurance, OPM; and public witnesses.

FEDERALISM ACT

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 2245, Federalism Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from L. Nye Stevens, Director, Federal Management and

Workforce Issues, General Government Division, GAO; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—DOD'S ANTHRAX VACCINE

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Relations held an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Defense's sole source procurement of anthrax vaccine. Testimony was heard from Louis J. Rodriguez, Director Defense Acquisition Issues, National Security and International Affairs Division, GAO; David R. Oliver, Jr., Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Acquisition Technology, Department of Defense; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere approved for full Committee action the following measures: H. Res. 57, amended, expressing concern over interference with freedom of the press and the independence of judicial and electoral institutions in Peru; H. Res. 181, condemning the kidnaping and murder by the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) of 3 United States citizens, Ingrid Washinawatok, Terence Freitas, and Lah'ena'e Gay; H. Res. 17, concerning the extradition to the United States of Salvadorans; H. Res. 228, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the peace process in Colombia and calling on the government and all other parties to the current conflict in Colombia to take steps to advance the peace process so as to end the ongoing violence which continues to pose a serious threat to democracy, human rights, and economic and social stability in that nation; H. Res. 25, congratulating the Government of Peru and the Government of Ecuador for signing a peace agreement ending a border dispute which has resulted in several military clashes over the past 50 years; and H. Con. Res. 140, amended, expressing the sense of the Congress that Haiti should conduct free, fair, transparent, and peaceful elections.

INTERNET LEGISLATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1686, Internet Freedom Act; and H.R. 1685, Internet Growth and Development Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Erik Sten, Commissioner of Public Works, Portland, Oregon; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 1552, amended, Marine Research and Related Environmental Research and Development Programs Authorization of 1999; S. 361, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to John R. and Margaret J. Lowe of Big Horn County, Wyoming, certain land so as to correct an error in the patent issued to their predecessors in interest; S. 449, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the personal representative of the estate of Fred Steffens of Big Horn County, Wyoming, certain land comprising the Steffens family property; H.R. 468, amended, Saint Helena Island National Scenic Area Act; H.R. 535, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make corrections to a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; H.R. 695, amended, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to convey an administrative site in San Juan County, New Mexico, to San Juan College; H.R. 834, amended, to extend the authorization for the National Historic Preservation Fund; H.R. 1487, amended, National Monument NEPA Compliance Act; H.R. 1528, National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999; H.R. 1753, amended, Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 1999; H.R. 1934, amended, Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Act of 1999; H.R. 2079, to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the State of South Dakota; and H.R. 2181, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to acquire and equip fishery survey vessels.

CONFERENCE REPORT—YEAR 2000 READINESS AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 775, Year 2000 Readiness and Responsibility Act, and against its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. Testimony was heard from Representatives Goodlatte, Davis of Virginia and Conyers.

FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a vote of 9 to 3, a structured rule on H.R. 10, Financial Services Act of 1999, providing ninety minutes of general debate: forty-five minutes divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and forty-five minutes divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print dated June 24, 1999, as original text for the purpose of amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule provides that no amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order

except those printed in the report, which may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in this report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone recorded votes and reduce voting time to five minutes on any postponed question, provided voting time on the first in any series of questions is not less than 15 minutes. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Leach, McCollum, Roukema, Baker, Castle, Royce, Metcalf, Barr, Paul, Cook, Toomey, Bliley, Oxley, Barton of Texas, Largent, Shimkus, LaFalce, Vento, Waters, Sanders, Maloney of New York, Gutierrez, Watt of North Carolina, Bentsen, Maloney of Connecticut, Inslee, Schakowsky, Gonzalez, Dingell, Markey, Towns, Rush, Eshoo, DeGette, Barrett of Wisconsin, Luther, Slaughter, Condit, Pomeroy, Jackson-Lee, and Weiner.

INDEPENDENCE DAY DISTRICT WORK PERIOD ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule providing for the consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution.

AIRPORT PRIVATIZATION EFFORTS—STATUS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on the Status of Airport Privatization Efforts. Testimony was heard from David L. Bennett, Director, Office of Airport Safety and Standards, FAA, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

VETERANS' MILLENNIUM HEALTH CARE ACT—COST ESTIMATES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on cost estimates for H.R. 2116, Veterans' Millennium Health Care. Testimony was heard from Paul N. Van de Water, Assistant Director, Budget Analysis, CBO; and Thomas L. Garthwaite, M.D., Deputy Under Secretary, Health, Department of Veterans Affairs.

INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS—U.S. TAX RULES IMPACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Held a hearing on the Impact of U.S. Tax Rules on International Competitiveness. Testimony was heard from Representatives Levin and Houghton; and public witnesses.

BRIEFING—KOSOVO UPDATE

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a briefing on Kosovo Update. The Committee was briefed by departmental briefers.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1999

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings on military operations regarding Kosovo, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, to hold hearings on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Section 8 Opt-out programs, 9:30 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings on the role of sanctions in United States national security policy, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, to hold hearings to examine United States policy towards Hong Kong, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine the federal food safety system, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Employment, Safety and Training, to hold oversight hearings on the proposed Work Investment Act, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold hearings on S. 1290, to amend title 36 of the United States Code to establish the American Indian Education Foundation, 9:30 a.m., SR–485.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1257, to amend statutory damages provisions of title 17, United States Code; S. 467, to restate and improve section 7A of the Clayton Act; S. 1258, to authorize funds for the payment of salaries and expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office; S. 1259, to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 relating to dilution of famous marks; S. 1260, to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws; and S. Res. 59, designating both July 2, 1999, and July 2, 2000, as ''National Literacy Day''; and pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–628.

House

Committee on Appropriations, to mark up the following appropriation bills: Military Construction and Interior; and to consider revised Section 302(b) budget allocations, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on H.R. 850, Security and Freedom through Encryption (SAFE) Act, 9:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, hearing on economic development conveyances and the reuse of former U.S. military installations, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Readiness, hearing on AH–64 Apache helicopter fleet, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, to continue hearings on Electricity Competition, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, hearing on Business Community Views on Reform of ESEA, 9:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on ''The Results Act: Status of Performance Budgeting Pilot Programs'' 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, to mark up the following measures: H. Res. 57, expressing concern over interference with freedom of the press and the independence of judicial and electoral institutions in Peru; H.R. 1993, Export Enhancement Act of 1999; H.R. 1477, Iran Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1999; H.R. 1794, concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization (WHO); H. Con. Res. 121, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the victory of the United States in the cold war and the fall of the Berlin Airlift; H. Con. Res. 144, urging the United States Government and the United Nations to undertake urgent and strenuous efforts to secure the release of Branko Jelen, Steve Pratt, and Peter Wallace, 3 humanitarian workers employed by CARE International, who are being unjustly held as prisoners by the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; and H. Con. Res. 128, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the treatment of religious minorities in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and particularly the recent arrests of members of that country's Jewish community; H. Res. 25, congratulating the Government of Peru and the Government of Ecuador for signing a peace agreement ending a border dispute which has resulted in several military clashes over the past 50 years; H. Con. Res. 117, concerning United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES–10/6; and H. Res. 227, expressing the sense of the Congress in opposition to the Government of Pakistan's support for armed incursion into Jammu and Kashmir, India, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, to mark up H. Res. 227, expressing the sense of the Congress in opposition to the Government of Pakistan's support for armed incursion into Jammu and Kashmir, India, 10 a.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, hearing on H.R. 1283, Fairness in Asbestos Compensation Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, to mark up H.R. 2083. Special Counsel Act of 1999, 1 p.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, hearing on H.R. 1598, Patent Fairness Act of 1999, 2 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Crime, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 218, Community Protection Act of 1999; H.R. 1791, Federal Law Enforcement Animal Protection Act of 1999; and H.R. 2336, United States Marshals Service Improvement Act of 1999, 9:15 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, oversight hearing on the Immigration and Naturalization Service's Interior Enforcement Strategy, 9 a.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources,, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, oversight hearing on the Franchise Fee Calculation for Ft. Sumter Tours, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing on H.R. 795, Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement Act of 1999, 11 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Technology, hearing on H.R. 2086, Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of 1999, Resources for IT Research, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, to consider legislation involving the SBA's 7(a), 504 and SBIR Programs, 9:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, to mark up the following measures: H.J. Res. 58, disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam; H.J. Res. 57, disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China, 3 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Medicare Veterans Subvention, 10:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, briefing on Chinese Embassy Bombing, 1 p.m., H–405 Captiol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 1

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will consider the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 557, Budget Process Reform , with a vote on the cloture motion to occur at 10:30 a.m.

Also, Senate will resume consideration of S. 1282, Department of the Treasury/Postal Service Appropriations, and expects to consider the conference report on H.R. 775, Y2K Act and any other cleared appropriation bills.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, July 1

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of the conference report on H.R. 775, Year 2000 Readiness and Responsibility Act (rule waiving points of order, 1 hour of general debate);

Motion to go to conference on H.R. 1401, Defense Authorization Act; and

Consideration of H.R. 10, Financial Services Act of 1999 (structured rule, 90 minutes of general debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bonilla, Henry, Tex., E1451
Cunningham, Randy ''Duke'', Calif., E1452
DeLay, Tom, Tex., E1445
Doolittle, John T., Calif., E1450
Everett, Terry, Ala., E1447, E1449
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E1445, E1448
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E1447, E1448, E1451
Horn, Stephen, Calif., E1449
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1448
Rodriguez, Ciro D., Tex., E1450
Stupak, Bart, Mich., E1447, E1448, E1452
Turner, Jim, Tex., E1447, E1449
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E1450

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.