United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1999 No. 118

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 13, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM GIBBONS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1906. An Act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1906) ''An Act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 28. An Act to authorize an interpretive center and related visitor facilities within the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park, and for other purposes.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) for 5 minutes.

MONEY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, my topic today is money. About the only thing most of us know about money is that we need more of it. But there is really a lot more that we need to know about our money system.

For example, most people do not know that we pay rent on our money; yes, interest or rent on the cash we use. It costs every American about $100 every year indirectly to rent our cash, that is, our paper money, from its owners, the Federal Reserve.

Of course, the Fed does not just spend that money. It is returned to the Federal Treasury. Thus, in reality, if it goes to the Treasury, it is a tax or rent we Americans pay to the Fed for the privilege of using the Fed's money, an indirect tax on our money in circulation.

We all know that we are taxed on nearly everything, but not many people know that we pay a tax on our money. This tax, about $25 billion, or $100 per person, is paid to the Fed each year by the U.S. Treasury to pay interest on U.S. bonds that are held by the Fed to back our money. What a foolish and costly system, to rent Federal Reserve notes for $25 billion a year, when the U.S. Treasury could issue our own currency, our own United States notes, without debt or bonds or any interest at all, just as we issue our coins.

Our coins are minted by the United States Treasury and essentially spent into circulation. The Treasury makes a neat profit on them of over 80 percent of the face value of the coins issued. That is a lot of profit. A grave question is, why do we not issue our paper money the same way we issue coins, and gain an immense profit or seigniorage for our Treasury, and, of course, for the American people?

It has been said that the U.S. Government goes further into debt whenever it issues currency, but makes a profit when coins are placed into circulation. This is truly a system that defies logic. Again, why do we not issue our own paper money, just as we issue our coins? There is no legitimate reason why we do not.

I am pleased to present a simple and realistic way to accomplish this. Congress needs only to pass legislation requiring the U.S. Treasury to print and issue U.S. Treasury currency in the same amount and the same denominations as the Federal Reserve notes.

The Treasury would issue these new U.S. notes through the banks, while withdrawing a like amount of Federal Reserve notes. Thus, there would be no change in the money supply. As these Federal Reserve notes are collected by the U.S. Treasury, they must be returned to the Fed to buy back or redeem the face value, the same face value in U.S. interest-bearing bonds now held by the Fed, a total of about $500 billion. So over a couple of years, we would have real U.S. currency circulating, and the U.S. debt would be reduced by substantially more than $400

billion. It sounds too simple, does it not? There must be a down side. Well, it is that simple, and there is no down side.

In fact, there is a substantial up side. The U.S. debt would be reduced by over $400 billion, and U.S. interest on the debt reduced each year by about $25 billion. Ask the chairman of the Committee on the Budget if it could help to reduce U.S. Treasury expenditures by $25 billion each year. I intend to introduce legislation to carry out this concept.

EAST TIMOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I had an opportunity to travel with a congressional delegation chaired by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) to the island Nation of Indonesia.

There we had an opportunity to meet with President Habibie, to meet in prison with Jose Alexandre Gusmao, who is likely to be the president of an independent East Timor, should that ever come to pass, as well as maybe of Indonesia's military leaders, people who appear to be sophisticated, many of whom are United States-educated.

Again and again we heard of Indonesia's commitment to democracy and its determined effort to undo the damage done by the Asian financial crisis and its need for our support. The scheduling of an election on independence for East Timor was perceived as a positive sign. But over the last 8 months we have been watching those events unfold in East Timor, hoping for the best, but with a growing sense of apprehension. Last month's election results and the carnage that followed realized our worst fears.

East Timor is in fact different from Indonesia's other areas of ethnic tension. Its history is different. It was ruled for hundreds of years by the Portuguese, not the Dutch. It is overwhelmingly Roman Catholic, not Muslim, like most of Indonesia.

The people of East Timor have done everything that the world community could have expected in seeking their independence. They have suffered 25 years of repression at the hands of Indonesian military and paramilitary groups. In August, over 98 percent of the 450,000 eligible voters braved grave personal peril to journey to the polls.

Only 2 weeks ago, those election results were described as a model vote, and the results, of course, were overwhelmingly clear. By a majority of more than three to one, East Timor voted for independence from Indonesia. But the reaction to this vote was chilling. Military groups have gone on a rampage. Innocent civilians, United Nations personnel, priests, nuns, women, and children have been attacked and killed. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of deaths have been added to the over 200,000 lives that have been lost on this troubled island over the last 25 years.

The situation in East Timor is indeed complex and delicate, because Indonesia is simultaneously trying to restore its own democracy after years of military dictatorship, repair a shattered economy, and retrain its military to respect civilian authority.

Whether it will be able to do those things is very much an open question. There is a great deal at stake in Indonesia's resolving these problems. It is indeed a huge country, the fourth most populous in the world. It has the largest Muslim population in the world. It is rich in natural resources. It was, until recently, aspiring to be an Asian and a world leader. Now it is just trying to hold itself together. Struggling with centrifugal forces of ethnicity are Nation's separatist movements that could splinter this vast Nation created and held together by force.

But the greatest threat to Indonesia's future is to allow the hardliners to overturn the referendum through violence and fear. Tolerating this would send exactly the wrong message to the Indonesians, their military, and people struggling to make democracy work.

The credibility of many is on the line. The United Nations did not create this crisis, but it must follow through if it is to have political and moral credibility. The neighboring Asian countries, through ASEAN, have a chance to be heard and a chance to play an important role in events of such direct interest to them, and perhaps putting a more Asian face on any peacekeeping effort.

The United States should continue to exert pressure and influence through every means possible to restore peace and bring democracy to East Timor. For 20 years, we have erred on the side of caution. We have been timid in seeking to protect East Timor. Perhaps that role is changing, as it should. I am greatly encouraged by the United States' role over the last 96 hours.

There are some that argue that we have to be selective in playing a role as the guarantor of freedom and the protector of those who seek democracy worldwide. There are limitations, it is argued, on the powers and realities in the many potential areas of involvement.

But the people of East Timor have already earned our support, paying a horrible price over the last 25 years. The world community needs to prove its capacity to keep its commitments to people aspiring to freedom. Indonesia must be strongly encouraged in new directions of tolerance and democracy, lest this vast island country dissolve, with enormous consequences to world stability, as well as to the 211 million Indonesians.

The United States has the opportunity and the responsibility to help Indonesians and the world keep their commitments. We in Congress should use every opportunity in the days ahead to keep the spotlight trained on this troubled island.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

We know, O God, that You are the God of grace and forgiveness. At our best moments we realize that You wish to save us from any conceit or selfishness that keeps us from being truly human. Allow us to open our hearts and our very souls to Your life giving peace, that peace that passes all human understanding. May Your good spirit fulfill our lives that we will live with thanksgiving and praise and our lives will have confidence and assurance. Bless us, O God, this day and every day, we pray. 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. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS 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.

REPUBLICAN PLAN DOWNSIZES THE POWER OF GOVERNMENT AND UPSIZES THE POWER OF PEOPLE

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, over the August recess I held nearly 20 town hall meetings across the great State of

Nevada talking with constituents about the Republican tax plan and how it was going to help them and their families.

Now this legislation is based on a very simple idea, the idea that once Government pays its bills and has money left over, it should be returned to those who paid: the taxpayer. Most taxpayers know if their money is left in Washington, politicians will spend it every time.

Mr. Speaker, the average family in Nevada worked until May 14 this year just to pay their tax bill. Simply put: Nevadans spent roughly the first 4 months of each year working for the Federal Government.

We are at a crossroads in our country's history. We balanced the budget, reformed welfare, cut wasteful spending, and created a surplus revenue in Washington, D.C. But a windfall for Washington is not right. Working families should not be working just for Washington, but Washington should be working for taxpayers, and cutting taxes is the best way to tip the scales back to our constituents, the hard-working people.

After all, Mr. Speaker, this debate is about downsizing the power of Government and upscaling the power of the people.

PILLOW TALK AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(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, after all the buying and spying, the Department of Energy has announced their new security policy. All scientists must now report any and all romantic affairs that they have with foreigners.

Now if that is not enough to centerfold our Playboys, check this out. There is one exception, and I am not kidding: one night stands are still permitted.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. The next time, Congress, we see an ad for a temporary, overnight, meaningful relationship, be careful. It may be from a real rocket launcher at the Department of Energy.

Launch this.

I yield back all the pillow talk at the Department of Energy.

SUPPORT THE PAIN RELIEF PROMOTION ACT

(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, is the Netherlands really ready for killing sick children? That is the question currently pending in Holland as they consider a bill that would allow the killing of six children as young as 12 years old if they are terminally ill. A spokeswoman for the Royal Dutch Medical Association said:

''The doctor will do his utmost to try to reach an agreement between patient and parents, but if the parents do not want to cooperate, it is the doctor's duty to respect the wishes of their patient.''

So much for the Hippocratic Oath for a civilized medical institution.

This situation in Netherlands gives us all the more reason to work to pass the Pain Relief Promotion Act, which disallows the intentional use of controlled substances to cause or assist in suicide. At the same time it recognizes that using controlled substances to alleviate pain and discomfort in the usual course of professional practice is a legitimate medical purpose and consistent with public health and safety.

Mr. Speaker, we never want to see a day when our young kids or elderly parents legally and intentionally die at the hands of a so-called doctor. Support the Pain Relief Promotion Act.

RURAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, over 20 percent of the students in this country attend small rural schools. Many of these schools are in my Nebraska district. These schools offer students excellent educations and many benefits including small classes, excellent educations, personal attention, strong family and community involvement. However, until now federal education programs have not addressed the unique funding needs in these districts. All current federal education formula grants unintentionally ignore small rural schools because these formulas do not produce enough revenue to carry out the program the grant is intended to fund.

To address this problem I have introduced a bill, the Small Rural Schools initiative to provide flexibility for districts with fewer than 600 students to combine funds from federal education formula grants to support local education efforts. The Small Rural Schools initiative is a common sense approach to help these schools to use federal funds for the purpose that Congress intended, to make a meaningful impact in the education of all students.

TIME TO ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have an important question to ask, and that is what is the President going to do about the marriage tax penalty?

Over the last 2 years, dozens of us in this House have asked the important question, is it right, is it fair, that under our Tax Code married working couples with two incomes pay higher taxes than identical couples with identical incomes living together outside of marriage. We believe it is wrong that 21 million married working couples pay higher taxes just because they are married; and this Congress, this Republican Congress, has passed, the end of July, legislation which will eliminate the marriage tax penalty for a majority of those who suffer it.

The question we have: Is the President going to join with us and make it a bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty by signing into law the tax cut when we send it to him later this week?

Twenty-one million married working couples pay $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married. Is it not time that we eliminate the marriage tax penalty?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken today after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 380) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 380

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

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL AWARD ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1999.

(a) CHANGE OF ANNUAL REPORTING DATE.—Section 3(e) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 802(e)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''April 1'' and inserting ''June 1''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraphs (A) and (D), by striking ''member of the Congressional Award Association'' and inserting ''recipient of the Congressional Award''; and

(2) in subparagraphs (B) and (C), by striking ''representative of a local Congressional Award Council'' and inserting ''a local Congressional Award program volunteer''.

(c) EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENTS REGARDING FINANCIAL OPERATIONS OF CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM; NONCOMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS.—Section 5(c)(2)(A) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 804(c)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''and 1998'' and inserting ''1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004''.

(d) TERMINATION.—Section 9 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 808) is amended by striking ''October 1, 1999'' and inserting ''October 1, 2004''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the

gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 380, the Congressional Award Act amendments of 1999. Congress established the Congressional Award in 1979 to recognize initiative, achievement, and service in our young people across the country. Senator Malcolm Wallop, a Republican from Wyoming, and Representative James Howard, a Democrat from New Jersey, authored the original legislation in a bipartisan effort.

The original legislation established the Congressional Award as a private-public partnership which receives funding from the private sector and was originally signed into law by President Jimmy Carter. In addition, Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton have signed legislation to reauthorize the act.

The Congressional Award is presented on a noncompetitive individual basis to young people in the United States between the ages of 14 and 23 to recognize their initiative, achievement, and service. Young people from all walks of life and levels of ability can work to earn the award. Participants range from the academically and physically gifted to those with severe physical, mental and socioeconomic challenges.

To earn a Congressional Award, participants work with advisers to set individual goals and plan activities to meet these goals in four program areas including voluntary public service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition exploration. Participants strive for either a bronze, silver, or gold award. At each level 50 percent of the required minimum hours to earn the award are in volunteer public service, a minimum of 100 hundred hours for the bronze, 200 for the silver and 400 for the gold. To date, more than 6,500 Congressional Awards have been presented representing more than 1.5 million hours of volunteer service from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Congress has spent a greater part of the 106th Congress working to ensure that tomorrow is a safer and more positive place for our youth. We now have an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to America's youth for another 5 years. Crime prevention, working with the United Way, aiding the elderly, collecting, sorting and distributing food for the needy and building a handicap-accessible ramp are just a few of the services that individuals perform while working to attain Congressional Awards.

America's youth is crying out for support and encouragement, and this award is helping to give them this today.

Several challenges are currently being implemented to the Congressional Award program to give more young people the opportunity to participate and earn awards. These changes include the reduction in the paperwork necessary to enroll, a lower enrollment fee, a shift of authority from national to local control which allows State councils, youth service organizations, and other entities to operate the Congressional Award and an additional track of awards called the Congressional Certificates to recognize individuals in a less demanding manner and help instigate interest in earning the Congressional Award. In addition, the Congressional Award has made a commitment to America's promise, headed by General Colin Powell, to increase the number of youth enrolled in the program over the next 2 years.

S. 380 was introduced in the Senate by Senator LARRY CRAIG on February 4, reported out by the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs on March 4. The bill would reauthorize this important initiative for 5 years. It also makes minor changes to current law to better streamline the annual reporting process and changes the membership requirements of the board of directors to allow for more participation at the local level enabling communities that do not have a Congressional Award Council to participate on the board of directors.

□ 1415

The bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent on April 13, 1999.

It is important to continue the authorization of the Congressional Award for several reasons. The Congressional Research Service submitted a memorandum to committee staff regarding the potential consequences to the Congressional Award program if it were not reauthorized. CRS concluded that if the board were not reauthorized, questions may arise as to the propriety of its continued use of the Congressional Award program name; an alternative mechanism for appointment of board members would be required because members of the board are currently appointed by Congressional leadership. Alternative means of financing the Congressional Award medals would be required because the U.S. Mint is currently directed to strike the medals used for the Congressional Award; I might add, at no direct expense to the taxpayers, and an in-kind congressional support, primarily office space at the Ford Building, could be terminated because of questions as to the propriety of the use of official resources to support an activity that did not seem to have the support of Congress.

There are currently around 2,000 young people from across the country pursuing the Congressional Award, with more entering the program each day. Each of these young people exemplifies the qualities of commitment to service and citizenship that our country embodies and which we promote through our own service in Congress.

I believe that this program, which is a private-public partnership that receives nearly all of its funding from the private sector should be supported by each and every Member.

Congress should support our Nation's youth in their efforts and recognize their achievements through the Congressional Award program.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and ask them to encourage the youth of their States to begin a quest to earn the Congressional Award by enrolling on-line at www.congressionalaward.org.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 380, a bill to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act. As has been said by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), first passed by Congress and signed into law by President Carter in 1979, the Congressional Award Act recognizes young Americans for their commitment to self-and community-improvement.

Program participants ages 14 to 23 set individual goals in the areas of voluntary community service, personal development, physical fitness, and exploration. Once these goals are achieved, they earn bronze, silver, or gold medals which are presented to them during a special ceremony by their Member of Congress.

Because a Congressional Award is noncompetitive and individuals earn rather than win awards, any young person, regardless of his or her life circumstances or physical or mental abilities, can participate.

The benefits of the Congressional Award program are numerous and lasting. While young people work to earn awards, they develop a sense of self-worth, self-confidence, and responsibility. They also learn important life skills such as initiative, organization, teamwork and problem solving.

In addition, the communities in which these young people reside benefit from their volunteerism and hard work. Since the program's inception in 1979, 8,204 young Americans have received Congressional Awards, and over 2 million hours of volunteer service have been completed.

While programs are administered at the local level by Congressional Award Councils, national activities and program oversight are carried out by the Congressional Award Foundation and the board of directors. Currently serving on the board are Senators MAX BAUCUS and LARRY CRAIG, and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ).

Although the Congressional Award program is a private-public partnership that receives no Federal funding, the Congressional Award Act has been reauthorized twice, once during the Reagan administration and once during the Bush administration, and it is once again due for reauthorization.

On April 13, S. 380 passed the Senate by unanimous consent, and I urge my House colleagues to follow that body's example and pass S. 380 today.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of reauthorization of the Congressional Award Program. This year marks the 20th anniversary of the award program and I believe that it is appropriate to consider and review the origins and meaning of the award and our expectations for the board that serves to administer it on our behalf.

I take special pride in the fact that the Congressional Award was started by our late distinguished colleague Representative James J. Howard from central New Jersey. The award was enacted 20 years ago this November by Representative Howard who began laying the groundwork in 1969 for the program with the help of a young and future physician, Frank H. Arlinghaus, Jr., of Rumson, NJ, to fashion this uniquely American program. With the help of former Senator Malcolm Wallop, a bipartisan program was enacted in 1979. At the time of this sponsorship in the Senate, Senator Wallop and Representative Howard noted that Congress recognized a responsibility and opportunity to elevate and encourage the pursuit of excellence and to focus the creative energies of America's young people on positive ends. Congress, they said, wished to offer young people an opportunity and a challenge to new endeavors and achievement.

Representative Howard noted at that time that, although there were many programs for young people throughout the world, the Congressional Award Program was ours, it was unique and was to be independent of any other organization or association. Indeed the senior leadership of Congress gave explicit guidance to the National Director in 1982 that while the mandate of the Congressional Award is to make the program available to all interested young Americans, the autonomy of the Congressional Award as an independent program must be preserved at all times as it bore the imprimatur of Congress. Any relationship with any organization wither domestic or international is subject to that proviso.

My distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle from New Jersey take special pride in the fact that the Congressional Award in New Jersey operates under the most successful council in the country. That council has recently surpassed 1,300 awards earned in New Jersey alone and is now embarked on a record setting year of participation. There are hundreds of young people participating in the program, equally as many advisors and validators, and a host of supporting voluntary agencies and corporate supporters. This year alone there may be as many as four ceremonies to recognize these special young Americans.

The Congressional Award is Congress's special message to young people about national aspirations, values and goals. This award is a special message to young people and is a way of our communicating to them and to provide an avenue of communication with the young people who will comprise the leadership of America in the future.

This program is not necessarily easy nor is it difficult, but it takes character, persistence, initiative, service and achievement. At the Bronze Award level 100 hours of public service, 50 hours of personal development and 50 hours of physical fitness endeavors with a one night expedition is a beginning test for a young person over 14 years old. It requires 7 months but not more that 12 to complete. The Silver Award requires 200 hours of public service, 100 hours of personal development effort, and 100 hours of physical fitness endeavor with a 2-night expedition. This requires over a 12-month commitment but not over 24 months. The Gold Congressional Award requires 400 hours of public service, 200 hours of personal achievement effort, 200 hours of physical fitness with a 4-night expedition. This supreme effort requires a 24-month commitment but not more than 36 months. A young person must be at least 16 to begin and be over 18 to earn and receive the Gold Award which our leaders present in a special ceremony in the Capitol. Each of these awards are earned separately and work done on one level is not counted for work on another level.

Indeed the special and rigorous nature of the award as achieved by those outstanding future leaders was cited by our distinguished Senate colleagues Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE as a requisite hallmark of the Congressional Award in their remarks at the Gold Award ceremony on June.

How do young people meet this challenge and earn this distinction? As was provided for in prior legislation, a state council is formed and appointed with consultation among our colleagues. The many adult volunteers and advisors who assist these young people are recruited, educated, and trained to administer the program. Each applicant registers, proposes their program, and it is evaluated and modifications made where appropriate. At the conclusion of that initial process their work begins. At the conclusion of demonstrated commitment, service, and achievement, we in turn through our councils assisted by the National Office salute their work with Congressional Award.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the legislative record my concerns about the direction of the Congressional Award and the changes that have been proposed by the National Office.

From the very beginning, when the Congressional Award was introduced by my predecessor, Representative James J. Howard, and then passed by the Congress In 1979, it was made very clear that the Award should be its own independent award under the sponsorship of the U.S. Congress. Congress did not intend that it be part of an international award under the patronage of Prince Philip of Great Britain. As stated by Congressman Howard ''It was never our intention to duplicate in design and purpose the Duke of Edinburgh's Award.''

The National Office of the Congressional Award has established new standards that make major changes in the award requirements including creating a second, less demanding track that enable young people to earn Congressional Award certificates. This is intended to bring the program more in line with the International Award. Unfortunately, it would also water down the overall program. Ultimately, I fear, young people would choose the easier route and the more intense medal program would fall by the wayside. This is not what Congress intended in 1979.

In addition the certificate track eliminates the close relationship that develops between adult advisors and young people as they plan their program goals. The certificate is awarded after the fact and there is little if any contact prior to that.

Finally, other changes have been made that affect how the hours spent by young people in voluntary public service, personal development and physical fitness as calculated toward earning gold medals.

I am very proud of the success of our New Jersey Congressional Award Program under the leadership of Dr. Frank Arlinghaus of Rumson, NJ. It was his idea to establish a Congressional Award.

As someone who has attended many of the Congressional Award ceremonies in New Jersey and seen many of my young constituents honored for their hard work, I would like to ask that the National Board of the Congressional Award address these questions and respond to the concerns raised by the programs in New Jersey, Arizona and elsewhere.

I believe we have a commitment to those who have earned the awards to date to maintain the high standards of the program. We also have a commitment to future participants and our colleagues to maintain the Award as it was originally intended by Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Congressional Award program and specifically how this program has worked in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, many involved in the Congressional Award program know that this program's success is the byproduct of the hard work of my former colleague and a member of the New Jersey delegation, Congressman Jim Howard. Jim worked closely with Dr. Frank H. Arlinghaus, Jr., the Chairman of the New Jersey Congressional Award Council, in drafting the legislation that created this program in 1979. Dr. Arlinghaus, as a member of the national board of directors, as well as the driving force behind the program in New Jersey, has been instrumental in the growth of this program, both in New Jersey, as well as across the country. He has advised other state councils on the best way to educate America's youth as to the intent and benefits of participation in the Congressional Award Program.

As part of the Congressional Award program, my office has worked closely with teenagers in the 4th Congressional District of New Jersey, as they volunteer the hundreds of hours required for the bronze, silver, and gold medals. Many of them have shared with me how their experiences in the areas of public service, physicial fitness, and personal growth have broadened their world view and fostered a greater appreciation for personal achievement.

On average, four students per year from the 4th Congressional District have received one of the three medals. Highlights of their community service has included volunteering at a local hospital where the students have assisted with everything from admitting patients and discharging patients, working in the children's clinic, and helping visitors with a variety of requests. Personal growth has included building physical endurance or improving a skill such as piano playing, which has facilitated their abilities on a variety of sports teams and in musical competitions. Students have also traveled overseas to the Philippines, Western Europe, and the Bahamas, experiencing first hand the challenges of cross cultural communication.

Recently, the National Board of Directors has been examining various ways to expand participation through a certificate program. To date, more than 6,500 awards have been presented nationwide. In New Jersey, we are

proud that 1300 of those awards, roughly 20 percent, have been given to young people from our state. Clearly, a program that is working so well in my state could offer a lot of ideas to the rest of the country about ways to attract more and more qualified students into the program.

In light of the recently proposed changes in the program and the shared goal of attracting more young people, I would suggest that a hearing on the Congressional Award program would be appropriate. The future growth of this program requires that Congress examine its development over the last 20 years as well as its future. I hope my good friend and colleague Chairman GOODLING will give full consideration to this request.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Congressional Award Program. This program has an Olympian quality because it encourages young people to stretch to their limits. The difference is that they set the high goals themselves. The experience is that the self-initiated goals are set so high that only 400 of the 1,000 students who start the program complete it.

Too often, we allow the impressive accomplishments of our youth to go unrecognized and unappreciated. We must encourage our young women and young men to strive to do their best in activities which develop themselves or their communities. The Congressional Award Program does just that by challenging students to set high goals for themselves in either personal development, physical fitness, or public service and provides them with recognition when they reach these goals. Last year I was proud to present seven awards representing a total of at least 400 hours of work to D.C. high school students, and this year, I believe that I will be able to award many more. I would like to recognize the 1998 recipients of the Congressional Award:

Leidi Reyes of Bell Multicultural High School, Silver medal; Jehan Carter—Banneker Senior High School, Bronze medal; Christin Chism—Bishop McNamara High School, Bronze medal; Brian Ford—Eastern Senior High School, Bronze medal; Miya Jackson—Eastern Senior High School, Bronze medal; Christiana Hodge—Eastern High School, Bronze medal; and Kate Ottenberg—Maret High School, Bronze medal.

These young people's families and community are rightly proud of them. They are members of an elite group of only 400 young people across the country who completed the program. I ask my colleagues to support them by supporting the re-authorization of the Congressional Award Program through 2004.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this bill (S. 380) that will re-authorize the Congressional Award Act. The re-authorization of this Act is significant because the program that is supported by this bill is one way in which the Congress provides an opportunity for the youths of the United States to better their own lives.

The Congressional Award has existed since 1979 as a way to encourage and reward American youth who undertake community service to benefit their community and themselves. It teaches our young people about such American values as citizenship, civic responsibility, and the importance of setting and achieving personal goals. Several thousand youths have participated in this program since its inception and have received recognition for their efforts.

Congressioinal awards come in different forms: certificates, which are ''introductory'' level awards; and medals, which are more difficult to achieve. Certificates and medals come in the form of gold, silver and bronze awards. Each award is earned through the accumulation of hours of community service. When an award is earned, those hours can be applied toward the achievement of the next award. The gold medal, which is the highest level of the awards, is extremely prestigious and very difficult to earn, because it requires a minimum of 800 hours of service accumulated over a period of at least 24 months.

I am one of the Members of Congress currently serving on the Board of Directors of the Congressional Award Foundation and I am honored to serve in this position. I have the privilege of working alongside Congresswoman BARBARA CUBIN in this capacity.

In addition to serving on the Board of Directors of the Foundation, I am equally proud that the congressional award will soon be established in Puerto Rico. We hope to publicize the award in schools on the island and I am confident that there will be large numbers of school children who will take up the challenge to earn their own congressional medals.

I would like to encourage other members to publicize the award and ask the young people in their districts to participate in the Congressional Award process. This is an excellent way to motivate young people to make positive contributions in their local communities and to develop important leadership skills for the future. I believe it is the duty for all of us serving in this body to make the Congressional Award more readily available to every young person in our communities. The first step in this process is through the passage and enactment of this Congressional Award reauthorization bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 380.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 380, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MULTIDISTRICT, MULTIPARTY, MULTIFORUM TRIAL JURISDICTION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2112) to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow a judge to whom a case is transferred to retain jurisdiction over certain multidistrict litigation cases for trial, and to provide for Federal jurisdiction of certain multiparty, multiforum civil actions, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2112

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 ''Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Trial Jurisdiction Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION.

Section 1407 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the third sentence of subsection (a), by inserting ''or ordered transferred to the transferee or other district under subsection (i)'' after ''terminated''; and

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

''(i)(1) Subject to paragraph (2) and except as provided in subsection (j), any action transferred under this section by the panel may be transferred for trial purposes, by the judge or judges of the transferee district to whom the action was assigned, to the transferee or other district in the interest of justice and for the convenience of the parties and witnesses.

''(2) Any action transferred for trial purposes under paragraph (1) shall be remanded by the panel for the determination of compensatory damages to the district court from which it was transferred, unless the court to which the action has been transferred for trial purposes also finds, for the convenience of the parties and witnesses and in the interests of justice, that the action should be retained for the determination of compensatory damages.''.

SEC. 3. MULTIPARTY, MULTIFORUM JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS.

(a) BASIS OF JURISDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1369. Multiparty, multiforum jurisdiction

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action involving minimal diversity between adverse parties that arises from a single accident, where at least 25 natural persons have either died or incurred injury in the accident at a discrete location and, in the case of injury, the injury has resulted in damages which exceed $75,000 per person, exclusive of interest and costs, if—

''(1) a defendant resides in a State and a substantial part of the accident took place in another State or other location, regardless of whether that defendant is also a resident of the State where a substantial part of the accident took place;

''(2) any two defendants reside in different States, regardless of whether such defendants are also residents of the same State or States; or

''(3) substantial parts of the accident took place in different States.

''(b) SPECIAL RULES AND DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) minimal diversity exists between adverse parties if any party is a citizen of a State and any adverse party is a citizen of another State, a citizen or subject of a foreign state, or a foreign state as defined in section 1603(a) of this title;

''(2) a corporation is deemed to be a citizen of any State, and a citizen or subject of any foreign state, in which it is incorporated or has its principal place of business, and is deemed to be a resident of any State in which it is incorporated or licensed to do business or is doing business;

''(3) the term 'injury' means—

''(A) physical harm to a natural person; and

''(B) physical damage to or destruction of tangible property, but only if physical harm described in subparagraph (A) exists;

''(4) the term 'accident' means a sudden accident, or a natural event culminating in an accident, that results in death or injury incurred at a discrete location by at least 25 natural persons; and

''(5) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

''(c) INTERVENING PARTIES.—In any action in a district court which is or could have been brought, in whole or in part, under this section, any person with a claim arising from the accident described in subsection (a) shall be permitted to intervene as a party plaintiff in the action, even if that person could not have brought an action in a district court as an original matter.

''(d) NOTIFICATION OF JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION.—A district court in which an action under this section is pending shall promptly notify the judicial panel on multidistrict litigation of the pendency of the action.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1369. Multiparty, multiforum jurisdiction.''.

(b) VENUE.—Section 1391 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) A civil action in which jurisdiction of the district court is based upon section 1369 of this title may be brought in any district in which any defendant resides or in which a substantial part of the accident giving rise to the action took place.''.

(c) MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION.—Section 1407 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by section 2 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j)(1) In actions transferred under this section when jurisdiction is or could have been based, in whole or in part, on section 1369 of this title, the transferee district court may, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, retain actions so transferred for the determination of liability and punitive damages. An action retained for the determination of liability shall be remanded to the district court from which the action was transferred, or to the State court from which the action was removed, for the determination of damages, other than punitive damages, unless the court finds, for the convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice, that the action should be retained for the determination of damages.

''(2) Any remand under paragraph (1) shall not be effective until 60 days after the transferee court has issued an order determining liability and has certified its intention to remand some or all of the transferred actions for the determination of damages. An appeal with respect to the liability determination and the choice of law determination of the transferee court may be taken during that 60-day period to the court of appeals with appellate jurisdiction over the transferee court. In the event a party files such an appeal, the remand shall not be effective until the appeal has been finally disposed of. Once the remand has become effective, the liability determination and the choice of law determination shall not be subject to further review by appeal or otherwise.

''(3) An appeal with respect to determination of punitive damages by the transferee court may be taken, during the 60-day period beginning on the date the order making the determination is issued, to the court of appeals with jurisdiction over the transferee court.

''(4) Any decision under this subsection concerning remand for the determination of damages shall not be reviewable by appeal or otherwise.

''(5) Nothing in this subsection shall restrict the authority of the transferee court to transfer or dismiss an action on the ground of inconvenient forum.''.

(d) REMOVAL OF ACTIONS.—Section 1441 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e) by striking ''(e) The court to which such civil action is removed'' and inserting ''(f) The court to which a civil action is removed under this section''; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, a defendant in a civil action in a State court may remove the action to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where the action is pending if—

''(A) the action could have been brought in a United States district court under section 1369 of this title, or

''(B) the defendant is a party to an action which is or could have been brought, in whole or in part, under section 1369 in a United States district court and arises from the same accident as the action in State court, even if the action to be removed could not have been brought in a district court as an original matter.

The removal of an action under this subsection shall be made in accordance with section 1446 of this title, except that a notice of removal may also be filed before trial of the action in State court within 30 days after the date on which the defendant first becomes a party to an action under section 1369 in a United States district court that arises from the same accident as the action in State court, or at a later time with leave of the district court.

''(2) Whenever an action is removed under this subsection and the district court to which it is removed or transferred under section 1407(j) has made a liability determination requiring further proceedings as to damages, the district court shall remand the action to the State court from which it had been removed for the determination of damages, unless the court finds that, for the convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice, the action should be retained for the determination of damages.

''(3) Any remand under paragraph (2) shall not be effective until 60 days after the district court has issued an order determining liability and has certified its intention to remand the removed action for the determination of damages. An appeal with respect to the liability determination and the choice of law determination of the district court may be taken during that 60-day period to the court of appeals with appellate jurisdiction over the district court. In the event a party files such an appeal, the remand shall not be effective until the appeal has been finally disposed of. Once the remand has become effective, the liability determination and the choice of law determination shall not be subject to further review by appeal or otherwise.

''(4) Any decision under this subsection concerning remand for the determination of damages shall not be reviewable by appeal or otherwise.

''(5) An action removed under this subsection shall be deemed to be an action under section 1369 and an action in which jurisdiction is based on section 1368 of this title for purposes of this section and sections 1407, 1660, 1697, and 1785 of this title.

''(6) Nothing in this subsection shall restrict the authority of the district court to transfer or dismiss an action on the ground of inconvenient forum.''.

(e) CHOICE OF LAW.—

(1) DETERMINATION BY THE COURT.—Chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1660. Choice of law in multiparty, multiforum actions

''(a) FACTORS.—In an action which is or could have been brought, in whole or in part, under section 1369 of this title, the district court in which the action is brought or to which it is removed shall determine the source of the applicable substantive law, except that if an action is transferred to another district court, the transferee court shall determine the source of the applicable substantive law. In making this determination, a district court shall not be bound by the choice of law rules of any State, and the factors that the court may consider in choosing the applicable law include—

''(1) the place of the injury;

''(2) the place of the conduct causing the injury;

''(3) the principal places of business or domiciles of the parties;

''(4) the danger of creating unnecessary incentives for forum shopping; and

''(5) whether the choice of law would be reasonably foreseeable to the parties.

The factors set forth in paragraphs (1) through (5) shall be evaluated according to their relative importance with respect to the particular action. If good cause is shown in exceptional cases, including constitutional reasons, the court may allow the law of more than one State to be applied with respect to a party, claim, or other element of an action.

''(b) ORDER DESIGNATING CHOICE OF LAW.—The district court making the determination under subsection (a) shall enter an order designating the single jurisdiction whose substantive law is to be applied in all other actions under section 1369 arising from the same accident as that giving rise to the action in which the determination is made. The substantive law of the designated jurisdiction shall be applied to the parties and claims in all such actions before the court, and to all other elements of each action, except where Federal law applies or the order specifically provides for the application of the law of another jurisdiction with respect to a party, claim, or other element of an action.

''(c) CONTINUATION OF CHOICE OF LAW AFTER REMAND.—In an action remanded to another district court or a State court under section 1407(j)(1) or 1441(e)(2) of this title, the district court's choice of law under subsection (b) shall continue to apply.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1660. Choice of law in multiparty, multiforum actions.''.

(f) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

(1) OTHER THAN SUBPOENAS.—(A) Chapter 113 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1697. Service in multiparty, multiforum actions

''When the jurisdiction of the district court is based in whole or in part upon section 1369 of this title, process, other than subpoenas, may be served at any place within the United States, or anywhere outside the

United States if otherwise permitted by law.''.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 113 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1697. Service in multiparty, multiforum actions.''.

(2) SERVICE OF SUBPOENAS.—(A) Chapter 117 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1785. Subpoenas in multiparty, multiforum actions

''When the jurisdiction of the district court is based in whole or in part upon section 1369 of this title, a subpoena for attendance at a hearing or trial may, if authorized by the court upon motion for good cause shown, and upon such terms and conditions as the court may impose, be served at any place within the United States, or anywhere outside the United States if otherwise permitted by law.''.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 117 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1785. Subpoenas in multiparty, multiforum actions.''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) SECTION 2.—The amendments made by section 2 shall apply to any civil action pending on or brought on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) SECTION 3.—The amendments made by section 3 shall apply to a civil action if the accident giving rise to the cause of action occurred on or after the 90th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in support of H.R. 2112, the Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Trial Jurisdiction Act of 1999 and urge the House to adopt the measure. This bill is authored by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Section 2 of H.R. 2112 responds to a 1998 Supreme Court decision pertaining to multidistrict litigation, the so-called ''Lexecon'' case.

Section 2 of the bill would simply amend the multidistrict litigation statute by explicitly allowing the transferee court to retain jurisdiction over referred cases for trial or refer them to other districts as it sees fit.

This change, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, makes sense in light of past judicial practice under the multidistrict litigation statute.

In addition, section 3 of H.R. 2112 offers what I believe are modest but necessary improvements to a specific type of multidistrict litigation, that involving disasters such as an airline or train accident, in which several individuals from different States are killed or injured.

Finally, I note that there is a technical error in the committee report. Pursuant to a change advocated by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), which we accepted at full committee markup, the dollar threshold for cases brought under section 3 was raised from a previous draft of $50,000 to $75,000. $75,000 is the correct figure.

This legislation obviously promotes judicial administrative efficiency without compromising the rights of litigants and their counsel to due process and appropriate compensation. It is strongly endorsed by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Trial Jurisdiction Act of 1999. I would like to thank, on behalf of the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman COBLE), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) of the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property for their hard work on this bill and for the bipartisan fashion in which they operated.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) for his generous remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the sponsor of the bill

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2112 is a combination of two other freestanding bills which I have introduced. Section 2 consists of the text of H.R. 1852, which would reverse the effects of the 1998 Supreme Court decision in the so-called ''Lexecon'' case, that would simply amend the multidistrict litigation statute by explicitly allowing a transferee court to retain jurisdiction over referred cases for trial or to refer them to other districts as it sees fit.

Section 3 is comprised of the language of H.R. 967, which beginning in the 101st Congress has been supported by the Department of Justice, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, two previous Democratic Congresses, and one previous Republican Congress.

Section 3 will help reduce litigation costs as well as the likelihood of forum shopping in single-accident mass tort cases. All plaintiffs in these cases would ordinarily be situated identically, making the case for consolidation of these actions especially compelling. These types of disasters, with their hundreds of thousands of plaintiffs and numerous defendants, have the potential to impair the orderly administration of justice in the Federal courts for an extended period of time.

In brief, section 3 addresses these problems by conferring original jurisdiction upon a Federal District Court of any civil action which features four basic attributes. First, the action is one in which minimal diversity exists between adverse parties. Second, the action arises from a single accident. Third, at least 25 people have either died or incurred injury in the accident. Fourth, in the case of injury, the injury has resulted in damages which exceed $75,000 per person.

Moreover, the relevant district court overseeing such a consolidated action is given wider authority to apply appropriate choice of law rules. This is a great improvement over the existing convoluted system in which a myriad of State laws ties the hands of a federal judge. The criteria the Court must invoke when making its decisions include examination of the place of the injury, the place of the conduct causing the injury, the principal place of business or domicile of the parties, the danger of creating unnecessary incentives for forum shopping and whether the choice of law would be reasonably foreseeable to the parties.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and I jointly amended the bill at full committee by making two basic and noncontroversial changes.

First, the treatment of compensatory damages in Section 2 will be made consistent with that in section 3.

Second, based upon a recommendation from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), we will raise the dollar threshold in section 3 actions from $50,000 to $75,000.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge the good faith efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) in resolving the one outstanding issue governing compensatory damages prior to the full committee markup. His willingness to work with us has resulted in a truly bipartisan and noncontroversial measure. I want these sentiments on the record, especially in his absence today.

So, Mr. Speaker, this legislation speaks to process, fairness and judicial efficiency. It will not interfere with jury verdicts or compensation rates for litigators. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and myself in a bipartisan effort to support the Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Jurisdiction Act of 1999.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the ''Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Jurisdiction Act of 1999.'' I'd like to begin by expressing thanks to Chairman COBLE and Representative SENSENBRENNER of the Intellectual Property and Courts Subcommittee for their hard work and dedication to working out the concerns that we raised with respect to the original version of the bill in a truly bipartisan fashion.

I. SECTION 2—OVERTURNS LEXECON V. MILBERG WEISS, 523 U.S. 26 (1998)

Section 2 of the bill overturns the recent Supreme Court decision of Lexecon V. Milberg Weiss, where the Supreme Court held that a transferee court (a district court assigned to hear pretrial matters by a multidistrict litigation panel in multidistrict litigation cases) must remand all cases back for trial to the districts in which they were originally filed, regardless of the views of the parties.

It is my understanding from the hearing that for some 30 year the transferee court often retained jurisdiction over all of the suits by invoking a venue provision of Title 28, allowing a district court to transfer a civil action to any other district where it may have been brought—in effect, the transferee court simply transferred all of the cases to itself. The Judicial Conference testified that this process has worked well, and as a matter of judicial expedience, I support overturning the Lexecon decision.

There was a concern raised at the Subcommittee hearing, however, that Section 2, as originally drafted, would have gone far beyond simply permitting a multidistrict litigation transferee court to conduct a liability trial, and instead, would have allowed the court to also determine compensatory and punitive damages. The concern here is that trying the case in the transferee forum could be extremely inconvenient for plaintiffs who would need to testify at the damages phase of the trial.

As a result of discussions between the minority and majority, Representative BERMAN successfully offered a bipartisan amendment addressing this concern at the Full Committee markup. Pursuant to this amendment, Section 2 now creates a presumption that the trial of compensatory damages will be remanded to the original district court.

II. SECTION 3—MINIMAL DIVERSITY FOR SINGLE ACCIDENTS INVOLVING 25 PEOPLE

Section 3 of the bill expands federal court jurisdiction for single accidents involving at least 25 people having damages in excess of $75,000 per claim and establishes new federal procedures in these narrowly defined cases for selection of venue, service of process, issuance of subpoenas and choice of law. It is my understanding here that mass tort injuries that involve the same injury over and over again such as asbestos and breast implants, etc., would be excluded. And that the types of cases that would be included would be plane, train, bus, boat accidents, environment spills, etc.—many of which may already be brought in federal court.

While I traditionally oppose having federal courts decide state tort issues, and disfavor the expansion of the jurisdiction of the already-overloaded district courts, unlike the broader class action bill (H.R. 1875), this bill would only expand federal court jurisdiction in a much narrower class of actions, with the objective of judicial expedience.

Thus, I support this Section with the understanding that it would only apply to a very narrowly defined category of cases and does not in any way serve as a precedent for broader expansion of diversity jurisdiction.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2112, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

LACKAWANNA VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 940) to establish the Lackawanna Heritage Valley American Heritage Area, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 940

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 ''Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The industrial and cultural heritage of northeastern Pennsylvania inclusive of Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wayne, and Susquehanna counties, related directly to anthracite and anthracite-related industries, is nationally significant, as documented in the United States Department of the Interior-National Parks Service, National Register of Historic Places, Multiple Property Documentation submittal of the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission (1996).

(2) These industries include anthracite mining, ironmaking, textiles, and rail transportation.

(3) The industrial and cultural heritage of the anthracite and related industries in this region includes the social history and living cultural traditions of the people of the region.

(4) The labor movement of the region played a significant role in the development of the Nation including the formation of many key unions such as the United Mine Workers of America, and crucial struggles to improve wages and working conditions, such as the 1900 and 1902 anthracite strikes.

(5) The Department of the Interior is responsible for protecting the Nation's cultural and historic resources, and there are significant examples of these resources within this 4-county region to merit the involvement of the Federal Government to develop programs and projects, in cooperation with the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and other local and governmental bodies, to adequately conserve, protect, and interpret this heritage for future generations, while providing opportunities for education and revitalization.

(6) The Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority would be an appropriate management entity for a Heritage Area established in the region.

(b) PURPOSE.—The objectives of the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area are as follows:

(1) To foster a close working relationship with all levels of government, the private sector, and the local communities in the anthracite coal region of northeastern Pennsylvania and empower the communities to conserve their heritage while continuing to pursue economic opportunities.

(2) To conserve, interpret, and develop the historical, cultural, natural, and recreational resources related to the industrial and cultural heritage of the 4-county region of northeastern Pennsylvania.

SEC. 3. LACKAWANNA VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area (in this Act referred to as the ''Heritage Area'').

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The Heritage Area shall be comprised of all or parts of the counties of Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wayne, and Susquehanna in Pennsylvania, determined pursuant to the compact under section 4.

(c) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity for the Heritage Area shall be the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority.

SEC. 4. COMPACT.

To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior (in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall enter into a compact with the management entity. The compact shall include information relating to the objectives and management of the area, including each of the following:

(1) A delineation of the boundaries of the Heritage Area.

(2) A discussion of the goals and objectives of the Heritage Area, including an explanation of the proposed approach to conservation and interpretation and a general outline of the protection measures committed to by the partners.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.

(a) AUTHORITIES OF THE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity may, for purposes of preparing and implementing the management plan developed under subsection (b), use funds made available through this Act for the following:

(1) To make grants to, and enter into cooperative agreements with States and their political subdivisions, private organizations, or any person.

(2) To hire and compensate staff.

(3) To enter into contracts for goods and services.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The management entity shall develop a management plan for the Heritage Area that presents recommendations for the Heritage Area's conservation, funding, management, and development. Such plan shall take into consideration existing State, county, and local plans and involve residents, public agencies, and private organizations working in the Heritage Area. It shall include recommendations for actions to be undertaken by units of government and private organizations to protect the resources of the Heritage Area. It shall specify the existing and potential sources of funding to protect, manage, and develop the Heritage Area. Such plan shall include, as appropriate, the following:

(1) An inventory of the resources contained in the Heritage Area, including a list of any property in the Heritage Area that is related to the themes of the Heritage Area and that should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, or maintained because of its natural, cultural, historic, recreational, or scenic significance.

(2) A recommendation of policies for resource management which considers and details application of appropriate land and water management techniques, including, but not limited to, the development of intergovernmental cooperative agreements to protect the Heritage Area's historical, cultural, recreational, and natural resources in a manner consistent with supporting appropriate and compatible economic viability.

(3) A program for implementation of the management plan by the management entity, including plans for restoration and construction, and specific commitments of the identified partners for the first 5 years of operation.

(4) An analysis of ways in which local, State, and Federal programs may best be coordinated to promote the purposes of this Act.

(5) An interpretation plan for the Heritage Area.

The management entity shall submit the management plan to the Secretary for approval within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act. If a management plan is not submitted to the Secretary as required within the specified time, the Heritage Area shall no longer qualify for Federal funding.

(c) DUTIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity shall—

(1) give priority to implementing actions set forth in the compact and management plan, including steps to assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in preserving the Heritage Area;

(2) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits in the Heritage Area; assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in developing recreational resources in the Heritage Area;

(3) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in increasing public awareness of and appreciation for the natural, historical, and architectural resources and sites in the Heritage Area; assist units of government, regional planning organizations and nonprofit organizations in the restoration of any historic building relating to the themes of the Heritage Area;

(4) encourage economic viability in the Heritage Area consistent with the goals of the plan; encourage local governments to adopt land use policies consistent with the management of the Heritage Area and the goals of the plan;

(5) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations to ensure that clear, consistent, and environmentally appropriate signs identifying access points and sites of interest are put in place throughout the Heritage Area;

(6) consider the interests of diverse governmental, business, and nonprofit groups within the Heritage Area;

(7) conduct public meetings at least quarterly regarding the implementation of the management plan; and

(8) for any year in which Federal funds have been received under this Act, make available for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of such funds and any matching funds, and require, for all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the receiving organizations make available for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of such funds.

(d) PROHIBITION ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The management entity may not use Federal funds received under this Act to acquire real property or an interest in real property. Nothing in this Act shall preclude any management entity from using Federal funds from other sources for their permitted purposes.

(e) SPENDING FOR NON-FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY.—The management entity may spend Federal funds directly on non-federally owned property to further the purposes of this Act, especially in assisting units of government in appropriate treatment of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

SEC. 6. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may, upon request of the management entity, provide technical and financial assistance to the management entity to develop and implement the management plan. In assisting the management entity, the Secretary shall give priority to actions that in general assist in—

(1) conserving the significant natural, historic, and cultural resources which support its themes; and

(2) providing educational, interpretive, and recreational opportunities consistent with its resources and associated values.

(b) APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLANS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Governor of Pennsylvania, shall approve or disapprove a management plan submitted under this Act not later than 90 days after receiving such management plan.

(c) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves a submitted management plan, the Secretary shall advise the management entity in writing of the reasons therefore and shall make recommendations for revisions in the plan. The Secretary shall approve or disapprove a proposed revision within 90 days after the date it is submitted.

(d) APPROVING AMENDMENTS.—The Secretary shall review substantial amendments to the management plan for the Heritage Area. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may not be expended to implement the changes made by such amendments until the Secretary approves the amendments.

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL ANTHRACITE COAL REGION DESIGNATION.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Upon publication by the Secretary in the Federal Register of notice that the Secretary has signed a compact (as provided for in subsection (b)) there is hereby designated the Schuylkill River National Heritage Area.

(b) COMPACT.—The compact submitted under this section with respect to the Schuylkill River National Heritage Area shall consist of an agreement between the Secretary and the Schuylkill River Greenway Association (who shall serve as the management entity for the area). Such agreement shall define the area (including a delineation of the boundaries), describe anticipated programs for the area, and include information relating to the objectives and management of the area. Such information shall include, but not be limited to, an explanation of the proposed approach to the conservation and interpretation of the area and a general outline of the protection measures committed to by the partners.

(c) AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES.—The authorities and duties of the management entity and other Federal agencies for the Schuylkill River National Heritage Area shall be the same as provided for by sections 5 and 6 of this Act, except that for such purposes any reference in such sections to the ''Heritage Area'' shall be deemed to be a reference to the Schuylkill River National Heritage Area and any reference to the ''management entity'' shall be deemed a reference to the Schuylkill River Greenway Association.

SEC. 8. CULTURE AND HERITAGE OF ANTHRACITE COAL REGION.

All authorized existing and future heritage area management entities in the Anthracite Coal Region in Pennsylvania are authorized and directed to coordinate with one another in the management of such areas. Each such management entity is authorized to use funds appropriated for such heritage areas for the purposes of this section.

SEC. 9. SUNSET.

The Secretary may not make any grant or provide any assistance under this Act after September 30, 2012.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated under this Act not more than $1,000,000 for any fiscal year for each heritage area designated by this Act. Not more than a total of $10,000,000 may be appropriated for each heritage area under this Act.

(b) 50 PERCENT MATCH.—Federal funding provided under this Act, after the designation of each heritage area, may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of any assistance or grant provided or authorized under this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

I am pleased that we are considering H.R. 940, the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area Act, a similar version which was passed by the House in the last Congress.

There are many excellent reasons to support the designation of this historic heritage area. The Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area Act would ensure the conservation of northeastern Pennsylvania's significant natural, historic and cultural resources. The Lackawanna Valley was the first heritage area designated by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and is recognized as nationally significant through its documentation into the U.S. Department of Interior's Register of Historic Places.

In the last decade, for every dollar contributed by the National Park Service to the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority, the ''management entity'' cited in my bill, has leveraged $10 in other federal, State, local and private sector funds to finance preservation activities. The Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority would continue to foster these important relationships with all levels of Government, the private sector, and local communities.

The Lackawanna Valley encompasses the counties of Lackawanna, Wayne, Susquehanna, and Luzerne in northeastern Pennsylvania. The Valley tells the story of the development of anthracite coal, one of North America's greatest natural resources. From early in the 19th century, Pennsylvania's coal provided an extraordinary source of energy which fueled America's economic growth for over 100 years. At the center of the world's most productive anthracite field, the Lackawanna Valley witnessed the inception, spectacular growth, and eventual deterioration of an industry which led our country to unparalleled prosperity.

The landscape of the Valley conveys the story of the industrial revolution most clearly. Miles of track and hundreds of industrial sites and abandoned mines are daily reminders of the importance of the regent industry. Heritage sites like Pennsylvania's Anthracite Heritage Museum, the Scranton Iron Furnace Historic Site, the Lackawanna County Coal Mine, and the Steamtown National Historic Site help to commemorate the hardships of the industrial revolution which has led us to our current prosperity. These sites provide the framework for the historic preservation which will be cemented by my proposed legislation.

A hearing was held on June 10 in the Subcommittee on National Parks and

Public Lands in which testimony was heard from the National Park Service, private citizens, and elected officials in strong support of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 940 was subsequently amended in the full Committee on Resources to direct the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Schuylkill River Corridor as a national heritage area. This addition to the bill will allow the history and culture of the major anthracite coal regions in Pennsylvania to be preserved for future generations. The amended bill passed by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full Committee on Resources, for their support and leadership on this important legislation. H.R. 940 is a bipartisan bill which deserves our support.

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I do want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his sponsorship of this piece of legislation.

H.R. 940, as introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), my colleague of the Committee on Resources, would have established the Lackawanna Valley Heritage Area in northeastern Pennsylvania.

The Lackawanna Valley covers the four counties of Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wayne, and Susquehanna Counties. In 1991, local citizens and governments established the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority to foster a partnership among State and local governments, business and civic organizations in the promotion of the Valley's historic, cultural, natural and economic resources.

Unlike other proposed heritage areas, the Lackawanna Valley has received significant federal funding prior to its establishment. Since 1989, a total of $3.147 million in the National Park Service funds has been earmarked in appropriations bills for a variety of unauthorized purposes.

In hearings on H.R. 940 before the Committee on Resources, the National Park Service testified in general support of the legislation, but did note several concerns with the bill's language, especially in regards to the lending authority and the requirement for certain studies. The bill was amended by the committee to address those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the Committee on Resources adopted an amendment that provides for the designation of an additional heritage area so that the preservation and interpretation of the resources of the anthracite coal region will also include those resources found in the southern anthracite coal fields of the Schuylkill River Valley located in the district of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN).

The bill already anticipated such cooperative heritage efforts by directing that the various management entities to coordinate with one another in the management of the heritage of the anthracite coal region in Pennsylvania. The changes made by the amendment will provide more complete coverage of the heritage of this entire coal region.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 940, as amended, is a good piece of legislation for heritage preservation, and I do urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN).

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 940 this afternoon. I would like to thank the chairmen of the committee and the subcommittee for bringing this legislation to the floor, and I thank the ranking members of the committee and subcommittee for their assistance, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), my good friend, for the way that he cooperated and extended his hand so that we were able to include the entire anthracite coal field in this heritage corridor, and I do truly appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman.

The link between the Schuylkill Heritage Corridor and the Lackawanna Heritage Corridor, as the gentleman mentioned, is anthracite coal, the anthracite coal that fueled the industrial revolution in this country, first by way of the Schuylkill Canal and then by way of the railroads. We should all be proud of that heritage, and I am certain that our managing entities are going to work very closely together so that we can highlight that proud history of anthracite coal.

Along with the coal fields in Pennsylvania came the first real effort for organized labor to set foot in the United States. I am very pleased to say that the work of the association started in Schuylkill County and was the forerunner to the United Mine Workers of America, where men fought long and hard for equitable pay and for working privileges and working rights that they were not able to have in the days when anthracite coal was first begun to be mined in Pennsylvania.

Through their efforts and through their long and hard work, they were able to have decent salaries and decent wages and decent working conditions in the anthracite fields right now. We should continue to honor the heritage of what was done in organized labor.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more to be told about the Schuylkill River Heritage. As we leave Schuylkill County and move down the Schuylkill River, we have a proud heritage in agriculture, a proud heritage in textiles, and in iron ore. All of these industries have a great tradition, and we all have great pride in what was accomplished right down the Schuylkill River as we get to Valley Forge and to Philadelphia. It was our link to get our goods to the marketplace, and we should make every effort possible to be appreciative as to what was done, but also try to highlight through Heritage Corridor what was done in the past and continue to move for economic development.

I am absolutely positive that when this Schuylkill River Heritage Corridor gets into a working agreement and hits the ground running, that it is going to be able to model itself after the Lackawanna Corridor, as my friend mentioned, where they were able to leverage with federal money, with private money, and State money and county money to do so much good in the Lackawanna Valley, and I am hoping we are going to use that example as we do in the Schuylkill River Corridor.

So I would just like to take this opportunity to say that this is a good piece of legislation. It certainly has been done in a very bipartisan manner. I think we all cooperated very well. Again, I would like to extend my gratification for that effort that was made to assist in making sure that anthracite coal and all of the treasures of the Schuylkill River can have a heritage corridor that we can work on.

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

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

I certainly want to thank both gentlemen from Pennsylvania for their introduction of this piece of legislation. I note with interest the mentioning of Susquehanna County as part of a very strong cultural heritage as part of our American history. In my little reading of history, I recall that the Susquehanna River has a very profound historical event that transpired as far as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is concerned, and I wanted to note that as a matter of record. I do want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) for his comments.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 940, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS COLE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 658) to establish the Thomas Cole National Historic Site in the State of New York as an affiliated area of the National Park System, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 658

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Thomas Cole National Historic Site Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Findings and purposes.
Sec. 4. Establishment of Thomas Cole National Historic Site.
Sec. 5. Retention of ownership and management of historic site by Greene County Historical Society.
Sec. 6. Administration of historic site.
Sec. 7. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term ''historic site'' means the Thomas Cole National Historic Site established by section 4 of this Act.

(2) The term ''Hudson River artists'' means artists who were associated with the Hudson River school of landscape painting.

(3) The term ''plan'' means the general management plan developed pursuant to section 6(d).

(4) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) The term ''Society'' means the Greene County Historical Society of Greene County, New York, which owns the Thomas Cole home, studio, and other property comprising the historic site.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Hudson River school of landscape painting was inspired by Thomas Cole and was characterized by a group of 19th century landscape artists who recorded and celebrated the landscape and wilderness of America, particularly in the Hudson River Valley region in the State of New York.

(2) Thomas Cole is recognized as America's most prominent landscape and allegorical painter of the mid-19th century.

(3) Located in Greene County, New York, the Thomas Cole House, also known as Thomas Cole's Cedar Grove, is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and has been designated as a National Historic Landmark.

(4) Within a 15 mile radius of the Thomas Cole House, an area that forms a key part of the rich cultural and natural heritage of the Hudson River Valley region, significant landscapes and scenes painted by Thomas Cole and other Hudson River artists, such as Frederic Church, survive intact.

(5) The State of New York has established the Hudson River Valley Greenway to promote the preservation, public use, and enjoyment of the natural and cultural resources of the Hudson River Valley region.

(6) Establishment of the Thomas Cole National Historic Site will provide opportunities for the illustration and interpretation of cultural themes of the heritage of the United States and unique opportunities for education, public use, and enjoyment.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to preserve and interpret the home and studio of Thomas Cole for the benefit, inspiration, and education of the people of the United States;

(2) to help maintain the integrity of the setting in the Hudson River Valley region that inspired artistic expression;

(3) to coordinate the interpretive, preservation, and recreational efforts of Federal, State, and other entities in the Hudson Valley region in order to enhance opportunities for education, public use, and enjoyment; and

(4) to broaden understanding of the Hudson River Valley region and its role in American history and culture.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF THOMAS COLE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established, as an affiliated area of the National Park System, the Thomas Cole National Historic Site in the State of New York.

(b) DESCRIPTION.—The historic site shall consist of the home and studio of Thomas Cole, comprising approximately 3.4 acres, located at 218 Spring Street, in the village of Catskill, New York, as generally depicted on the boundary map numbered TCH/80002, and dated March 1992.

SEC. 5. RETENTION OF OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC SITE BY GREENE COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

The Greene County Historical Society of Greene County, New York, shall continue to own, administer, manage, and operate the historic site.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION OF HISTORIC SITE.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM LAWS.—The historic site shall be administered in a manner consistent with this Act and all laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act of August 25, 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.; commonly known as the National Park Service Organic Act), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.; commonly known as the Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act).

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) ASSISTANCE TO SOCIETY.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the Society to preserve the Thomas Cole House and other structures in the historic site and to assist with education programs and research and interpretation of the Thomas Cole House and associated landscapes.

(2) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—To further the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of New York, the Society, the Thomas Cole Foundation, and other public and private entities to facilitate public understanding and enjoyment of the lives and works of the Hudson River artists through the provision of assistance to develop, present, and fund art exhibits, resident artist programs, and other appropriate activities related to the preservation, interpretation, and use of the historic site.

(c) ARTIFACTS AND PROPERTY.—The Secretary may acquire personal property associated with, and appropriate for, the interpretation of the historic site.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Within two complete fiscal years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a general management plan for the historic site with the cooperation of the Society. Upon the completion of the plan, the Secretary shall provide a copy of the plan to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives. The plan shall include recommendations for regional wayside exhibits, to be carried out through cooperative agreements with the State of New York and other public and private entities. The plan shall be prepared in accordance with section 12(b) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–1 et seq.; commonly known as the National Park System General Authorities Act).

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 658 would establish the Thomas Cole Historic Site in the State of New York as an affiliated area of the National Park System. This bill is the result of the dedication of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) and retired Congressman Jerry Solomon, also from New York, who worked hard to protect this historic site. The Thomas Cole House is currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places and has been designated as a national historic landmark. H.R. 658 also authorizes the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements with both public and private entities relating to the preservation, the interpretation and use of this historic site.

One of the private entities, the Greene County Historical Society, shall continue to own, manage and operate this historic site.

This bill also directs the historical society with assistance from the Secretary to develop a management plan for the site within 2 fiscal years of enactment. This bill is supported by the administration, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 658.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R.658 establishes the Thomas Cole National Historic Site in the State of New York as an affiliated area of the National Park System.

Mr. Thomas Cole, who lived from 1801 to 1848, was the founder of an American artistic movement known as the Hudson River School. Mr. Cole painted landscapes of the American wilderness. Students and followers included such artists as Frederick Church, Alfred Dierstadt, and Thomas Moran. This school of painting, with its focus on natural landscapes, is closely associated with the beginning of the conservation movement.

The Thomas Cole property, known as Cedar Grove, is located in Catskill, New York. Originally encompassing 88

acres, the home and grounds now occupy 3.4 acres. The property has been designated a national historic landmark. In 1991, the National Park Service completed a suitability and a feasibility study of the Thomas Cole property.

□ 1445

Legislation dealing with the Thomas Cole property has been around since the early 1900s. Hearings were held on a nearly identical bill, H.R. 1301, in the 105th Congress. That legislation was favorably reported by the Committee on Resources, passed the House last September, but unfortunately, action was not completed on the measure prior to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Resources adopted a minor amendment to H.R. 658 that made a clarifying change requested by the National Park Service. We believe this is a good change in the bill, and support the bill. I do urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Again, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) for his management of this legislation.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), for bringing up this legislation, and also thanking the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) of the Committee on Rules, the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the ranking member, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), and my friends on the other side for their assistance here.

This legislation, as has been said, Mr. Speaker, would allow the Greene County Historical Society to remain as owners and operators of the Thomas Cole House while establishing the site as an affiliated area of the national park system.

Essentially what this legislation does, it allows for the historical society to develop interpretive programs related to the facility. It also requires an annual general management plan by the historical society. Both of these things I think are very important to the continued health and welfare of the Thomas Cole House.

I am a strong supporter of preserving our national historical sites generally, and specifically here as it relates to the Thomas Cole House. The circumstances of the Thomas Cole House make this an important piece of legislation, given its age. It is a true national treasure in the heart of one of the most scenic areas of the Nation, New York's Hudson River Valley.

As has been stated, Thomas Cole was one of the country's preeminent landscape painters in the earlier 19th century. His work inspired generations of artists, including Frederick Church and Thomas Moran, to chronicle the growth of the young United States and help to generate interest in our country's natural beauty.

Today the paintings provide insight and reflect the growth of what is the uniquely American spirit. In passing this legislation, we will preserve this school of art and the very residence Thomas Cole worked from within in creating many of his paintings, as well as the landscapes these artists painted of the beautiful Hudson River Valley.

Last year the legislation passed the House. It was not passed by the Senate point. That was because there was some language in the bill that the Senate objected to regarding the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior of the paintings and artwork. We have revised that and made amendments to make that language more palatable. I am confident that the Senate will pass it this year.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the committee and the National Park Service for their assistance, as well as the local organizations in my district who worked strenuously to see this bill passed, and who worked as a partnership to ensure the continuation of the Thomas Cole House. I look forward to seeing the Thomas Cole site become an important addition to the National Park Service.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation that will provide the Thomas Cole National Historic Site with appropriate federal recognition and assistance. It is appropriate because Thomas Cole continues to be a major figure in our nation's history, and an important influence on many Americans who would not recognize his name.

As founder of the Hudson River School of American Painting, Thomas Cole stood at the beginning of a long line of artists who taught Americans to love and appreciate dramatic landscapes. It is hard for us now to imagine a time when places like the Hudson Highlands, the Grand Canyon, and the mountain peaks of the east and west were not treasured, but that was largely the case before Thomas Cole's time. They were regarded as obstacles or places of danger. His paintings showed people they were beautiful; his allegories invested them with meaning. If it were not for Thomas Cole, we might not have our national parks today; we would almost certainly not have our long tradition of landscape art.

I hope this legislation will enable more people to learn about Thomas Cole and his followers and the history of how our people came to appreciate the beauty of nature and the landscape. I further hope it will bring more people to the Hudson Valley that Cole loved and painted, and educate them about the role that the Hudson Valley—through its natural features, its people, and its history—has had in defining our country's vision of itself.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 658, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SHERWOOD. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

FISHERMAN'S PROTECTIVE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1651) to amend the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1651

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

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR REIMBURSEMENT UNDER FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Fishermen's Protective Act Amendments of 1999''.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR REIMBURSEMENT UNDER FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(e) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1977(e)) is amended by striking ''2000'' and inserting ''2003''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 7(a)(3) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1977(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''Secretary of the Interior'' and inserting ''Secretary of Commerce''.

TITLE II—YUKON RIVER SALMON

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Yukon River Salmon Act of 1999''.

SEC. 202. YUKON RIVER SALMON PANEL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Yukon River Salmon Panel (in this title referred to as the ''Panel'').

(2) FUNCTIONS.—The Panel shall—

(A) advise the Secretary of State regarding the negotiation of any international agreement with Canada relating to management of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada;

(B) advise the Secretary of the Interior regarding restoration and enhancement of such salmon stocks; and

(C) perform other functions relating to conservation and management of such salmon stocks as authorized by this or any other title.

(3) DESIGNATION AS UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVES ON BILATERAL BODY.—The Secretary of State may designate the members of the Panel to be the United States representatives on any successor to the panel established by the interim agreement for the conservation of salmon stocks originating

from the Yukon River in Canada agreed to through an exchange of notes between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada on February 3, 1995, if authorized by any agreement establishing such successor.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Panel shall be comprised of six members, as follows:

(A) One member who is an official of the United States Government with expertise in salmon conservation and management, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of State.

(B) One member who is an official of the State of Alaska with expertise in salmon conservation and management, who shall be appointed by the Governor of Alaska.

(C) Four members who are knowledgeable and experienced with regard to the salmon fisheries on the Yukon River, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of State in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) APPOINTEES FROM ALASKA.—(A) The Secretary of State shall appoint the members under paragraph (1)(C) from a list of at least 3 individuals nominated for each position by the Governor of Alaska.

(B) In making the nominations, the Governor of Alaska may consider suggestions for nominations provided by organizations with expertise in Yukon River salmon fisheries.

(C) The Governor of Alaska may make appropriate nominations to allow for appointment of, and the Secretary of State shall appoint, under paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) at least one member who is qualified to represent the interests of Lower Yukon River fishing districts; and

(ii) at least one member who is qualified to represent the interests of Upper Yukon River fishing districts.

(D) At least one of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(C) shall be an Alaska Native.

(3) ALTERNATES.—(A) The Secretary of State may designate an alternate Panel member for each Panel member the Secretary appoints under paragraphs (1) (A) and (C), who meets the same qualifications, to serve in the absence of the Panel member.

(B) The Governor of the State of Alaska may designate an alternative Panel member for the Panel member appointed under subsection (b)(1)(B), who meets the same qualifications, to serve in the absence of that Panel member.

(c) TERM LENGTH.—Panel members and alternate Panel members shall serve four-year terms. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of any term shall be appointed for the remainder of that term.

(d) REAPPOINTMENT.—Panel members and alternate Panel members shall be eligible for reappointment.

(e) DECISIONS.—Decisions of the Panel shall be made by the consensus of the Panel members appointed under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(1).

(f) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out their functions, Panel members may consult with such other interested parties as they consider appropriate.

SEC. 203. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) APPOINTMENTS.—The Governor of Alaska may establish and appoint an advisory committee of not less than 8, but not more than 12, individuals who are knowledgeable and experienced with regard to the salmon fisheries on the Yukon River. At least 2 of the advisory committee members shall be Alaska Natives. Members of the advisory committee may attend all meetings of the Panel, and shall be given the opportunity to examine and be heard on any matter under consideration by the Panel.

(b) COMPENSATION.—The members of such advisory committee shall receive no compensation for their services.

(c) TERM LENGTH.—Members of such advisory committee shall serve two-year terms. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of any term shall be appointed for the remainder of that term.

(d) REAPPOINTMENT.—Members of such advisory committee shall be eligible for reappointment.

SEC. 204. EXEMPTION.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Panel or to an advisory committee established under section 203.

SEC. 205. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY.

(a) RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game shall be the responsible management entity for the United States for the purposes of any agreement with Canada regarding management of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada.

(b) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The designation under subsection (a) shall not be considered to expand, diminish, or otherwise change the management authority of the State of Alaska or the Federal Government with respect to fishery resources.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—In addition to recommendations made by the Panel to the responsible management entities in accordance with any agreement with Canada regarding management of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada, the Panel may make recommendations concerning the conservation and management of salmon originating in the Yukon River to the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, and other Federal or State entities as appropriate. Recommendations by the Panel shall be advisory in nature.

SEC. 206. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION.—Panel members and alternate Panel members who are not State or Federal employees shall receive compensation at the daily rate of GS–15 of the General Schedule when engaged in the actual performance of duties.

(b) TRAVEL AND OTHER NECESSARY EXPENSES.—Travel and other necessary expenses shall be paid by the Secretary of the Interior for all Panel members, alternate Panel members, and members of any advisory committee established under section 203 when engaged in the actual performance of duties.

(c) TREATMENT AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Except for officials of the United States Government, all Panel members, alternate Panel members, and members of any advisory committee established under section 203 shall not be considered to be Federal employees while engaged in the actual performance of duties, except for the purposes of injury compensation or tort claims liability as provided in chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 71 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 207. YUKON RIVER SALMON STOCK RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, may carry out projects to restore or enhance salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada and the United States.

(b) COOPERATION WITH CANADA.—If there is in effect an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada for the conservation of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada that includes provisions governing projects authorized under this section, then—

(1) projects under this section shall be carried out in accordance with that agreement; and

(2) amounts available for projects under this section—

(A) shall be expended in accordance with the agreement; and

(B) may be deposited in any joint account established by the agreement to fund such projects.

SEC. 208. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out this title $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003, of which—

(1) such sums as are necessary shall be available each fiscal year for travel expenses of Panel members, alternate Panel members, United States members of the Joint Technical Committee established by paragraph C.2 of the memorandum of understanding concerning the Pacific Salmon Treaty between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada (recorded January 28, 1985), and members of an advisory committee established and appointed under section 203, in accordance with Federal Travel Regulations and sections 5701, 5702, 5704 through 5708, and 5731 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) such sums as are necessary shall be available for the United States share of expenses incurred by the Joint Technical Committee and any panel established by any agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada for restoration and enhancement of salmon originating in Canada;

(3) up to $3,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for activities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce for survey, restoration, and enhancement activities related to salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada, of which up to $1,200,000 shall be available each fiscal year for Yukon River salmon stock restoration and enhancement projects under section 207(b); and

(4) $600,000 shall be available each fiscal year for cooperative salmon research and management projects in the portion of the Yukon River drainage located in the United States that are recommended by the Panel.

TITLE III—FISHERY INFORMATION ACQUISITION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Fisheries Survey Vessel Authorization Act of 1999''.

SEC. 302. ACQUISITION OF FISHERY SURVEY VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations, may in accordance with this section acquire, by purchase, lease, lease-purchase, or charter, and equip up to 6 fishery survey vessels in accordance with this section.

(b) VESSEL REQUIREMENTS.—Any vessel acquired and equipped under this section must—

(1) be capable of—

(A) staying at sea continuously for at least 30 days;

(B) conducting fishery population surveys using hydroacoustic, longlining, deep water, and pelagic trawls, and other necessary survey techniques; and

(C) conducting other work necessary to provide fishery managers with the accurate and timely data needed to prepare and implement fishery management plans; and

(2) have a hull that meets the International Council for Exploration of the Sea standard regarding acoustic quietness.

(c) AUTHORIZATION.—To carry out this section there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $60,000,000.

Amend the title so as to read: ''To amend the Fishermen's Protective

Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country, and for other purposes.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1651 is a package of noncontroversial bills that should pass this body without much debate.

The first title amends the Fisherman's Protective Act to extend the period of time during which reimbursements may be provided to owners of U.S. fishing vessel for costs incurred when a vessel is illegally seized and detained by a foreign country. The time period is extended from October 1, 2000, to October 1, 2003.

The second title, the Yukon River Salmon Act of 1999, establishes the Yukon River Salmon Panel, which will advise the Secretary of State regarding negotiations on any international agreement with Canada relating to the management of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River.

In addition, the panel will advise the Secretary of the Interior and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game regarding restoration and enhancement of Yukon River salmon.

In 1995, Congress passed the Yukon River Salmon Act as part of the Fisheries Act of 1995. This Act created the Yukon River Salmon Panel, as required in the interim agreement between the United States and Canada for the conservation of Yukon River salmon stocks originating in Canada.

This interim agreement expired in March of 1998. The expiration of the interim agreement has made the role of the Yukon Salmon Panel unclear. This legislation authorizes the panel and its activities, regardless of the agreement with Canada. If a new agreement cannot be reached between United States and Canada, the Secretary of State is authorized to appoint the advisory panel members to any panel created by the new agreement. The authorized appropriations in this title have been capped at the level authorized in 1995.

The third title to the bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to acquire and equip a fishery survey vessel. This new vessel will provide fishery managers with accurate and timely data necessary to implement the fishery management plans and to meet international treaty obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an aye vote on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to initially commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, and as the ranking member of that subcommittee, again I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership and for his ability to bring these pieces of legislation under a substitute format.

I also want to thank the chairman of our Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), our ranking Democrat, for their support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the three fisheries-related bills included in the substitute amendment that will be offered are noncontroversial and have the full support of the administration. Thus, I do urge that the substitute be adopted by my colleagues.

I am particularly pleased this bill will authorize funding to construct a fisheries research vessel. The fleet of research vessels operated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Mr. Speaker, is aging. Without modern vessels, NOAA will be unable to obtain accurate data on fish stocks and oceanographic conditions, and thus will compromise the Administration's ability to manage our Nation's fisheries as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and several international treaties.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will authorize funds for one vessel. I look forward to working with the chairman of the Committee on Resources to authorize funds in future years to modernize NOAA's fishing research fleet, not only for ships in Alaska, but throughout our Nation's waters, so our administration can gather the best data possible to fulfill its statutory obligations and successfully manage our $3 billion annual commercial fishing industry.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the gentleman from American Samoa, the ranking member of the subcommittee, for his great work in support in getting this bill to the floor. It is much appreciated.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1651, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

''To amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1651, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

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.

BIKINI RESETTLEMENT AND RELOCATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2368) to assist in the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll by amending the terms of the trust fund established during the United States administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2368

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 ''Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. PARTIAL DISTRIBUTION OF TRUST FUND AMOUNTS.

Three percent of the market value as of June 1, 1999, of the Resettlement Trust Fund for the People of Bikini, established pursuant to Public Law 97–257, shall be made available for immediate ex gratia distribution to the people of Bikini, provided such distribution does not reduce the corpus of the trust fund. The amount of such distribution shall be deducted from any additional ex gratia payments that may be made by the Congress into the Resettlement Trust Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2368, the Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act of 1999 is an important

measure to help the relocation and resettlement of the people of the Bikini Atoll. This community was displaced during the time of United States nuclear testing in the Pacific, and while the U.S. was the administering authority for the islands under the United Nations' Trust Territory of the Pacific islands.

In the 1982, Congress established a Resettlement Trust Fund for the benefit of the Bikinians. H.R. 2368 would authorize a one-time 3 percent distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund for relocation and resettlement assistance primarily for the remaining senior citizens of the Bikini Atoll, 3 percent of $126 million, or $3.7 million.

This will not require any appropriation of any funds by the U.S. Congress, and will not diminish the original corpus of the Resettlement Trust Fund of $110 million.

These funds will provide relocation assistance now to the surviving 90 members of Bikini who were removed from their home island, as it may still take years to complete radiological restoration of the atoll to permit safe habitation.

The bill also responds to the resolution of the Bikini Council requesting this legislative action by Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure.

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

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

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this act would authorize a one-time 3 percent distribution from the resettlement fund for the people of Bikini established by Congress in 1982 for relocation and resettlement assistance primarily for the remaining senior citizens of Bikini Atoll.

The odyssey of the Bikini people is a very sad one, indeed. They were moved off their atoll in March of 1946 by the U.S. Navy to facilitate the U.S. nuclear testing program. They were first moved to Rongerik, an uninhabited atoll some 100 miles east of Bikini. Naval officials stated that Rongerik was bigger and richer than Bikini, but it turned out that the move was ill-conceived and poorly planned.

Contrary to the Navy's assertions, Rongerik's land area is one-quarter of the size of Bikini, and its life-sustaining pandanus and coconut trees were considerably less productive than those of Bikini.

The situation on Rongerik steadily deteriorated over the next 2 years. In July of 1947, a medical officer who visited the atoll reported that the Bikinians were visibly suffering from malnutrition. Several sites for another relocation were explored, but none proved satisfactory.

However, when a Navy physician examined the Bikinians in March of 1948 and found them to be a starving people, emergency measures were called for and the Bikinians were immediately evacuated to the Navy base at Kwajalein Atoll. As early as 1948, as the official Navy history of the Trust Territory notes, ''Definite physiological scars were left on the people.'' The consequences of their two relocations, 2 years on Rongerik and nearly 8 months on Kwajalein, were already abundantly evident.

In less than 3 years, the once self-sufficient people had been transformed into dependent wards of the United States. Their very existence had been threatened, and the little confidence that they had in themselves was diminished.

□ 1500

The third relocation of the Bikinians occurred in November of 1948 when the community was moved to Kili Island some 400 miles south of Bikini. Although Kili receives more rainfall than Bikini and has richer soils, it is an island, a high island, not an atoll, and it is about one-ninth the land area of Bikini.

It has neither lagoon, sheltered fishing ground, protected anchorage, nor good beaches. Instead, a flat reef shelf forms around the circumference of the island and drops abruptly to great depths. As a result, it is virtually inaccessible by sea from November to May, when tradewinds cause heavy surf to pound the shore.

This drastic change from an atoll existence, with its abundant fish and islands as far as the eye could see, to an isolated island with no lagoon and inaccessible marine resources, took a severe physiological toll on the Bikini people.

Since their arrival there in 1948, the Bikinians have compared Kili to a jail. The elders sorely miss the ability to move about an atoll, engage in fishing expeditions across the lagoon or in the open sea, and sail to other islands. At Bikini, much of men's lives had centered about their sailing canoes, and they spent many hours working together on them. These sailing canoes had to be abandoned on Kili, and the Bikinians have lost virtually all thier sailing and fishing skills.

Today, 53 years after their move from Bikini, less than half the ''elders'' who were moved off originally in 1946 are still alive. The radiological cleanup and resettlement of Bikini is at least a decade away, and will cost at least several hundred million dollars, and the numerous relocations of the people have had severe consequences.

The Bikinians did not desire relocation in 1946, but they believed they had no alternative but to comply with the wishes of the United States.

Much of the Bikinians' culture and society and identity are rooted in their ancestral home: the islands, reefs, and lagoon of Bikini Atoll. The people's identity, the very essence of their perceptions of themselves, is intimately tied to their home atoll.

The system of land rights provided much of the underlying structure for the organization of the community. Short of loss of life itself, the loss of their ancestral homeland represented the worst calamity imaginable for the Bikini people.

The confinement of the Bikini people to Kili has deprived them of most of the activities and pleasures that they enjoy at Bikini Atoll.

The people of Bikini gave the United States everything they had, their land and their home. They demanded nothing in return. They asked only that the United States care for them until their land had served its purpose and could be returned to them. The United States promised that it would do so, but some 53 years later, and 41 years after the last nuclear test at Bikini, the Bikinians are still not home. They lived up to their side of the deal, and the people of the free world did well by them.

They made contributions to the victory and the Cold War that many other peoples did not. The tests in the Marshall Islands cost hundreds of billions of dollars, but we never questioned their value because these nuclear tests assured U.S. nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union and saved billions of dollars in defense spending.

As the Atomic Energy Commission reported to Congress in 1953, ''Each of the tests involved a major expenditure of money, manpower, scientific effort, and time. Nevertheless, in accelerating the rate of weapons development, they saved far more than their costs.''

In an attempt to assist the people of Bikini, we provided funding for their Resettlement Trust Fund in 1982. Those funds have been well invested, and it is only appropriate for us to support a one-time 3 percent distribution to the heads of household, with the understanding that the Bikini elders will be the primary beneficiaries.

Thanks to sound investment decisions, this trust fund has earned almost 14 percent annually since 1982, so a 3 percent distribution will not require an appropriation of funds by Congress nor will it diminish the original corpus of the trust.

I want to say on a personal note that this especially goes out to the family of Ralph Waltz who was a Peace Corps volunteer on Kili Atoll and who was personal witness to this. Mr. Waltz has since passed away, but he was a very good friend of mine, and he first brought me to these issues that are attendant to the plight of the Bikini people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I may consume to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for yielding this time to me to say a few words concerning this piece of legislation. I do

thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) for his management of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2368, a bill to assist the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll by amending the terms of the trust fund established during the United States administration of a Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. Speaker, 53 years ago, we removed the residents of Bikini Atoll from their home to conduct atomic and nuclear weapons tests. Between 1946 and 1958, we conducted well over 23 such tests, which made the Atoll uninhabitable. In 1968, we told the former residents it was safe to return to the Atoll only to remove them again in 1979 because radiation levels were still far in excess of Federal standards.

Mr. Speaker, today the remaining nine residents of Bikini in 1946 who are still alive, and some of the descendants of the other 158 people of the atoll, are still living in a temporary location 400 miles from their true home.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to partially compensate the residents of Bikini for all the injury and suffering the United States has caused them, it is only reasonable that Congress establish a trust fund in 1982, and a total of $110 million has been appropriated for the fund. The fund has been well managed, and the market value of the fund is now approximately $126 million. H.R. 2368 authorizes a one-time distribution of 3 percent of the value of the trust, which will go primarily to the elders of this group.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken to this floor many times over the years to advocate that the United States devote more of its resources to this problem, especially as it deals with the good people of the Republic of the Marshall Islands. This is only a small part of the mess we created by conducting atomic and nuclear atmospheric tests in the Pacific.

The residents of the Bikini and other atolls of the Pacific have been forced to make considerable sacrifices so that our Nation could remain militarily strong, and I find it highly offensive that we have not addressed this problem forthrightly.

Even today, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a plan to clean up and resettle the atoll, and it is estimated that cleanup and resettlement will take 10 years, 10 more years, Mr. Speaker. We can, and we should be doing better than that.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), our ranking Democrat of the committee, and their staffs for moving this bill as quickly as they have. This is important to the former residents of Bikini and shows that this authorizing committee can act in a timely manner.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Bikinians would have liked to have seen this provision in the fiscal year 2000 Interior appropriations bill, but with today's action in the House and a little luck in the Senate, they may get their money just as quickly as following regular authorizing procedures. I support this bill and believe we have a moral obligation to do much more than this.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to commend the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for his tireless efforts and tremendous leadership to assist his fellow Pacific Island community.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have cosponsored this legislation with Chairman YOUNG which directs the Secretary of Interior to distribute 3% of interest made from the Resettlement Trust Fund for the People of Bikini to surviving Bikini elders. This payment will be a one time only payment and comes from interest made, does not need an additional appropriation, and will not effect the original corpus of the fund.

To facilitate the US nuclear testing program, the people of Bikini were moved off their islands in 1946. Between 1946 and 1958, the U.S. government detonated 23 atomic and hydrogen bombs at Bikini Atoll, including the March 1, 1954 Bravo shot, the largest nuclear test ever conducted by the United States. Our treatment of the people directly affected by these tests has not always been forthright and just. Much information about the test shots was kept from the Marshallese until I was able to persuade the Bush Administration to finally release DOE documents to the Marshall Islands Government. While this process has been slow, it has resulted in thousands of pages of new information released.

In 1982 Congress established the Resettlement Trust Fund to assist the people of Bikini, ''for the relocation and resettlement of the Bikini People in the Marshall Islands, principally on Kili and Ejit Islands.'' Congress appropriated additional funds in 1988 into the trust and modified its terms to provide that monies could also be ''expended for the rehabilitation and resettlement of Bikini Atoll.''

The people of Bikini have maintained the fiscal integrity of the Resettlement Trust Fund since its inception. They have hired U.S. banks as trustees and well respected investment advisors and money managers. The Trust has averaged a nearly 14% annual return since inception and has permitted the Bikini community to provide for scholarships, health care, food programs, housing electrical power, construction, maintenance and repairs on the islands of Kili and Ejit, as well as infrastructure, cleanup and resettlement activities on Bikini Atoll. Through prudent management and voluntary restrictions on the use of the corpus by the people of Bikini, the market value of the Resettlement Trust Fund today is approximately $125 million.

Throughout this most tumultuous time, the elders of the community have remained the solid base for all the people of Bikini. This one time payment is being made at the request of the Bikini community based, in part, on the reality that resettlement of the atoll is unlikely during the lifetime of the elders. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2368, the Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act of 1999. I fully support the request of the Bikini Council to have a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust fund to assist in the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll.

In 1946, our country made the decision to test nuclear weapons in the Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands. This difficult decision, during World War II, created a negative situation for the Bikini Atoll. This environmental catastrophe still exists, over thirty years later. The people of Bikini Atoll have been relocated twice since the Island was polluted with nuclear residue during the nuclear testing that started in 1946.

I commend our government's recognition of the devastation caused during this testing period and I commend our efforts to restore this magnificent Island so its citizens can return to their homes. Unfortunately, it appears another 10 years is necessary to guarantee the return of the Bikini people to an environmentally safe home.

Traditionally, the people of Bikini Atoll have administered the Resettlement Trust Fund in a commendable manner. I fully support the Council's decision to make available 3% percent of the market value of the Resettlement Trust Fund for immediate ex gratia distribution to the people of Bikini. The culture and tradition of the people of Bikini pay special homage to the seniors of the communities. It is anticipated that the senior citizens of Bikini, many who will not have an opportunity to return to the Island and their homeland because of the length of clean-up time, may be the primary beneficiaries of this distribution.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the enactment of the bill would have no impact on the federal budget. Mr. Speaker, dear colleagues, I urge that we continue to support the restoration of Bikini Island and resettlement of its citizens.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act of 1999, H.R. 2368, is an important measure to help the relocation and resettlement of the people of Bikini Atoll. This community was displaced during the time of United States nuclear testing in the Pacific and while the U.S. was the administering authority for the islands under the United Nations Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Congress continues to have responsibility for the trust funds that were established during the trusteeship for the resettlement and relocation of certain island communities, including Bikini Atoll.

The Committee on Resources conducted a Congressional pre-hearing briefing on May 10th and a hearing on May 11th, 1999, on the status of nuclear claims, relocation and resettlement efforts in the Marshall Islands. During the hearing process, the elected representative of the people of Bikini presented the Kili/Bikini/Ejit Local Government Council's May 12, 1999 Resolution, asking Congress to support a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund, which is used both for the cleanup of Bikini and for the ongoing needs of the Bikini people. In addition, the Marshall Islands Government expressed unqualified support for the Bikini request. Congress established the Resettlement Trust Fund in 1982 pursuant to P.L. 97–257 and appropriated additional funds in 1988 pursuant to P.L. 100–446.

I introduced H.R. 2368 jointly with the Ranking Minority Member GEORGE MILLER of the Committee on Resources on June 29, 1999, to respond to the request of the Bikini community and the government of the Marshall Islands. My statement of introduction appeared

in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that date with the text of the Kili/Bikini/Ejit Local Government Council's May 12, 1999 Resolution on June 29, 1999 H.R. 2368 would:

Authorize a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund for relocation and resettlement assistance primarily for the remaining senior citizens of Bikini Atoll [3% of $126 million or $3.7 million]; not require an appropriation of any funds by the U.S. Congress; not diminish the original corpus of the Resettlement Trust Fund [$110 million]; provide relocation assistance now to the surviving 90 members of Bikini who were removed from their home island, as it may still take years to complete radiological restoration of the atoll to permit safe habitation; and respond to the resolution of the Bikini Council requesting this legislative action by Congress.

The Bikinians, for their part, have ensured the fiscal integrity of the Resettlement Trust Fund. They have selected reputable U.S. banks as trustees, hired well-respected and talented investment advisors and money managers, and provided for routine monthly financial statements and annual audits. Due to the Bikini Council's voluntary restraint on the use of these funds, and the success of the fund managers, the corpus remains intact, the trust fund has earned almost 14% annually, every dollar has been accounted for, annual audits are prepared, and monthly financial statements are sent to the Interior Department.

In light of the strength of the trust, its fiscal integrity, the lengthy time a cleanup and restoration will take, and the special circumstances of the elders, the Bikinians wish to make a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund, with the understanding that the primary beneficiaries of the distribution will be the 90 surviving Bikini elders. Because of the excellent management of the trust fund, such a distribution will not require an appropriation of funds by Congress, nor will it diminish the original corpus of the trust.

The authorization in H.R. 2368 for the people of Bikini is appropriate and consistent with the desires of the community of Bikini and congressional intent for the resettlement of the people whose lives and homes were disrupted by U.S. testing. This measure assists some of the people of the former Trust Territory community administered by the United States, who we still maintain relations through a Compact of Free Association. Without any additional cost to the U.S. taxpayer, Congress can be responsive to the remaining senior Bikini elders' resettlement and relocation efforts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2368.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 898) designating certain land in the San Isabel National Forest in the State of Colorado as the ''Spanish Peaks Wilderness.''

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 898

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 ''Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS.

(a) COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT.—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 756; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS.—Certain land in the San Isabel National Forest that—

''(A) comprises approximately 18,000 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled 'Proposed Spanish Peaks Wilderness', dated February 10, 1999; and

''(B) shall be known as the 'Spanish Peaks Wilderness'.''.

(b) MAP; BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION.—

(1) FILING.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary''), shall file a map and boundary description of the area designated under subsection (a) with—

(A) the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and boundary description under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 756), except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and boundary description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and boundary description under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service.

SEC. 3. ACCESS.

Within the Spanish Peaks Wilderness designated under section 2—

(1) the Secretary shall allow the continuation of historic uses of the Bulls Eye Mine Road established prior to the date of enactment of this Act, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may provide; and

(2) access to any privately owned land within the wilderness areas designated under section 2 shall be provided in accordance with section 5 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1134 et seq.).

SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 10 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 756; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 898, the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1999, was introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), my esteemed colleague, and would simply add the Spanish Peaks area to a list of areas designated as wilderness by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) has worked long and hard to protect local interests while trying to preserve an outstanding scenic and geological area. I have hunted and hiked through the Spanish Peaks, and they rise above the high plains majestically all by themselves and are an area certainly worthy of preservation.

This bill passed through subcommittee and full committee on a voice vote, therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 898, the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1999, under suspension of the rules.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 898 would designate approximately 18,000 acres of land in Colorado, San Isabel National Forest, as wilderness. These lands which contain headwaters in two spectacular 13,000 foot peaks have been studied and considered for wilderness designation for nearly two decades.

This month marks the 35th anniversary of the law that created a national wilderness preservation system. The Wilderness Act has led to the protection of more than 104 million acres of Federal lands. In light of this anniversary, it is most appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that the House is acting on a wilderness bill, an all too infrequent event in recent years I would say.

I do commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), our Democratic colleague, for their sponsorship and hard work on this legislation.

This is a worthy bill, this legislation. It certainly deserves the support of our colleagues, and I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy here with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. Speaker, this bill does differ from last year's Skaggs-McInnis bill in a few respects, and I want to take a few moments to discuss one in particular, namely the exclusion from wilderness of an old road, known as the Bulls Eye Mine Road and the inclusion of language related to that road.

Because some questions have been raised about the scope and effect of that language, contained in subsection 3(1), I think it appropriate to provide a further explanation of how that subsection would or would not affect management of this area.

Accordingly, at the request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) I would like to engage the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) in a brief colloquy regarding this part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that has been raised concerning the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to regulating the use of the road. During the subcommittee hearing of the bill, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) asked whether the Secretary would continue to limit those uses to hiking and horseback riding and was assured that the Secretary could do that under the terms of the bill.

Would my colleague agree that, under this bill, the Secretary will continue to have that authority?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman's inquiry, the answer to that is yes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, another important question concerns the extent to which the bill might be read as requiring the federal government to repair or maintain the road. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because my colleague will recall that the Forest Service testified that they are in no position to make any commitments to keep the road open, and because its condition is such as to raise serious safety problems and possibly even questions of liability, would the gentleman from Colorado agree that nothing in the bill would have the effect of requiring the United States to undertake any improvements of the road or to maintain any part of the road?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from American Samoa, the answer is yes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, some parties have raised the question about ownership of the road right-of-way itself. Does the gentleman from Colorado agree that nothing in this bill would have the effect of lessening any property before the United States of that land or of limiting the ability of the Secretary to take legal action to assert those interests?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman repeat the question.

□ 1515

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Does my colleague agree that nothing in this bill would have the effect of lessening any of the property interests of the United States in that land or of limiting the ability of the Secretary to take legal action to assert those interests?

Mr. MCINNIS. The answer to that is yes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very exciting day for me and for the people of the State of Colorado that the designation of the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness area is about to pass the House of Representatives. This bill has bipartisan support. This bill does something that we should have done a couple of years ago.

At the very beginning of my comments, I think it is appropriate to give credit to my former colleague, our former colleague, David Skaggs, who retired from Congress 2 years ago, I think. The gentleman put a lot of effort into the Spanish Peaks wilderness. I was privileged to work with David Skaggs for a period of several years on this legislation, and today I hope he is watching so he gets to see this pass.

I have got a lot of personal interest in the Spanish Peaks of Colorado. First a little description of the Spanish Peaks. There are two peaks, the east and west peak. These peaks were often used as guidance for the pioneers who settled in Colorado. When we see them against the Colorado horizon, they stand out against that beautiful blue sky. It really is an asset to the people of this country to have the Spanish Peaks. Now to take that movement to put the Spanish Peaks into a wilderness area is a designation that is well served.

Let me point out an issue that I think is very important. Number one, it is important for all who are watching today and my colleagues on the floor to understand that there are lots of different ways to manage public lands. Wilderness is not the only way to manage public lands. We have lots of tools out there.

For example, we have national parks, we have national forests, we have special areas. There are lots of different ways to manage public lands. The most restrictive and, therefore, the one we should utilize with the most caution is the wilderness designation.

How should we go about naming an area or designating an area as ''wilderness''? The first thing that I think fundamentally to the principle of wilderness is that we have got to have local input. We do not have an outside interest come in and dictate to the local people what they ought to do in that local community. We had a lot of local input.

This bill did not start with an outside interest. This bill did not start with some organization outside of the area. This bill started with the local people. I know a lot of those local people.

My great grandparents homesteaded down in that area in La Veta, Colorado, in the 1880s. I know those people down there, and they got together several years ago and they said, the Spanish Peaks at the very top where, by the way, Mr. Speaker, it does not affect water rights, which are absolutely crucial in the State of Colorado, the local people got together and said these are beautiful peaks. Let us manage a small part of the peaks, about 18,000 acres, as wilderness; and let us do it at the very top where it does not impact water rights, where it limits impact on private property.

I am a strong advocate of private property rights in this country. When this idea first came up, there was some conflict, there was some controversy. So did we look outside of the State of Colorado or even outside that area for advice or dictate on how we ought to resolve that controversy or that conflict? No. We sat down together; we sat down and we talked.

We have had a lot of able leadership through that community to come to a resolution that we are now seeing today about ready to pass the United States House of Representatives.

This bill will mark the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness for many, many, many centuries to come. And long after we are all gone, people will look back and say, the United States Congress, with these conditions and this particular area, made the right decision for wilderness.

A moment to comment about my colleague WAYNE ALLARD. Senator WAYNE ALLARD is also carrying this. He has put a lot of time into this effort. We have got a good team working. We have also had good support from the Colorado delegation. I would be remiss if I did not mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), our senior Member from Colorado Springs; if I did not mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), if I did not mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

I should also mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) who has spent a good deal of time since he has been elected to Congress to work specifically with me on making sure that the agreements that we have in place are being kept. He has been supportive. I know that that came up a little quicker today than we imagined, so he is not in our presence. He certainly would be here today, but he does support it. And his concerns I think are well protected.

But back to what I think is something all of us can be proud of, and that is, if my colleagues have the opportunity to go to Colorado, my district, the third congressional district is the highest district in the country in elevation and so on. It has got 56 mountains over 14,000 feet, and one of those Spanish Peaks goes over that 14,000. If my colleagues have an opportunity to go to Colorado, take a look at the Spanish Peaks. Understand the history of those mountains and what it means to the people of this country, what it means to the people of Huerfano County, what it means to the people of every county in the State of Colorado.

Today, a great moment for the State of Colorado. It is a great moment for this country. I am proud to be the sponsor of the Spanish Peaks Wilderness area.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for his eloquence and certainly for in a more specific way allowing Members of our body to understand the specifics of this legislation. I, too, would like to commend his former colleague and our good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. David Skaggs, for his cosponsorship originally of this legislation with my good friend from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, since I do not have any additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, could we have a time check?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) has yielded back the balance.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to my good colleagues on the other side, I would like to make a couple more comments. I do not have any other speakers. My colleague, although he has yielded back his time, if he would like me to yield time, I would be happy to.

Again, now that I know I have got a couple more minutes, let me be a little more exhaustive in my remarks about, number one, David Skaggs.

David came to me several years ago. As my colleagues know, David is a Democrat. I am a Republican. David and I have known each other for a long period of time. We worked together in the Colorado House of Representatives. At the time, I was the majority leader and he was the minority leader.

It was kind of fun to come back here in Congress and to be able to work on something that we completely agreed on and we had our hearts in. I wish David were here today, but I know that David will be at the dedication that we have of the Spanish Peaks down in southern Colorado when we dedicate that portion of the wilderness.

I also want to emphasize and talk for just a couple more minutes about wilderness and what is important about it. There is a philosophy out there or a thought out there that the only way to protect federal lands is to put them in wilderness. As I mentioned, earlier in my remarks, wilderness is the most restrictive and most inflexible management tool we have in our arsenal of tools to manage federal lands. Once we put an area into wilderness, it is in essence locked into that designation forever.

Now, it is true that Congress can overturn a wilderness designation, but for that politically to occur it would be next to impossible.

So before we designate wilderness, I think we, one, need to take our time and make sure that it meets all of the conditions for wilderness designation; number two, that we try to think into the future and try to come up with what might be the unintended consequences in putting that into wilderness instead of, say, a special area or some type of reserve or a conservation area or national park and so on.

Because the measure is so dramatic, we should manage a wilderness designation just like the former Congressman David Skaggs and myself and the Colorado delegation and my good colleague on the other side of the aisle have done, and that is we sat down and we met with the local community, we took the local input; we let most of the controversy be resolved at the local level; we put together legislation in a very open type of manner. We did not push this as a public relations type of campaign, going out and getting billboards for wilderness and things like that. This has a lot of substance to it. It has got a lot of study and a lot of energy into it. This is the way we ought to name wilderness bills that go through this Congress.

So once again, I thank my colleagues from the Colorado delegation. I thank my good colleague from the other side of the aisle. But more than anything else, I thank the people of America for allowing us to take care of the Spanish Peaks with this designation at the very top.

Every one of my colleagues, this vote they make today will be a vote that generations from now will look back and say, my grandpa and my grandma or my great grandpa or my great grandma voted yes for this.

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

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to note, for the RECORD, if there is anything as a demonstration of my colleagues in this chamber, I would say that the delegation from Colorado, both Republican and Democrats, probably has displayed the highest example of what bipartisanship should be when it comes to this issue of wilderness legislation.

I want to commend the gentleman for being a part of that ability to give and take. Sometimes we get to be a little too extreme in our views and not be tolerable to the views of another Member, especially on an issue as important as wilderness area. So I commend and thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I too share the comments of the gentleman. We did not try to sneak minimum wage or the Republican tax cut in this bill. This bill was kept clean through the process. It is purely bipartisan, and we can all be very proud when the vote names the Spanish Peaks of Colorado as a wilderness.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 898, I rise in support of this important bill to designate the Spanish Peaks as wilderness.

The mountains we call the Spanish Peaks are two volcanic peaks in Las Animas and Huerfano Counties. Their Native American name is Wayatoya. The eastern peak rises to 12,893 feet above sea level, and the summit of the western peak is at 13,626 feet.

These two peaks were landmarks for Native Americans and for some of Colorado's other early settlers and for travelers along the trail between Bent's Old Fort on the Arkansas River and Taos, New Mexico.

This part of the San Isabel National Forest has outstanding scenic, geologic, and wilderness values, including a spectacular system of more than 250 free-standing dikes and ramps of volcanic materials radiating from the peaks. These lands are striking for their beauty and are also very valuable for wildlife habitat.

Since 1977, the Spanish Peaks have been included on the National Registry of Natural Landmarks, and the State of Colorado has designated them as a natural area. The Forest Service first reviewed them for possible wilderness designation as part of its second roadless area review and evaluation and first recommended them for wilderness in 1979. However, the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1980 instead provided for their continued management as a wilderness study area—a status that was continued on an interim basis by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Spanish Peaks are a very special part of Colorado. Their inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System has been too long delayed. In fact, I had hoped that designation of this area as wilderness would be completed last year. The House did pass a Spanish Peaks wilderness bill sponsored by my predecessor, Representative David Skaggs, and Representative MCINNIS after it was favorably reported by the Resources Committee. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on that measure.

So, I am very appreciative of the persistence shown by Representative MCINNIS as well as the good work of Chairman YOUNG and Subcommittee Chairman CHENOWETH, and the leadership of Representative MILLER of California and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. SMITH. As a new Member of the Committee, I am very glad to have been able to work with them to bring us to where we are today with this bill.

This bill does differ from last year's Skaggs-McInnis bill in a few respects, and in particular by the exclusion from wilderness of an old road, known as the Bulls Eye Mine Road, and the inclusion of language related to that road.

Because some questions have been raised about the scope and effect of that language, contained in subsection 3(1), I thought it was important to provide a further explanation of how that subsection would or would not affect management of this area. Accordingly, I greatly appreciate the assistance of the gentleman from American Samoa in engaging my colleague from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS, in a brief colloquy regarding that part of the bill. This colloquy is an important part of the legislative history of this bill.

As was mentioned earlier during debate on this bill, its passage is an appropriate step in recognition of the recent 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Wilderness Act. As a strong supporter of protecting wilderness—and particularly of protecting our wilderness areas in Colorado—I hope that this is only the first of several Colorado wilderness bills that will come before the House in the months ahead.

Already, the Resources Committee has approved a bill that, among other things, would

designate additional wilderness in the area of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison. And currently pending before the Committee are two wilderness bills I have introduced, dealing with the James Peak area and with lands within Rocky Mountain National Park, as well as a very important bill by our colleague Ms. DEGETTE that breaks important new ground in terms of protecting wilderness areas on public lands in Colorado managed by the Bureau of Land Management. In my opinion, all these measures deserve priority consideration in our Committee and here on the floor of the House.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I again thank both the gentleman from American Samoa and my colleague, Mr. MCINNIS, for their cooperation, and am glad to join in support of the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R.898.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1619) to amend the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 to expand the boundaries of the Corridor, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1619

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Reauthorization Act of 1999''.

(b) REFERENCE.—Whenever in this Act a section or other provision is amended or repealed, such amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–449; 16 U.S.C. 461 note).

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Section 102 of the Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts'' after ''State of Connecticut'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) through (9) as paragraphs (2) through (8), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''New Haven,'' after ''Hartford,''.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR; PURPOSE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 103(a) of the Act is amended by inserting ''and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts'' after ''State of Connecticut''.

(b) PURPOSE.—Section 103(b) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

''(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this title to provide assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their units of local and regional government and citizens in the development and implementation of integrated natural, cultural, historic, scenic, recreational, land, and other resource management programs in order to retain, enhance, and interpret the significant features of the lands, water, structures, and history of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley.''.

SEC. 4. BOUNDARIES AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) BOUNDARIES.—Section 104(a) of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting ''Union,'' after ''Thompson,''; and

(2) by inserting after ''Woodstock'' the following: ''in the State of Connecticut, and the towns of Brimfield, Charlton, Dudley, E. Brookfield, Holland, Oxford, Southbridge, Sturbridge, and Webster in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which are contiguous areas in the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley, related by shared natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources''.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(b) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) The Corridor shall be managed by the management entity in accordance with the management plan, in consultation with the Governor and pursuant to a compact with the Secretary.

''(B) The management entity shall amend its by-laws to add the Governor of Connecticut (or the Governor's designee) and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (or the Governor's designee) as a voting members of its Board of Directors.

''(C) The management entity shall provide the Governor with an annual report of its activities, programs, and projects. An annual report prepared for any other purpose shall satisfy the requirements of this paragraph.

''(2) COMPACT.—To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a compact with the management entity. The compact shall include information relating to the objectives and management of the Corridor, including, but not limited to, each of the following:

''(A) A delineation of the boundaries of the Corridor.

''(B) A discussion of goals and objectives of the Corridor, including an explanation of the proposed approaches to accomplishing the goals set forth in the management plan.

''(C) A description of the role of the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

''(3) AUTHORITIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—For the purpose of achieving the goals set forth in the management plan, the management entity may use Federal funds provided under this Act—

''(A) to make grants to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

''(B) to enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

''(C) to hire and compensate staff; and

''(D) to contract for goods and services.

''(4) PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The management entity may not use Federal funds received under this Act to acquire real property or any interest in real property.''.

SEC. 5. STATES CORRIDOR PLAN.

Section 105 of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b);

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (a);

(3) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking the first sentence and all that follows through ''Governor,'' and inserting the following: ''The management entity shall implement the management plan. Upon request of the management entity,''; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking ''identified pursuant to the inventory required by section 5(a)(1)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) GRANTS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—For the purposes of implementing the management plan, the management entity may make grants or provide technical assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other persons to further the goals set forth in the management plan.''.

SEC. 6. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

Section 106 of the Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Governor'' each place it appears and inserting ''management entity'';

(B) by striking ''preparation and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: ''Such assistance shall include providing funds authorized under section 109 and technical assistance necessary to carry out this Act.''; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may not make any grants or provide any assistance under this Act after September 30, 2009.''.

SEC. 7. DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 107 of the Act is amended by striking ''Governor'' and inserting ''management entity''.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

Section 108 of the Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period the following: ''and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts''.

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period the following: ''and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts'';

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking ''each of'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''the Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments, the Windham Regional Council of Governments, and the Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments in Connecticut, (or their successors), and the Pioneer Valley Regional Planning Commission and the Southern Worcester County Regional Planning Commission (or their successors) in Massachusetts.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) The term 'management plan' means the document approved by the Governor of the State of Connecticut on February 16, 1999, and adopted by the management entity, entitled 'Vision to Reality: A Management Plan', the management plan for the Corridor, as it may be amended or replaced from time to time.

''(7) The term 'management entity' means Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation (or its successor) incorporated in the State of Connecticut.''.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 109 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 109. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated under this title not more than $1,000,000 for any fiscal year. Not more than a total of $10,000,000 may be appropriated for the Corridor under this title after the date of the enactment of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Reauthorization Act of 1999.

''(b) 50 PERCENT MATCH.—Federal funding provided under this title may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of any assistance or grant provided or authorized under this title.''.

SEC. 10. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) LONG TITLE.—The long title of the Act is amended to read as follows: ''An Act to establish the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley

National Heritage Corridor in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.''.

*(b) HEADING.—The heading for section 110 of the Act is amended by striking ''**service**'' and inserting ''**system**''.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1619 amends the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 by expanding the boundaries of the Corridor.

Specifically, this bill authorizes the expansion of the Corridor into the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Corridor currently is wholly contained within the State of Connecticut. These river valleys contain significant natural and historical resources, including scenic vistas, archaeological sites, and recreational opportunity.

As a college student, I canoed down through this river. It is a beautiful river valley.

□ 1530

The bill, as amended, assures that both the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of Connecticut remain involved in the management of the corridor. Furthermore, the legislation provides for a sunset of the funding and assistance from the Federal Government which may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of that assistance or grant.

This bill has local and State support and is also supported by the administration. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1619, as amended.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend first the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) for their sponsorship of this legislation. I also want to commend the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, for their sponsorship and support of this legislation; and definitely both the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee, for their support.

Mr. Speaker, the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor is an 850-square-mile area, including more than 25 towns, along the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers in Northeastern Connecticut. The area includes lush woodlands, clean rivers and streams, as well as many historically and culturally significant sites. This corridor has been referred to as the ''last green valley'' in the area between Boston and Washington.

The 103rd Congress designated the area as a National Heritage Corridor. None of the land within the corridor is federally owned but the designation has allowed the National Park Service to provide important technical assistance, coordination and funding to what began, and has continued to be, a grassroots effort to preserve this area and to educate people about its importance.

Mr. Speaker, a management plan for the corridor, approved by the Governor of Connecticut, was adopted earlier this year and a private, nonprofit organization has been designated to implement the plan.

The bill, H.R. 1619, sponsored, as I said earlier, by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) would reauthorize the corridor and extend its reach in the process. This legislation would add several counties in Massachusetts to the corridor and amend the original enabling legislation to reflect adoption of the management plan. Importantly, this measure was amended by the Committee on Resources to increase oversight of the corridor's management entity.

Mr. Speaker, creation of this heritage corridor has led to important educational and preservation efforts. It has worked so well, in fact, that another State now wants to be included. This bill, H.R. 1619, would allow more people to experience and benefit from the beauty and history of this area. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 1619 along with Congressman NEAL, I rise in strong support of this measure. I would like to begin by thanking Chairmen YOUNG and HANSEN and Ranking Members MILLER and ROMERO-BARCELÓ and their staffs for their support in moving this legislation through the Committee process. I truly appreciate their efforts.

The bill before us today represents a consensus reached between residents of Connecticut and Massachusetts to expand the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor. The new communities in Massachusetts and Connecticut are linked to the existing 25 towns in the Corridor by geography, history, culture and, most importantly, the rivers they share.

The bill before us today has been slightly modified from the measure Congressman Neal an I introduced in late April. I am pleased to report that the amended version has the support of the National Park Service, the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts, the management authority and citizens in both states.

The bill expands the boundary of the Corridor to include Union, Connecticut and the towns of Brimfield, Charlton, Dudley, E. Brookfield, Holland, Oxford, Southbridge, Sturbridge, and Webster, Massachusetts. It designates a local, nonprofit entity—Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc.—as the management entity. It provides a continuing role for the Governors of Connecticut and Massachusetts in Corridor management. Finally, the measure increases federal support for the Corridor.

I believe the increase in funding is reasonable. It would provide the necessary funds to expand programs into the new communities in Massachusetts and Connecticut. It would also bring the Quinebaug and Shetucket in line with other Corridors created since 1996. The National Park Service has also supported the increase in testimony before the subcommittee on Parks and Public Lands.

I want to note that this bill does not change the non-regulatory nature of the Corridor. Land use and zoning regulations will remain completely under the control of local governments. Moreover, the management entity does not have the authority to purchase land with federal funds. Land will remain in private hands and local residents will continue to chart the region's direction. The Corridor has always been, and continues to be, a mechanism for organizing many efforts to achieve common goals.

The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers National Heritage Corridor is a nationally significant resource which deserves continued federal support. The Corridor has proven to be successful over the last four years in preserving cultural, natural and historic resources and in promoting to better understanding of the importance of this region to our country. Passing this legislation today will allow citizens in Connecticut and Massachusetts to build on this record of success.

I urge my colleagues would join me in voting in support of H.R. 1619.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an extremely worthwhile piece of legislation, the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Reauthorization Act of 1999, House Resolution 1619. H.R. 1619 expands the boundaries of this National Heritage Corridor by ten towns, nine of which are in my home state of Massachusetts. I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. GEJDENSON for his tireless efforts on behalf of this bill.

The Quinebaug and Shetucket region's history and significance begins with the Native Americans, as it was largely a frontier zone between tribes. European settlement began in the late 1650s, and the area soon became a center of fiscal, religious, and political radicalism. The Industrial Revolution began on a small scale here, with water powered textile structures on lesser streams and as a spillover from the adjoining Blackstone Valley. However, the latter half of the nineteenth century saw the construction of the great mills that characterize the valley. Staffed by immigrants from Europe and Canada, these factories were the region's prime economic engine.

However, the twentieth century brought steady declines of the textile industry, leaving many formerly busy mills empty or only marginally used. Thus, the region entered a long period of economic recession and the need to

develop a more diversified economy, a condition that brings us to the present day.

The region into which we wish to expand this Heritage Corridor is clearly both culturally and environmentally part of ''the Last Green Valley.'' The expansion area shares a history, a desire to protect resources and a view to economic revitalization. The mill towns and farmland offer residents and visitors a special view into the American experience and allow them to explore New England's agrarian and industrial past.

Environmental protection is one of the most important tasks facing the American people as we go forth into the new millennium. As such, the goal of this legislation is to develop and implement natural, cultural, historic, scenic, recreational, land and other resource management programs. The purpose is to retain and enhance the significant features of lands, water, structures, and history of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley. The National Heritage Corridor designation allows local governments and grassroots organizations to carry out their visions for a healthier, more sustainable society. As always, the delicate balance between environmental protection and economic growth is at the heart of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor.

Since the authorization of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor in 1994, the State of Connecticut, via the Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc., has worked efficiently under a constrained budget by combining the financial resources of the public and private sectors. As a result, the economic aspect of the Corridor has been as successful as the environmental protection programs. The Corridor Commission has been able to match federal funds at a ratio of 12:1. The Commission and its partners have revitalized Industrial Revolution era mills, enhanced greenways and waterways, and have increased preservation of open space and wildlife habitats, resulting in an increase in tourism. The proximity of the Corridor to the major metropolitan areas of Springfield, Worcester, Boston, Hartford, Providence, and New York City serves as further evidence that this expansion is an economically viable venture.

In order to ensure that the projects selected reflect the needs and desires of the states, the Corridor Commission Board of Directors will include voting members from the offices of the Governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut. The Commission will also be linked to, and under the guidance of, the Secretary of the Interior via a compact.

Mr. Speaker, the most important people involved in the environmental and historical preservation process are the locals. These are the people involved in the actual work that our legislation authorizes. I would like my colleagues to understand that the local governments and local business along the Corridor are in overwhelming support of this legislation. I have received numerous calls from businessmen and women looking for ways to get involved and the Boards of Selectmen of the affected towns have been pressing the issue in their town halls. The people have spoken out and they are in favor of the Corridor Expansion.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that we in Massachusetts are not stepping on the toes of our Connecticut neighbors. The members of the Massachusetts State Heritage Corridor Commission have been working with their successful counterparts from Connecticut for a long time now. The two groups have come to an understanding and are looking forward to working together. In order for the Corridor Expansion to be a success, the experience of those on the Connecticut side must be utilized.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to thank Mr. GEJDENSON for all of his work, and I would like to thank the members of the Corridor Commission who have been the driving force behind this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1619, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the six bills just considered.

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

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY FRIENDLY TELEVISION PROGRAMMING

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 184) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance of ''family friendly'' programming on television.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 184

Whereas American children and adolescents spend between 22 and 28 hours per week viewing television;

Whereas American homes have an average of 2.75 television sets, and 87 percent of homes with children have more than one television set;

Whereas there is a need to increase the availability programs suitable for the entire family during prime time viewing hours;

Whereas surveys of television content demonstrate that many programs contain substantial sexual or violent content;

Whereas although parents are ultimately responsible for appropriately supervising their children's television viewing, it is also important to provide positive, ''family friendly'' programming that is suitable for parents and children to watch together;

Whereas efforts should be made by television networks, studios, and the production community to produce more quality family friendly programs and to air them during times when parents and children are likely to be viewing together;

Whereas members of the Family Friendly Programming Forum are concerned about the availability of family friendly television programs during prime time viewing hours; and

Whereas Congress encourages activities by the Forum and other entities designed to promote family friendly programming, including—

(1) participating in meetings with leadership of major television networks, studios, and production companies to express concerns;

(2) expressing the importance of family friendly programming at industry conferences, meetings, and forums;

(3) honoring outstanding family friendly television programs with a new tribute, the Family Program Awards, to be held annually in Los Angeles, California;

(4) establishing a development fund to finance family friendly scripts; and

(5) underwriting scholarships at television studies departments at institutions of higher education to encourage student interest in family friendly programming: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes and honors the efforts of the Family Friendly Programming Forum and other entities supporting family friendly programming;

(2) supports efforts to encourage television networks, studios, and the production community to produce more quality family friendly programs;

(3) supports the proposed Family Friendly Programming Awards, development fund, and scholarships, all of which are designed to encourage, recognize, and celebrate creative excellence in, and commitment to, family friendly programming; and

(4) encourages the media and American advertisers to further a family friendly television environment within which appropriate advertisements can accompany the programming.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and insert extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is also a statement on behalf of the Members of this body that we expect better television programming than perhaps what is being offered today to our children and our families to survive the ratings battle. The broadcast networks do spend a considerable amount of time trying to develop sound, family-friendly programming that consumers will watch. Unfortunately, all too often this type of

programming does not receive the high ratings necessary to keep those series on the air. This is unfortunate, but the networks should not give up hope or stop trying to improve the quality of their TV offerings.

I am pleased that the House today has an opportunity to consider H. Con. Res. 184. I am hopeful that the other body will soon offer a companion resolution. I would also like to acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for bringing this issue to the attention of the Committee on Commerce. I am also hopeful that the Committee on Commerce members will have an opportunity to consider the impact of media outlets on the culture of the Nation in the near future.

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and for all the effort he has put into this and for coming to the floor today to support it. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the Committee on Commerce staff for allowing us to have this resolution come to the floor today in an expedited manner.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) to introduce House Concurrent Resolution 184. The resolution is pretty straightforward. It recognizes the importance, as the gentleman from Michigan has said, of family-friendly television programming and the specific contributions of a new group called the Family Friendly Programming Forum and the efforts they are undertaking to make this goal a reality.

Recent events have intensified a national debate on child development and particularly the influence of popular culture on our children. We cannot overlook the important role that television plays in shaping the attitudes and the outlook of our Nation's young people. Studies show that on average children will watch between 22 and 28 hours of television every week which in many cases, Mr. Speaker, is about the same amount of time they spend in school.

And television is not only a powerful influence, unfortunately it is too often a negative one. Let us be clear. Parents should always have the final responsibility for regulating their children's viewing habits. But the simple fact remains that the number of family-friendly programs available, particularly during prime time, has been declining. Parents are looking for more programs that are appropriate for them to watch together with their children.

This resolution specifically supports the work of the Forum, an organization of 33 of the Nation's very largest advertisers who have recognized this unmet need in the marketplace.

The argument is sometimes made that family-friendly programs do not draw big ratings, that advertisers will not support them and that, therefore, networks cannot afford to carry them. The work of the Family Friendly Programming Forum is changing this perception. The major advertisers who are members of the Forum are taking specific steps, including a new annual awards program that recognizes excellence in family-friendly programming, the first of which took place in Beverly Hills, California just last week. The Forum is also making a financial commitment. It has established a development fund to finance family-friendly scripts. It is underwriting university scholarships to encourage students' interest in writing family-friendly programming. The Forum is also conducting a series of public awareness events, campaigns around the country, to encourage families to seek out new options during prime time.

Mr. Speaker, family-friendly does not mean dull. Good programming over the years, such as the 1999 Family Friendly Programming Forum Lifetime Achievement award winner ''The Cosby Show'' and the long-running ''Home Improvement'' demonstrates that television programming can be both appropriate and enjoyable for the entire family and very successful. There is a market for good programming of this type. Frankly, the statement made by the advertising community through this forum about their interest in this kind of programming is to me very significant.

Mr. Speaker, as a father of three, I am all too well aware of the powerful influence that television programming can have on our kids and the need for more programming we can enjoy as a family. While Congress cannot and should not tell the television networks what programming to air, we can and should support efforts like the Forum's constructive, free market approach to promoting family-friendly television. That is what this resolution is all about. By passing it at the beginning of the school year as we are doing, we as a Congress are making an important statement about the need for more suitable programming on our Nation's airwaves for all Americans.

I commend the Family Friendly Programming Forum and the goals they are advancing. I urge adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 184.

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

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

I begin by complimenting, praising the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), who is the principal author of this resolution. I thank him for asking me to be his coauthor. This is without question an important statement for the Congress to make. After all, we do spend a considerable amount of time here in Congress criticizing the impact which the media have upon the culture of our country, especially as it impacts the children in our society, so I think that as the Family Friendly Programming Forum begins a process of trying to encourage positive, family-friendly television, that we should praise them.

This resolution does four things: First, it recognizes and it honors the efforts of the Family Friendly Programming Forum and other entities supporting family-friendly programming. Secondly, it supports efforts to encourage television networks, studios and production communities to produce more quality family-friendly programs. Third, it supports the proposed Family Friendly Programming Awards, development fund, and scholarships, all of which are designed to encourage, recognize and celebrate creative excellence in, and commitment to, family-friendly programming. And, fourth, it encourages the media and American advertisers to further a family-friendly television environment within which an appropriate advertisement campaign can accompany the appropriate programming.

Now, this Family Friendly Programming Forum is a project of the National Association of Advertisers, which includes some of our Nation's largest companies: General Motors, Procter & Gamble, Wendy's, Coca-Cola, Bell Atlantic, Gillette and others. These companies are the life's blood of free, over-the-air television, because, of course, without advertising from these large companies, there can be no television because there would be no advertising that the networks would use in order to fund the production of programs that are run on every single community in our country. These network ads are critically important to the cable industry and to the satellite industry as well, and as a result they have tremendous leverage over the television industry in general, whether it be broadcast, cable or satellite. And so we should all applaud this effort.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) has, I think, done an enormous favor to each of us in bringing this resolution out because it will give us a chance to go on record in support of the kinds of initiatives that we would like to see large American corporations undertake to use their leverage in order to stem the trend towards more sex, more violence, lowering of standards, increasing the tsunami of words and images that assault the minds of young children in our country.

Now, this is a huge breakthrough. Back in 1993, I attempted to have a hearing on this issue, inviting the largest advertisers to come to Congress to discuss it. At the time, only AT&T was willing to come forward to discuss a strategy by which these largest corporations would advance this kind of a cause. So it is heartening indeed to see this broad coalition today come together. I think that the more that we come to realize that these advertisers have this clout as the broadcasters attempt to attract large audiences in influencing the kind of programming that is played on the air, that we are

going to have the kind of influence that we would like to see, and, as the gentleman from Ohio said, private sector initiated, advertisers pressuring, encouraging broadcasters to do the right thing, because they, that is, those advertisers, want to be associated with the right thing, with that kind of programming.

□ 1545

As the Family Friendly Forum states in their mission statement: we support a wide range of programming options, and we will continue to advertise on shows that appeal to different target audiences, but we want to ensure the existence of a family-friendly television environment, particularly in the early evening time period.

And most importantly, they are establishing a development fund to finance TV scripts, underwriting scholarships for students interested in exploring family-friendly programming, and granting awards for excellence in this area. They held their first awards ceremony just last Thursday, as the gentleman from Ohio pointed out. It is something that should be applauded and encouraged.

The WB Network has already taken up the challenge. In August, WB CEO Jamie Kellner and Andrea Alstrup, vice president of advertising for Johnson & Johnson, on behalf of the Forum agreed to identify writers to produce new scripts that will entertain and engage family audiences.

As my colleagues know, the V-Chip is an important device to have built into TV sets, and by the beginning of next year, that is, January of the year 2000, every television set that is sold in the United States will have a V-chip built into it. We sell 25 million TV sets a year in the United States. But the V-chip is really only a way by which parents, in programming it, can block out the programming they do not want their children to be exposed to. In no way can the V-Chip put good programming on the air.

What is happening here, what is being encouraged by the advertisers of the United States, is encouragement given to the networks, to the cable industry, to the satellite industry to put good programming on that parents can sit their children down in front of with the parent sitting there with them and watch as a family. It is something that should be encouraged. It is something that this resolution, I think, correctly identifies as just the kind of trend that we should be encouraging here in the Congress.

I want to again congratulate my friend from Ohio.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I rise in support of this resolution. I have long been an advocate for more family-friendly programming on television. American children spend much of their time each week in front of a TV, and it is important that at least some of the programs available to them are devoid of the gratuitous sex and violence that so frequently pollute prime TV. I really believe the sponsors should not be allowed their advertising deduction when they sponsor programming which is clearly over the line for family audiences. We in the House should be encouraging the television industry to clean up its act, and I am happy to support this resolution today.

Again, I thank the gentleman for having yielded this time to me.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because it encourages TV networks, studios, and the production community to produce more quality family programs. In a time of extreme violence and graphic situations on television, I am proud to support this measure. We need to encourage any voluntary efforts by the entertainment industry to clean up prime time TV.

Traditionally, prime time television was concentrated in the early portion of the evening TV schedule—7 or 8 pm. During this time, families would watch television together, usually with dinner or shortly thereafter while the children were still awake. The programming that was aired during these hours focused on the family unit.

Recently, this trend has changed dramatically. Most of the networks do not air any family programming at this time, or such programming has been limited to certain nights of the week, such as Sunday. Gone are the days of an entire family sitting around the television set.

The traditional family programming has been replaced with violence, sexual situations and profanity. Thankfully, the industry's internal system of checks and balances has weighed heavily in favor of the family's return to prime time.

The Family Friendly Programming Forum, established this year by 30 advertisers, encourages the networks to develop family friendly programming for families to view together. In addition to encouraging more family friendly programming through advertising revenues, the Forum will establish a special fund to finance scripts written for such programming.

The Forum will also establish a scholarship program to encourage student interest in family friendly programming. Such efforts will send a powerful message to television producers, network executives and other advertisers that consumers deserve better programming for their families and that advertisers will be more selective in sponsoring certain programs.

I support this effort because families deserve to have a time to sit and watch television together. Parents should ultimately maintain control over the television and what programs are acceptable in the home, but the networks do have some responsibility to promote a more positive alternative to the sex and violence currently seen in prime time.

Advertisers are in the unique position to provide that internal check—advertising dollars that can send the message that parents want more programming geared for family viewing. I strongly support internal industry checks on television content and I support the efforts of the Family Friendly Programming Forum. I urge my Colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time either, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H.Con.Res. 184.

The question was taken.

Mr. UPTON. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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 International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein during the calendar year 1998. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 79–264; 22 U.S.C. 287b).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 13, 1999.*

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I do want to take this time simply to point out that the minority was not told until a very few minutes ago that these motions were going to be made at

this time today. We are in the situation where several of our ranking subcommittee members are not on the floor because they did not know this motion was going to be made. I do not think it is quite fair to them to proceed under this kind of a situation.

I recognize it is not the fault of the gentleman from New Mexico, so I will not object; and we have no interest in delaying the action of the House, but I would simply ask that in the future, action be taken to make certain that the minority is made aware in a timely fashion of the intent to make these motions at a time so that we can be prepared as quickly as possible in making the correct motions.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

□ 1600

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I share the same approach that the gentleman has because we were given the word at exactly about the same time that he had it. Thank God the word finally got here, but it certainly puts a lot of folks in a position of not knowing that it was coming on the floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would simply say to the leadership of the House, we are trying to be cooperative on this committee on both sides. It is pretty hard to cooperate if we don't have prior notice.

The gentleman has indicated he hasn't had that notice either, and I think that's equally unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the House and Senate on H.R. 1906, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY 2000, be instructed to provide maximum funding, within the scope of conference, for food safety programs at the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I will not take very long. The situation is very simple. The House bill is $15 million above the Senate bill for the Department of Agriculture's food and safety inspection service programs, and it is $5 million above the Senate bill for FDA food safety initiatives. We believe the public has a right to have total confidence in the safety of its food supply. It certainly, in some instances unfortunately, does not have that to date. We think that the numbers in the bill will be at least minimally affected in increasing our ability to assure a safe food supply for the American public and would urge, therefore, that the conferees be instructed to provide the higher of the two numbers in each account in order to do the maximum that is allowable under rules, given the difference in scope between the two bills, to assure that food safety is the highest priority in the bill as it comes back from conference.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the gentleman that I support his effort and have no quarrel whatever with the work. I think this is the time that we should work toward the goal of taking care of the matters attendant to the field of agriculture, and to get it done as quickly as possible because it has been sitting there fermenting for quite some time.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will name the conferees at a later time.

THE REASON FOR CONFUSION IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in case people are wondering what is happening here, why the House looks so disorganized, it is for the following reason: Those of us on the Minority on the Appropriations Committee have been working with the Majority on the committee all today under the assumption that we would have a common understanding about what the schedule would be for the remainder of the day, and we had expected one and perhaps at most two motions would be made to go to conference on appropriation bills.

We were trying to cooperate with the Majority in making sure that that went smoothly on the matters that we understood might come before us. Then what happened is that evidently the House leadership decided it wanted to make a unilateral decision to have motions on five different appropriation bills. The problem is that the Majority on the Committee on Appropriations did not know that that was going to happen and neither did the Minority. In my view, that is a lousy way to run a railroad. The House is running around here now looking confused because it is confused.

It just seems to me that there is no particular purpose to be served in rushing to conference on these bills when neither side even understood that we were going to be doing that. I am still trying to cooperate under these circumstances, but I would ask the House leadership that if we cannot do this in an orderly fashion for some of the remaining bills that we simply deal with it tomorrow morning, if we run out of bills that we can handle in a rational fashion, because otherwise we are simply stumbling around here. And in the process, we will be denying Members the opportunity to debate questions which I know Members wanted to debate on at least two of the bills that are coming up today.

Members did not know this would be happening before they got back, and I think the leadership has an obligation to avoid situations like that.

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 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 5 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2605, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VISCLOSKY moves that in resolving the difference between the House and Senate, the

managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2605, be instructed to insist on the higher funding levels for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works program included in the House-passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I bring this motion to instruct conferees to the House floor today and would argue four points on its behalf.

First of all, I again would want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the staff on both sides and members of the subcommittee because I think we in the House have put together a very good work product. I would hope that we collectively in the House could protect our prerogatives during the conference.

I would, first of all, point out as far as water projects that are important as far as the economic viability and future of this country, as well as to individual Members and their constituencies, our figure is $454 million over the Senate figure.

Because of the misallocation between the two bodies, there is a $1.2 billion difference between the House and Senate versions. And, essentially, if we factor that $400 million in, the differential as far as protecting Members' interest is about 1.6. So I think it is very important that we make the point today to the other body that we want to hold firm to protect the economic infrastructure of this country and Members' prerogatives.

Secondly, since this House passed the bill to the other body, the Water Resources and Development Act has been signed into law and that has placed even more demand as far as the limited resources we have.

The third point I would make is that, even with the higher water figure in the House, we are $320 million under what the Corps' capability is if we would fund all of the Corps' capability and projects on the boards.

Those include such important economic improvement such as harbor dredging, commercial and navigation as far as our economic infrastructure, including flood control to prevent the loss of life and property damage. It includes environmental restoration. And we have some major projects in the proposal of the beach nourishment. We recently had tropical storms and hurricanes devastate portions of the United States.

Finally, the important issue of water supply. I would close this portion of my remarks by simply saying again, given the misallocation and higher allocation with the other body, given their preponderance to oversubscribe for Department of Energy programs, I would want to protect the prerogatives of this institution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has made I think very substantive points on his motion, and I support his motion without exception to instruct conferees.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PACKARD, ROGERS, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, CALLAHAN, LATHAM, BLUNT, YOUNG of Florida, VISCLOSKY, EDWARDS, PASTOR, FORBES, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2561, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2561, be instructed to insist on:

Section 8113 of the House bill providing $50,000,000 to enhance United States defense capabilities against domestic terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction, and on Section 8114 of the House bill providing $150,000,000 to improve the protection of Department of Defense computer systems from non-authorized access.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to be here alone on this question today. I regret that because of the surprise nature of the consideration of these issues that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) was not able to be here to deal with the agriculture bill that was brought before us.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) had no notice either of the intention of the House to deal with the State, Justice, Commerce bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) is in the same situation with respect to the Defense appropriations bill.

Let me say that this motion to instruct is very simple. It asks the Congress to think about the kind of threats that we will face in the future, not the kind of threats that we have faced in the past. We must be mindful of the latter, but we must be even more alert to the former.

It seems to me that we have to recognize the fact that one of the largest dangers to our security interests over coming years will be a threat that comes from potential terrorist attacks using chemical and biological and other different kinds of weapons that are traditionally thought of when one thinks of war.

As we move more and more into an electronics age, as we are more and more both aided by and imprisoned by computers, we need to recognize the fact that there is a substantial security risk to this country on the part of persons who can weave their way into our own computers, not just at DOD but other agencies across Government.

So this motion simply asks that the higher amounts that are within scope in the conference on these items be approved so that we do whatever it is possible to do to the maximum given the nature of the bills before us to enhance our security against terrorist attacks and to enhance our ability to defend against computer hackers.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that he is never here on the floor alone when he and I have an opportunity to work on behalf of the American public together.

In the meantime, the motion of the gentleman is a good one. It is not controversial. We are pleased to accept it on our sides.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEWIS of California, YOUNG of Florida, SKEEN, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, DICKEY, FRELINGHUYSEN, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, DIXON, VISCLOSKY, MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that in resolving the difference between the House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2670, be instructed to insist on the higher funding levels for programs related to embassy security included in the House-passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, what is at issue here is what level of funding we ought to provide to do our dead-level best to provide security arrangements for our various embassies around the world. As we very well know, we have had a number of terrorist attacks against those embassies. Many people in our society have a tendency to dismiss State Department officials as being ''stripe pants boys.'' But the fact is that many of them have lost their lives promoting U.S. interests around the world and a number of those lives have been lost in terrorist attacks.

I find it somewhat interesting that the administration seems to be in a position where they are damned if you do and damned if they do not in terms of embassy security.

I remember earlier in the year the House committee held a hearing and at that point demanded that the administration support a higher level of funding for embassy security. The administration requested an additional $314 million in this bill, and the House committee approved $314 million. But then when it got to the Senate, the Senate cut back that number to $110 million.

In my view, the House number is correct. The purpose of this motion is to send a clear signal that the House would prefer to fund the highest level possible given what the spread of the difference is between the House and the Senate on this issue.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. This is a motion that we can agree to. It is not controversial, at least on this side of the Capitol. It may be when we reach the other body.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is correct. After the embassy bombings in Africa, the administration made announcements that they were going to pursue embassy security around the world in a much more vigorous way, something that we agree with here in this subcommittee and I think the full Congress.

□ 1715

But then when the administration sent their budget to the Hill, we looked very quickly to the section dealing with embassy security and maintenance of U.S. missions abroad, and found that there was an absolutely inadequate request. When the Secretary came to testify before the subcommittee, the request, I think, was for $36 million. We told the Secretary that the request was absolutely inadequate, that we had to pay attention to the problems that were being presented to us around the world in the way of threats to our personnel, and we asked her to go back to the White House and to come up with an amended request.

In due course of time, they did just that. And so the request, then, from the administration was amended. They requested an additional $264 million, for a total of $300 million for a security capital construction program. And that is exactly the dollar figure that the subcommittee, the full committee and now the full House included in this appropriation bill. The Senate bill is at $36 million for this program. That is the original request level. The Crowe Commission, named for Admiral Crowe who headed it up, dealing with embassy security, had called for a major investment in new secure embassy facilities. That followed on the heels of many other requests by various commissions down through the years. And so we stand ready to pursue the full House figure. We hope we can convince our colleagues across the Capitol that this level of funding is necessary.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for bringing the matter to the attention of the body, and it is a matter that we can fully agree upon. I urge the adoption of the motion.

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

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

I would simply say in closing that I think this is one point on which there is no difference of opinion between the administration and the House on either side of the aisle in the House. I do think if I were the administration, I would be hard-pressed to follow the conflicting instructions that seem to be coming from the two congressional bodies, with the Senate going in one direction and the House in another, but I think they are going in the right direction on this item with their amended request. I think the House agrees with that. I think this motion to instruct will make it clear to the Senate that we believe they ought to back off and accept the higher number now contained in the administration request.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROGERS, KOLBE, TAYLOR of North Carolina, REGULA, LATHAM, MILLER of Florida, WAMP, YOUNG of Florida, SERRANO, DIXON, MOLLOHAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes: Messrs. SKEEN, WALSH, DICKEY, KINGSTON, NETHERCUTT, BONILLA, LATHAM, Mrs. EMERSON, MR. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DELAURO, and Messrs. HINCHEY, FARR, BOYD and OBEY.

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1802

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2561, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000, WHEN CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY IS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of California moves, pursuant to rule XXII, clause 12 of the House rules, that the conference meetings between the House and the Senate on the bill H.R. 2561, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration; provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have a right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, this motion is nondebatable and must be taken by the yeas and nays.

Members are advised that this vote will be followed by a 15-minute vote and a 5-minute vote on suspensions considered earlier today.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 7, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

YEAS—388

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—7

DeFazio
Gutierrez
Hilliard
Kucinich
Lee
McKinney
Stark

NOT VOTING—38

Barcia
Brown (FL)
Buyer
Carson
Clay
Dooley
Ehlers
Gephardt
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hulshof
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kingston
Lantos
Largent
Linder
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCrery
McIntosh
Meeks (NY)
Moakley
Neal
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Scarborough
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wu

□ 1827

Mr. HILL of Indiana changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 405, I missed the vote due to flight delays on two successive United Airlines flights. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 405. The motion to close proceedings on H.R. 2561, I was unavoidably detained on Midwest Express. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye''.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 658, de novo; and House Concurrent Resolution 184, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

THOMAS COLE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 658, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 6, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—396

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—6

Chenoweth
Coble
Paul
Royce
Sanford
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—31

Barcia
Bliley
Brown (FL)
Carson
Clay
Dooley
Gephardt
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hulshof
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Lantos
Largent
Manzullo
McCrery
McIntosh
Moakley
Neal
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Scarborough
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Taylor (NC)
Wicker
Wu

□ 1846

Mr. SENSENBRENNER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY FRIENDLY TELEVISION PROGRAMMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 184.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 184.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 0, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—396

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

Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—37

Barcia
Bliley
Brown (FL)
Carson
Clay
Dooley
Gephardt
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hulshof
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Lantos
Largent
Manzullo
McCrery
Meehan
Moakley
Neal
Ortiz
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Scarborough
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Spratt
Taylor (NC)
Weiner
Wicker
Wu
Wynn

□ 1856

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the threat of Hurricane Floyd to South Florida I found it necessary to stay in my district to attend to the needs of my constituents. However, I wish to be recorded as a ''yes'' vote on the motion to close the conference on H.R. 2561, the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Appropriations bill due to national security reasons. I also wish to be recorded as a ''yes'' vote on H. Con. Res. 184 and H.R. 658.

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.

ENHANCING INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, citizens chronically complain about the state of America's public capital, about dilapidated school buildings, condemned highway bridges, contaminated water supplies, and other shortcomings of the public infrastructure.

In addition to inflicting inconvenience and endangering health, the inadequacy of public infrastructure adversely affects productivity and the growth of our economy. Public investment, private investment, and productivity are intimately linked.

For more than two decades, Washington has retreated from public investment as the costs of entitlements and of the interest payable on rapidly rising debt have mounted.

State and local governments, albeit to a lesser extent, have also slowed investments. Their taxpayers were frequently reluctant to approve bond issues to finance the infrastructure.

Whereas, in the early 1970s, non-defense public investment accounted for 3.2 percent of GDP, it now accounts for only 2.5 percent. That is a huge loss. Widespread neglect of maintenance has contributed substantially to the failure of the stock of public capital assets to keep pace with the Nation's needs.

□ 1900

For instance, the real nondefense public capital stock expanded in the past two decades at a pace only half that set earlier in the post-World War II period.

Evidence of failures to maintain and improve infrastructure is seen every day in such problems as unsafe bridges, urban decay, dilapidated and overcrowded schools, and inadequate airports. A General Accounting Office study finds that education is seriously handicapped by deteriorating school buildings and that an investment of $110 billion is needed to bring them up to minimally acceptable.

The problems take a toll in less visible and perhaps even more important ways, in unsatisfactory gains in private sector productivity and a diminished rise in real income for the Nation at large. Seemingly endless traffic jams, disruptions to commuter service and backed-up airport runways, everyday experiences for Americans, spell waste and inefficiency for the economy at large. Congestion on the Nation's highways alone costs the Nation over $100 billion a year according to the Competitiveness Policy Council estimate. That estimate does not include the cost of added pollution and the wear and tear on vehicles.

This legislation is designed to help the Nation take a significant step both toward overcoming its infrastructure debt and promoting the productivity needed to meet the competitive challenges of the 21st century.

The plan is fiscally sound. It follows the best accounting procedures of the private sector and is designed to recognize the statutes that mandate a balanced Federal budget. In salient ways, it advances sound fiscal operation. The plan would provide $50 billion a year for mortgage loans to State and local governments for capital investment in types of projects specified by Congress and the President. These mortgage loans would be at zero interest. They would thereby cut the overall cost of projects about in half, depending on the prevailing interest rates, for State and local taxpayers.

We have a plan, the opportunity to rebuild and maintain our infrastructure for the 21st century. By using an innovative and logical approach to sound public financing without debt and without huge interest payments.

IMMIGRATION RESTRUCTURING AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 1999 that I have offered along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and others.

Partly this discussion this evening is prompted by a very effective hearing, field hearing, that was held today that I just came from in Chicago, Illinois, called by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and attended by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and myself, the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

What I was most struck by is the consensus of all those who had gathered that this is a Nation of laws but it is also a Nation of immigrants. We all have come from somewhere. And we all stand willing and waiting, if you will, to be patriotic and to love this country if given the opportunity. In fact, one of the statements made by the witnesses was that many immigrants and most of them come to this land for a better way of life. We heard testimony from

very outstanding members of the Illinois delegation, Democrats and Republicans, we heard testimony from district constituency workers of Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, and we heard testimony from the INS regional director. Sadly, however, much of the commentary was about the ills of the INS, the difficulties in getting service, the difficulties in getting the right answers, the difficulties in the timeliness of the responses, the long lines. I was very gratified to hear by the INS regional director, however, that he was struck by these complaints, and of course, had been working over the last couple of months to remedy the concerns that had been expressed. He offered on behalf of his staff a genuine interest to work with congressional offices but most importantly to do the taxpayers' business, and, that is, to do the very best task that he might be able to do.

I believe, however, that he needs additional assistance. And one of the points that was made is that we should not throw money, good money, if you will, after bad. We should not throw money at a problem and yet not be able to fix its very infrastructure. And so the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 1999, I believe, offers real reform.

Americans, I think, in their heart of hearts appreciate the fact that this is a Nation that welcomes immigrants in order to have a better way of life. We realize that we support and our Constitution and our laws support legal immigration, not illegal immigration. In order to do that, we must encourage those who seek to go through the processes, the legal processes, we must expedite that process, we must not penalize and be punitive, we must not be negative, we must not characterize immigrants as people who are taking and not giving, deadbeats who are not willing to contribute to this society. I could list a whole litany of contributions that immigrants throughout the years and ages have given to this Nation. And all of us stand in a position that we can claim some contribution to this Nation.

The Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 1999 does several things. We restructure and reorganize the immigration function within the Department of Justice through the creation of a fair, effective and efficient National Immigration Bureau, the NIB. Such a bureau is urgently needed, given both the importance of this entity's mission, the hundreds of thousands of people, of family members who are already citizens within this country and in the international community and the size of the agency which is larger than five current Cabinet agencies. We need to establish the INS not as an agency but as a bureau to separate the enforcement and adjudication functions of the Federal immigration function. The goal of such separation is to lead to more clarity of mission and greater accountability which in turn will lead to more efficient adjudications and more accountable, consistent, effective and professional enforcement to create strong centralized leadership for integrated policymaking and implementation.

Coordination is a key. In order to fulfill this new agency's important responsibilities, a single voice is needed at the top to coordinate policy matters and interpret complex laws in both enforcement and adjudications. We must also emphasize that the INS, now named INS, I hope the NIB, key goal is service. There is an enforcement responsibility and we all know the tragedy of the Resendez-Ramirez case, the alleged serial killer, we want to end that as well by giving the enforcement aspect the tools that it needs to ensure that illegal and also criminal aliens do not make it into the United States, and if they do so that they are caught immediately.

To coordinate policymaking and planning between the National Immigration Bureau offices so as to ensure efficiencies and effectiveness that result from shared infrastructure and unified implementation of the law among the office of immigration, adjudication, enforcement, prehearing services and detention and shared services. Those are the subsets of what I think we need to fully fund the adjudication function. Many, many people are in the process, are in the works, if you will, yet they wait 3 and 4 and 5 years in order to be adjudicated to become a naturalized citizen. This keeps them from employment. This keeps them from planning for their future. This disallows young people to get scholarships. It prevents young people from getting into college.

We are a Nation, Mr. Speaker, of laws, but we are also a Nation of immigrants. I would ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Immigration Restructuring and Accounting Act of 1999 for real INS reform.

WELCOME BACK TO THE CLEVELAND BROWNS

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about something close to my heart, the Cleveland Browns football team. As many of my colleagues may know, Sunday marked the beginning of a new season for us, an important one, a historic day in Cleveland because this is the first season, since the departure of the original Browns for Baltimore, Cleveland has its own NFL franchise.

Though the result of the game was decidely not what the fans assembled were hoping for, seeing our Browns take the field in a regular season NFL contest was extremely satisfying. We were welcomed back to the Dawg Pound, the brown and orange colors of the Browns, and the familiar uniforms of the team. Just being able to host the game was exciting for those of us from Cleveland.

Hats off to Al Lerner, the owner, and Carmen Policy, its manager. Thank you. Cleveland Browns, we are going to win the rest of the season.

CRISIS IN EAST TIMOR

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the House Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on Asia-Pacific Affairs, of which I am a member, held a joint hearing with the Senate Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to review the current crisis in East Timor and the implications on the overall future of Indonesia. I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) for jointly addressing this compelling crisis now confronting the international community.

Mr. Speaker, I recall some 38 years ago right outside this Chamber at his inaugural address, I believe it was in 1961, that President John F. Kennedy made this profound statement to the world, and I quote: ''Let every Nation know that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.''

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I am greatly disturbed and saddened by the brutal, violent response of the pro-Jakarta militia and Indonesian military to the overwhelming vote for independence demonstrated by the courageous people of East Timor. However, I am not at all surprised at the rampant killings, Mr. Speaker, as the Indonesian military has routinely used violence as a tool of repression as it is doing now and for the past 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, although the Timorese struggle for self-determination has received much publicity, scant attention has been paid to the people of West Papua New Guinea who have similarly struggled in Irian Jaya to throw off the yoke of Indonesian colonialism. Mr. Speaker, one cannot talk about the crisis in East Timor and ignore the same crisis in West Papua New Guinea or it is now known as Irian Jaya. As in East Timor, Indonesia took West Papua New Guinea by military force in 1963 in a pathetic episode, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations in 1969 sanctioned a fraudulent referendum, where only 1,025 delegates were hand-picked and paid off by the Indonesian government, permitted to participate in a so-called plebiscite, and at the point of guns on their heads and with threats on their lives, these 1,025 individuals voted obviously for Indonesian rule. At the same

time, the rest of West Papua New Guinea, well over 800,000 strong Indonesians, had absolutely no voice in this undemocratic process.

Mr. Speaker, since Indonesia subjugated West Papua New Guinea, the native Papuan people have suffered under one of the most repressive and unjust systems of colonial occupation in the 20th century. Like in East Timor where 200,000 East Timorese are thought to have died, the Indonesian military has been just as brutal in Irian Jaya. Reports estimate that between 100,000 to 300,000 West Papua New Guineans have died or simply vanished at the hands of the Indonesian military. While we search for justice and peace in East Timor, Mr. Speaker, we should not forget the violent tragedy that continues to this day to play out in West Papua New Guinea. I would urge my colleagues and my fellow Americans and the international community to revisit the status of West Papua New Guinea to ensure that justice is also achieved there.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the events of the past week in East Timor, the Indonesian government should be condemned in the strongest terms for allowing untold atrocities to be committed against the innocent, unarmed civilians of East Timor. I commend President Clinton for terminating all assistance to and ties with the military of Indonesian. The latest United Nations estimates are that up to 300,000 East Timorese, over a third of the population of East Timor, have been displaced and it remains to be seen how many hundreds more, if not thousands, have been killed in the mass bloodletting and carnage. A war crimes tribunal as called for by UNHCR head Mary Robinson is necessary to punish those responsible for the atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, I further commend the decision of the United Nations to maintain its presence in Delhi, even if only with a skeletal staff. It was absolutely essential that international observers, such as the United Nations, not desert East Timor or the likelihood of genocide against the Timorese people would have substantially increased.

It is clear the United Nations must also commit to a peacekeeping force and not shirk its duty. Besides playing a significant role in supplying airlift capabilities and logistical support, I believe America should also contribute a small, if not symbolic, contingent of ground troops which by its presence, Mr. Speaker, an international peacekeeping force in East Timor may well lend a hand in stabilizing not just that island but the fragile democracy that ostensibly governs that country.

Mr. Speaker, with Indonesia being the fourth largest nation and the largest Muslim country in the world which sits astride major sea lanes of communication and trade, I urge my colleagues that we do something about this, raising the question about the instability of that country but more importantly make the will of the East Timorese people become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia-Pacific Affairs, of which I am a member, held a joint hearing with the Senate Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to review the current crisis in East Timor, and the implications on the overall future of Indonesia. I commend the gentleman from Nebraska, Chairman DOUG BEREUTER, and the gentleman from Wyoming, Senate Chairman CRAIG THOMAS for jointly addressing this urgent and compelling crisis now confronting the international community.

Like many of our colleagues, I am greatly disturbed and saddened by the brutal, violent response of the pro-Jakarta militia and Indonesian military to the overwhelming vote for independence demonstrated by the courageous people of East Timor. However, I am not at all surprised at the rampant killings, Mr. Speaker, as the Indonesian military has routinely used violence as a tool of repression now, and for the past thirty years.

Although the Timorese struggle for self-determination has received much publicity, Mr. Speaker, scant attention has been paid to the people of West Papua New Guinea who have similarly struggled in Irian Jaya to throw off the yoke of Indonesian colonialism. Mr. Speaker, one cannot talk about the crisis in East Timor, and then ignore the same crisis in West Papua New Guinea or Irian Jaya. As in East Timor, Indonesia took West Papua New Guinea by military force in 1963. In a pathetic episode, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations in 1969 sanctioned a fraudulent referendum, where only 1,025 delegates were handpicked and paid off by the Indonesian government were permitted to participate in a so-called plebiscite, and at the point of guns on their heads and with threats on their lives, these 1,025 individuals voted for Indonesia. The rest of the West Papuan people, over 800,000 strong, had absolutely no voice in this undemocratic process.

And, Mr. Speaker, recent media reports indicate even Australia and our own country were parties to this fraudulent plebiscite.

Since Indonesia subjugated West Papua New Guinea, the native Papuan people have suffered under one of the most repressive and unjust systems of colonial occupation in the 20th century. Like in East Timor where 200,000 East Timorese are thought to have died, the Indonesia military has been just as brutal in Irian Jaya. Reports estimate that between 100,000 to 300,000 West Papuans have died or simply vanished at the hands of the Indonesian military. While we search for justice and peace in East Timor, Mr. Speaker, we should not forget the violent tragedy that continues to play out today in West Papua New Guinea. I would urge my colleagues, my fellow Americans, and the international community to revisit the status of West Papua New Guinea to ensure that justice is also achieved there.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the events of the past week in East Timor, the Indonesian Government should be condemned in the strongest terms for allowing untold atrocities to be committed against the innocent, unarmed civilians of East Timor. I commend President Clinton for terminating all assistance to and ties with the Indonesian military. The latest U.N. estimates are that up to 300,000 Timorese, over a third of the population of East Timor, have been displaced and it remains to be seen how many hundreds, if not thousands, have been killed in the mass bloodletting and carnage. A war crimes tribunal, as called for by UNHCR head Mary Robinson, is necessary to punish those responsible for the atrocities.

I further commend the decision of the United Nations to maintain its UNAMET operations in Dili, even if only with a skeletal staff. It was absolutely essential that international observers, such as the U.N., not desert East Timor or the likelihood of genocide against the Timorese people would have substantially increased.

As to the issue of a U.N. or international peacekeeping force, I strongly support such an intervention in East Timor and commend Indonesian President Habibie for his decision this weekend to authorize entry. While Australia and new Zealand may take the lead in the formation of such a peacekeeping force, it is crucial that Southeast Asian nations, such as the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand, contribute significant troops to the effort, and I applaud the cooperation and commitment of these countries. Jakarta, however, should not be permitted to dictate which countries shall comprise and contribute to the international peacekeeping force.

It is clear the United States must also commit to this peacekeeping effort and not shirk its duty. Besides playing a significant role in supplying airlift capabilities and logistical support, I believe America should also contribute a small, if not symbolic, contingent of ground troops, which could easily be drawn from our substantial forces of U.S. Marines based in Okinawa.

With Indonesia being the fourth largest nation and the largest Muslim country in the world, which sits astride major sealanes of communication and trade—certainly we have substantial national interests in preserving stability in Indonesia and Southeast Asia, as well as preventing a U.N. initiative from turning into a catastrophic humanitarian disaster.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what has happened in East Timor—where the Indonesian military forces played a major role in the horrific violence—holds prophetic ramifications for the future of Indonesia as a whole. In front of the world, President Habibie has been humiliated by the inability to control his own military while Defense Minister General Wiranto's hand in the unfolding events in East Timor is still being questioned. It raises the question as to who is actually in control in Jakarta, and whether a civilian democratic government or military regime holds the reigns of power to Indonesia—now and for the future.

By its simple presence, Mr. Speaker, an international peacekeeping force in East Timor may well lend a hand in stabilizing not just that island but the fragile democracy that ostensibly governs Indonesia.

□ 1915

PREPARING FOR HURRICANE FLOYD

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak out in support for all of those people who are now

working to prepare for the probable arrival of Hurricane Floyd. Hurricane Floyd is a Class Four, possibly Class Five, hurricane right now, which represents an extremely powerful and strong storm. The last hurricane that was a Class Four to hit the United States was Hurricane Andrew.

I had the opportunity to go down into the devastated area after Hurricane Andrew came through south Florida as part of a program involving the Florida Medical Society. I went into the area to work in a clinic, and I was able to see firsthand the devastation wrought by this powerful storm, and it is for that reason that my heart, my concerns, my prayers go out to all those people who are being now asked to respond to this devastating storm, and in particular those people who are being asked to evacuate. Emergency management personnel are now calling for the evacuation of many of the barrier island communities such as the community of Indialantic in my congressional district.

Additionally, the storm is projected to go up the coast and come very close to Kennedy Space Center, and I had the opportunity to visit Kennedy Space Center today and review there with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the Senate Director, Roy Bridges, the preparations that are underway. At Kennedy Space Center right now is about $8 billion worth of space station hardware that is being prepared for launch on the space shuttle. Obviously, all the space shuttles are there as well. And the crews are doing a great job in getting ready, and boarding up the buildings and preparing the equipment for the arrival of this storm, and I would be very happy to yield to my colleague from Orlando, Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding both because I want to comment on this storm with him as I know all about the east coast of Florida is preparing for what could be one of the most serious hurricanes to strike the United States in years, including Hurricane Andrew; and we all pray that it does not happen.

We do not want to see it strike landfall anywhere because of the strength and power of this storm, but it could be particularly devastating to our coastline and for the families that are there; but also to comment with him, as he has pointed out on the fact, that we were today at the Cape. I was scheduled as my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), knows to go with him to visit and tour the Cape for other reasons, as it is a neighboring district to mine and I have a great interest in the space program, as the gentleman and I have shared over the years.

But to me to be there today when they were making these preparations is a reminder of the enormous task that NASA has to be involved with not only in launch preparations in terms of all of the shuttle program and now the space station program and the tremendous effort and dedication the men and women there for those purposes, but also to prepare for disasters like this, to protect those valuable goods that are there at taxpayer expenses.

So I want to pay tribute with the gentleman from Florida tonight to the men and women who work at the Cape for all they have done to be dedicated not only to the program itself, but to the preparation each and every time there has been an approaching storm like this, but particularly now.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I, too, would ask that all Members keep the communities not only in coastal Florida, but as well Georgia and South Carolina in the path of this devastating storm in their thoughts and prayers. We have great emergency management personnel that are preparing the communities and getting ready for the arrival of Hurricane Floyd; and we certainly do hope that the winds carry it out to sea further up north into the cooler waters of the Atlantic where it could be downgraded into a tropical storm and then ultimately perhaps just become a rain storm.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McCOLLUM. As my colleague knows, one of the things that we talked about today that was impressive to me is this is just the wind damage that could be terrible and devastating. It is the storm surge itself, the water levels, Pointed out at the Cape that that could come up 6 to 15 feet above sea level; and I know that is important to everybody concerned with the protection of all of the valuable equipment that is there.

But in addition to that, in your district and in many others along the coast of Florida there are many, many homes that are at a level which could be devastated by this, not just right on the beaches, but inland, too, if the water surge and storm surge comes up that much.

So there is a great threat in the storm that is approaching, not just in the wind and the things you read about from the tornadoes and the storms that are spawned by it, but also by the tremendous potential for flooding and water damage from that surge.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

(Mr. RUSH addressed the House. HIs remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN MEMORY OF FATHER HILARIO MADEIRA AND FATHER FRANCISCO SOARES WHO WERE MURDERED IN EAST TIMOR

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the news that Indonesia will allow an international peacekeeping force into East Timor, but let me emphasize that the international community must act quickly before more lives are lost.

Shortly before the August 30 referendum on independence, I was in East Timor with two of my colleagues from the other body. Dili was a bustling city as it prepared for the U.N.-supervised vote. We were the only Congressional delegation to travel to East Timor before the elections and the last Members of Congress to see Dili as it once was. The burned, looted, and destroyed city emptied of its people is heartbreaking. Our delegation traveled to two towns along the western border, Maliana and Suai; and I would like to share some of what I saw in Suai.

August is the dry season in East Timor. It was sweltering, hot and dusty. In this poor town we went to the Catholic church compound where over 2,000 people were seeking refuge. Father Hilario Madeira, the senior parish priest, and Father Francisco Soares who would be our guides greeted us. They introduced us to their world, one filled with worry and tension and subjected daily to violence and intimidation by the Indonesian military and militias organized and armed by the Indonesian armed forces.

Despite the strain and uncertainty of their situation, I was impressed by Father Hilario and Father Francisco's warmth, good humor, hospitality, and steady nerves. Here were men carrying out God's mandate to love and care for your neighbor, protect the weak and live humbly.

In talking to the refugees, we discovered most had been burned out of their homes or forcibly evicted. The majority were women and children. They sought refuge in the church compound surrounded by militia who over the past 2 days had cut off all their food and water.

Our delegation met with town officials asking that the water be restored. It was clear that militias were in charge of the water and that town officials would do nothing. The armed Indonesian police and soldiers, those charged with protection and security of the East Timorese people during the U.N. process, stood in the shade doing nothing, laughing and joking with the militias.

When I met with President Habibie in Jakarta, we demanded the water be restored in Suai. Less than 24 hours later the militias turned on the water.

Father Hilario shared with us his concerns about the current violence and his fears about violent retaliation

against the people who would go to the polls scarcely a week later, and we took that message to heart.

That evening in Dili we had dinner with Nobel Peace Prize winner and Catholic bishop Carlos Belo. In the dining room of his house overlooking the courtyard between his residence and the chapel where he said mass, Bishop Belo emphasized the need for protection following the vote, and as we met in Dili with Indonesian officials, police and military commanders, we were constantly assured they were providing security for the people. They brushed aside our description of the situation in Suai, and I asked that they could cite a single instance where they had detained, arrested, or confiscated the weapons of any militia member, and they could not.

As our delegation prepared to depart from Dili, we called upon the U.N. to immediately deploy armed peacekeepers to East Timor to protect the people from further violence, especially following the referendum.

Now we know everyone's worst fears have been realized. Over the Labor Day weekend I received word that the home of Bishop Belo where I had dined just 2 weeks ago had been burned to the ground. The bishop barely escaped with his life. The 3,000 people given refuge in his courtyard were forced out at gun point by uniformed Indonesian military militias. Their fates are unknown.

And on Wednesday morning I received a phone call from human rights workers in Jakarta that eyewitnesses reported militias had gunned down and killed Father Hilario and Father Francisco along with Jesuit priest Father Dewanto. Many of the people of Suai sheltering inside the church were also killed. Some escaped while others were forcibly transported out of the country. These were good men; these were holy men. Nothing we say or do here in Congress, nothing President Clinton may say or do, nothing the U.N. may say or do can bring these men back to the people of Suai. In so many ways we in the United States and the international community failed them. They trusted us, and we failed them. If we were to honor their memory, then we must not fail them again.

Mr. Speaker, we must support the rapid deployment of an international force to rescue and guarantee the security of the people of East Timor. We must take immediate steps to protect refugees and displaced people from further harm and attacks. We must disarm the militias and confiscate and destroy their weapons. We must provide humanitarian support, food and medicine for East Timor. We must safely return those who are forced to leave their homes, villages, and country. We must guarantee the full and safe implementation of the independence process for East Timor, and we must help the East Timorese people rebuild their cities and towns.

This time the international community must keep its word to the people of East Timor.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1999]

NUNS DESCRIBE SLAUGHTER IN E. TIMOR—MILITIAMEN KILLED PRIESTS, THEN REFUGEES IN CHURCH, WITNESS SAYS

(Doug Struck)

KUPANG, Indonesia, Sept. 10—Father Dewanto was the first to die, said Sister Mary Barudero.

The militiamen had lined up outside the old wooden church filled with refugees from East Timorese town of Suai on Monday afternoon, and parishioners watched as the young Indonesian Jesuit priest stepped out dressed in his clerical robes to meet the trouble.

A burst of gunfire cut him down. Father Francisco followed. The militiamen waited for the senior parish priest, Father Hilario. When he did not emerge, a witness said, they kicked down the door to his study and sprayed him with automatic weapons fire.

A nun who watched the massacre from the window of her house described the scene to Barudero less than an hour later. The nun told Barudero the militiamen entered the church filled with refugees, and began firing long bursts from their weapons. Then they threw hand grenades into the huddled victims.

Inside, there had been only young children and women, babies at their mothers' breasts, and pregnant women, Barudero said. The men had fled days earlier. Barudero, who works as a nurse, had sent four of the pregnant women from her hospital to Suai just two hours earlier to await further progress in their labor.

''They went to the church because that's where they felt safe. They felt being near the priests was protection,'' said the 64-year-old nun, vainly fighting her tears.

Her account of the massacre, also reported Thursday by the Vatican's missionary news agency Fides, is one of the first graphic descriptions of the violence that has wracked East Timor at the hands of Indonesian military-backed militiamen who opposed the independence for the province.

Roman Catholic clergy, seen by the militia as having supported independence for East Timor, were among the first victims. Most citizens of East Timor, a former Portuguese colony, are Roman Catholics. Indonesia is the world's largest Muslim country.

Barudero, a Philippine-born Indonesian citizen who belongs to the French order of Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres, agreed to talk to a reporter here in western Timor, because ''I have lived my life. I am not afraid to die.''

Other refugees still feel the militias' reach in the supposed safety of western Timor, and have been warned not to talk to reporters. Barudero's colleague who watched the massacre, and who belongs to the Canossian order, has fled to Darwin, Australia, but still is afraid to be identified, she said.

Barudero said the militia that carried out the massacre had been active in the area and was well known to residents. Of the three priests who died, young Father Dewanto was an Indonesian citizen from Java who arrived in Suai just three weeks before the massacre and had been ordained only a month before that. Father Hilario, who had been in the town for some time, was well known as a supporter of independence for East Timor, according to Fides.

Fides also said about 100 people were killed in the Suai massacre. It quoted witnesses as saying 15 priests were killed in the cities of Dili and Baukau, and some nuns were killed in Baukau.

Here in the western part of the island of Timor, refugees who fled the violence in East Timor still have cause for fear. The militiamen who brought destruction to East Timor, have taken control of the 84,000 refugees now in camps in western Timor, and move freely around the city. Some are armed; some seem intent on intimidating foreigners and refugees. Foreigners have not been allowed in the camps.

At a western Timor refugee camp in Atambua, on the border with East Timor, a man identified as a supporter of independence was killed Wednesday, apparently by militiamen.

An official of Catholic Relief Services, who had just returned from Atambua, provided some confirmation of reports that pro-independence refugees were forcibly removed from East Timor.

''If you ask the refugees once, they say they left because it was unsafe, and they had to leave their houses. But if you ask again, they will tell you that the soldiers terrorized them and made them come,'' said William Openg, an Indonesian relief worker for Catholic Relief Services.

Although many in the refugee camps are said to be opponents of independence—like the militiamen—those who support the outcome of the Aug. 30 referendum favoring independence may not acknowledge it.

''They are afraid to show their faces. It could cost them their lives,'' said Agapitus Prasetya, an Indonesia UNICEF worker who has been in the refugee camps. ''The militias are everywhere. They are all over.''

Anti-foreigner passions have been whipped up by the militias, and even Indonesian staff members distributing food to the refugees strip the UNICEF signs off their cars, he said.

''The militias are killing people, and the people are threatened here in west Timor,'' complained a Catholic clergyman who fled Dili only to find militiamen in control of refugee camps in western Timor. ''Where is the law and order in Indonesia? The militias, the military and the police are above the law.''

He and several other clergy members described their flight from East Timor on condition that their names not be used. They said they fear consequences from the Indonesian military and Timorese militias.

One nun who lived in Dili said the gunfire began about three hours after the ballot result approving independence was announced last Saturday.

''It was really frightening. We couldn't go out of the house,'' she said. ''We could see a lot of fires. It looked like they would use diesel gas, because the fires would be big black balls, and then you could see white smoke from houses. That was everywhere.''

On Monday, she and other nuns decided it was too dangerous, and left in an old pickup truck in a convoy escorted by police. As they passed through Dili, she saw a surrealistic scene of fires and lawlessness, she said.

''It was remarkable. There was shooting going on, and people were running for their lives. But others were looting the stores, very calmly, as though they were so relaxed.'' She said she saw some looters loading goods into military trucks.

In one section, ''all the stores were razed,'' she said. ''I saw a lot of military, and of course, the militias. Some people were ransacking, and some people were looting. The whole place was in ruins, except for the government buildings.''

''And there were a lot of people moving out, because their houses were burning.''

Another clergyman said the gunfire intensified after the referendum results. ''God, it was frightening,'' he said. ''There were motorcycles running all over, bringing military and militias. You could hear the big guns of the military.''

On Tuesday, water, electricity and telephone lines were cut in his section of Dili, and he decided to leave, the clergyman said. He passed many burned houses, he said. ''It

seemed the pro-independence houses were targed. But the referendum was approved 4 to 1, so they didn't have to go very far.''

''I never saw any instance of refugees being forced by gun-point,'' said a priest. ''Our people did not want to leave. But they were told if they stayed, the houses would be burned and they might be killed. They were forced out by fear.''

The militias were particularly strong in the western areas of East Timor, where Barudero and four other nursing nuns ran a hospital in Suai, and where Roman Catholic priests ran the church where the massacre occurred.

Barudero said she was not intending to leave, even after the men fled, even after more victims of the rising violence came to the hospital, even after she and the other nuns had to dig a grave for a victim on the grounds of the hospital. The victim's family members were too afraid to claim him or were victims themselves, she said.

But after the massacre, ''there was no one left to help. They had all left or been killed. And I knew, if we stayed, we could be killed,'' she said. ''I am old, I'm ready to die. But the young sisters would not go unless I went. They have many years left to help people. Finally, I said, 'pack what you can. We will leave.''''

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1999]

JAKARTA'S ARMY TIED TO DEATHS—REPORT SAYS SYMPATHETIC TROOPS JOINED MILITIA RAMPAGE

(By Doug Struck)

KUPANG, Indonesia, Sept. 11—A human rights organization said today it has documented atrocities in East Timor that implicate the Indonesian military and militias in at least seven instances of mass killings and dozens of individual slayings.

''Killing, plundering, burning, terror intimidation and kidnapping [have] been carried out by the Indonesian armed forces along with the pro-Jakarta militia'' in the days since East Timor voted overwhelmingly for independence on Aug. 30, concludes the report by the Foundation for Law, Human Rights and Justice, based in Dili, the East Timor capital.

The organization interviewed many refugees secretly because of fears of retribution from militiamen in the refugee camps. Most of the atrocities cited by the group have not been verified, because after the shooting erupted in Dili, journalists were confined to the U.N. compound and then evaluated.

According to the report, witnesses identified Indonesian military members, in addition to the militaries, as having participated in the atrocities. Indonesia has denied that any mass killings occurred and has sent more troops to East Timor to impose martial law and end the turmoil.

[U.N. human rights commissioner Mary Robinson said Sunday that she wanted an international war crimes tribunal set up to investigate human rights violations in East Timor. She said she would also probe the extent of military and police involvement in such violations.]

The Indonesian human rights group's report includes some incidents that have been verified by the media and other sources and others not previously known. Among them:

Several hours before results of the independence referendum were announced on Sept. 4, 45 people were killed in Maliana, in western East Timor. They included 21 drivers and local employees of the U.N. observers' operation.

Ten people in Bidau Macaur Atas, a neighborhood in Dili, were hacked to death Sept. 4 by militiamen and Indonesian soldiers, according to the human rights report. Some were buried by relatives, but ''others were put into bags and thrown away on the side of the road. Others were thrown into the ocean.''

On the same day, militia members killed 50 people in Bedois, in eastern Dili. The next day, the report said, eight people who went to the Dili harbor to try to leave by ferry were identified as pro-independence and shot dead by Aitarak militia members.

The group said it also has documented the attack on the Dili Roman Catholic diocese that killed at least 25 people, including a baby; the killing on Sept. 5 of 15 local employees of the International Committee of the Red Cross in Dili; and an attack by the army and militia on a Catholic church compound in the Dili neighborhood of Balide, where unknown numbers were slain.

The human rights group, which is working in western and East Timor, provided reliable reports in Dili before chaos engulfed the city last week. Its offices there were ransacked, and many of its files were destroyed.

Much of the violence has been carried out by pro-Indonesian militias, but there also have been frequent reports of shooting and looting by the military. The Indonesian armed forces chief Gen. Wiranto, acknowledged today that the militias and military are ''comrades in arms.'' He said his forces have not succeeded in ending the violence because, for his soldiers, ''I can understand it is very hard to shoot their own people.''

An official of the foundation asked not to be identified for fear the group's work would be stopped by the military or the militias, who control the refugee camps in western Timor through fear and intimidation. For the same reason, the official said, the witnesses were not identified in the report.

In Australia, aid worker Isa Bradridge told Channel 7 that his wife, Ina, had seen piles of dead bodies stacked in a room at a police station in Dili before the couple was evacuated. ''It was chockablock full of dead bodies, right up to the roof.'' he was quoted as saying. ''All she could see through the bars were arms hanging out, heads, old and new, blood dribbling out under the door.'' The report could not be verified.

Some human rights groups alleged that some East Timorese were forced by the militias to become refugees. Accounts slowly emerging from the refugee camps in western Timor appeared to confirm that claim.

''We were asked by the local government and the Aitarak [militia] to leave East Timor,'' said a 29-year-old Dili resident of the Noelbaki Refugee Camp near Kupang. ''I didn't want to go. . . . I would like to go back to Dili.''

Reporters have been barred from the camps in western Timor, though several Indonesian journalists accompanied Social Affairs Minister Yustika S. Baharsjah on a quick tour of three camps today.

[From the Sidney Morning Herald, Sept 9, 1999]

CATHOLIC CLERGY EXECUTED BY INDONESIAN MILITARY

(By Louise Williams)

Catholic Church leaders were hiding in remote East Timor mountains last night after military backed pro-Jakarta militia gangs went on a rampage of bloody retribution, murdering at least 14 priest and nuns and stabbing the Bishop of Baucau.

Six nuns were reported killed in Baucau, four nuns in Dili and three priests in Suai, said a spokeswoman for Caritas Australia, the Catholic overseas aid agency. The Bishop of Baucau, the Most Rev Basilio do Nascimento, was stabbed before escaping into the mountains.

Father Francisco Barreto, the local director of Caritas, was believed to have been murdered just outside the capital, Dili.

He had warned the Foreign Minister, Mr. Downer, during a visit to Australia in April that terrible violence would be orchestrated by the Indonesian military.

One account of the attack on the six Canossian sisters in Baucau, 115 kilometers east of Dili, said the militia thugs had forced them into a forest where they were murdered.

Reports of the atrocities emerged as Indonesia announced last night that a five-member United Nations Security Council team would travel to East Timor tomorrow, but Jakarta remained strongly opposed to any UN peacekeeping force.

In the worst slaughter to date, the UN confirmed that at least 100 people, including three priests, had died in an attack earlier this week on refugees sheltering in the church at Suai, on the remote east coast.

The dead priests were Father Hilario Madeira, who had long been an outspoken critic of military and militia abuses, Father Francisco Soares and Father Tarcisius Dewanto.

The savage attacks are the first deliberate violations of the sanctity of the church under Indonesian rule and have robbed the East Timorese of their last refuge.

The militias appear to be using a death list of independence sympathizers compiled before the ballot to systematically hunt down their targets.

Many of the priests and nuns are sheltering on Mate Bean, the mountain of death, where tens of thousands were killed by bombing in the first years of the Indonesian occupation.

It is not known whether they have any supplies or access to medical treatment.

A communications blackout in Dili has made it impossible to confirm the number of dead or injured in the attacks and Catholic networks in Australia and Indonesia are working with the Vatican to try to establish the facts.

Some reports have been received by overseas diocese offices through e-main from outlying Catholic schools and churches in East Timor, describing attacks on churches and buildings were nuns and priests were sheltering with thousands of refugees.

A Caritas Australia spokeswoman, Ms. Jane Woolford, said: ''We don't even know where many of our local staff are. We hold grave fears for their safety as many of them have been on death militia lists before and have been attacked trying to deliver aid.''

Many church leaders were identified as independence supporters and the Catholic Church became an important symbol of opposition to the Muslim-dominated Indonesian Government.

The leader of the Catholic Church in East Timor, Bishop Carlos Belo, was evacuated to Darwin earlier this week after his offices and home were burnt to the ground, with scores killed.

Father Jose San Juan, also recently evacuated to Darwin, said: ''I fear many, many priests and sisters will be killed if they stay. In the past the church was a safe place, even from the Indonesian military, but if they can attack the bishop then that's it.''

The militia units were stacked with Indonesian operatives, and Father San Juan, a Filipino from the Salesian order.

''I saw the militias attacking churches before I got out and many of them were speaking in Indonesian, not the local language, so I do not believe they are all East Timorese,'' he said.

''They were yelling at people to get out or be killed, and if they refused they just shot or stabbed them. The Indonesian police and military were just standing there.''

The chairman of Caritas Australia, Bishop Hilton Deakin, said: ''These murderous attacks on the church are part of a much wider unjust genocide.

''When Catholic Church members, who have offered relief and refuge to East Timorese, are struck down, we realize there is no respect for any life in East Timor.''

Ms. Ana Noronha, director of the East Timor Human Rights Commission, said information on the deaths had been sent to the United Nations. ''It is now obvious that the violence is reaching everyone and that there is a pattern of the Catholic Church being attacked.''

[From the Carter Center East Timor Weekly Report No. 9, Sept. 13, 1999]

INDONESIAN ARMED FORCES CONTINUE CAMPAIGN OF MURDER, VIOLENCE, AND MASSIVE FORCED DEPORTATION IN EAST TIMOR AS MILITIAS TERRORIZE TIMORESE REFUGEES IN WEST TIMOR

The Carter Center is encouraged by the decision of the Indonesian government to allow the deployment of an international peacekeeping force in East Timor. However, the Indonesian military and police, with the assistance of their militia surrogates, continue to murder and terrorize the people of East Timor, destroying buildings and infrastructure and forcibly expelling tens of thousands of unarmed civilians from the territory. The city of Dili, the capital of East Timor, has been almost completely destroyed over the past week, and reports from other parts of the territory indicate widespread destruction, looting, and murder. It is clear that the Indonesian armed forces are executing a deliberate, planned campaign under the direction of senior military commanders to destroy and forcibly depopulate East Timor.

In West Timor armed pro-integration militias are now operating with official support, openly terrorizing the more than 100,000 East Timorese refugees who have been forced over the border. Those displaced by the violence, both in East Timor and West Timor, now face the threat of malnutrition and disease as domestic and international humanitarian efforts are hampered by militia and military activity and Indonesian government efforts to block access to refugee camps.

Carter Center staff and observers, forced at gunpoint to evacuate Dili Sept. 5 and now reporting from several locations throughout Indonesia, have confirmed the following through eyewitness accounts from reliable sources:

Refugees fleeing East Timor have been subject to extreme intimidation and acts of violence. The Carter Center has confirmed that pro-integration militia members murdered approximately 35 young men traveling on the Dobon Solo ferry from Dili to Kupang on Tuesday, Sept. 7, and dumped their bodies overboard.

In the attack at Bishop Belo's compound last week, militiamen hacked to death with machetes some 40 refugees in the courtyard while TNI soldiers fired into the bishop's residence from the street. A military ambulance later came and removed all but two of the bodies.

In an Indonesian television interview, Rui Lopez, a militia leader, admitted that Indonesian civilian police and military officials in Suai, East Timor, held a meeting before announcement of balloting results and were given instructions to attack UNAMET offices, burn the town of Suai, and drive the population into West Timor.

There are now more than 100,000 refugees from East Timor in West Timor and on the islands of Flores and Alor, and estimates of the total number of people displaced from the territory range from 120,000 to 200,000 (nearly one-fourth of the entire population). Refugees have been transported by Indonesian military ships and aircraft to a number of locations within Indonesia, including Irian Jaya, Ambon, Sulawesi, Surabaya, and Bali, some of which are thousands of kilometers from East Timor.

Pro-integration militias are now active throughout West Timor, particularly in the towns of Atambua and Kupang. Eyewitnesses report that militia members have entered refugee camps with lists of names of supporters of independence, and that a number of individuals have been removed from camps or executed in the camps of militiamen. Militia members armed with automatic weapons also have been seen stopping and searching vehicles in central Kupang and driving looted UNAMET vehicles in and out of the provincial police headquarters.

The Indonesian military and police have prevented international aid workers, journalists, and observers from visiting refugee camps in West Timor and from interviewing Timorese refugees.

Eyewitnesses report that the Indonesian military and police have joined in the looting and destruction of Dili. Indonesian soldiers and police officers have frequently sold looted food and other basic necessities to refugees under their control at exorbitant prices.

It is now apparent that militia violence has been targeted at political, social, and religious leaders, and a number of priests and nuns have been murdered during militia and military attacks on churches sheltering those seeking refugee from the violence.

PRESIDENT GRANTS CLEMENCY TO THE FALN

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, last Friday culminated a very rough week, indeed a rough few weeks and a rough 24 years for some families across America, because some individuals associated with the FALN, the most notorious terrorist group to set foot on American soil, had engaged in a reign of terror across America in the 1970's and 1980's and claimed responsibility for 130 bombings that killed innocent people, that maimed innocent people, that in part had no remorse or offered no apologies for the damage that they created or for the victims that they made. They were set free on Friday, back into society because our White House offered these terrorists clemency, in other words, a get-out-of-jail-free card.

So to those families who have had to endure, for example, like Ms. Diana Berger of Cherry Hill, New Jersey, whose husband was dining in Fraunces Tavern in 1975 like any other American would have been in any other bar or restaurant, Ms. Berger was 6 months pregnant with their first child when her husband was killed. Or Joseph Connor and Thomas Connor. Joseph was 9 years old; his brother was 11. Joseph was celebrating his ninth birthday. His father was in that same restaurant, again out for a business lunch. He never came home to celebrate Joseph's ninth birthday because he was killed by a FALN bomb. Or on December 31, 1982, when this same group of terrorists claimed responsibility proudly for several bombs in downtown New York. Officer Rocco Pascarella of upstate New York lost a leg in that explosion. Officer Richard Pastorella in an attempt to respond to officer Rocco Pascarella, got another call for a bomb threat. He responded to that bomb threat. He tried to diffuse the bomb. He is blinded for life. He has lost all his fingers on one hand. He has 22 screws in his head, has undergone 13 major surgeries. He will never be the same. His partner that night was Officer Anthony Semft from Long Island, New York, who was blinded in one eye and who is partially deaf.

Those are just a few of the victims of this terrorist organization known as the FALN. They were serving rightly a long time in prison until the President offered them clemency, clemency that they initially rejected and finally accepted. I think this is absolutely the worst thing that we can be doing to send a signal to anybody contemplating terrorism on American soil to set these terrorists free. If anybody sitting at home or anybody in this chamber could imagine if in 10 or 15 years a man by the name of Terry Nichols who is affiliated or associated with the Oklahoma City bombing, who many argue was not actually at the bomb scene, but clearly involved in the conspiracy to kill innocent people, so many families left without children, left without fathers, left without mothers, left without grandmothers, if 10 or 15 years the then President steps forward and offers clemency, can you imagine the outrage across America?

□ 1930

That is the outrage that we are experiencing right here today. That is why so many people cannot fathom how the President reached this decision. That is why a wide range of law enforcement agencies, including the FBI, the Bureau of Prisons, the U.S. attorney's offices in Illinois and Chicago, all recommended against granting clemency. Why? Because this is a wrong signal to be sending to terrorists but, above all, these people killed were part of a killing operation, and to this very day, while they are celebrating their release and while there are some who are calling them heroes, to this very day show no remorse, offer no apologies, offer no contrition for what they did.

Indeed, what they suggest is that the Connor or the Berger family or the Pastarella family or the Pascarella family or the Semft family, they were casualties of war. I hope and pray that these people never get the opportunity to bomb and kill an innocent person ever again.

My prayers and thoughts go out to all of the victims associated with the terror associated with the FALN and may we rue the day if they ever act as they did for 10, 15 and 20 years.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMPACT IT HAS ON OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise and discuss the issue of scientific research in the United States and the impact that it has on our economy.

The reason I do this is because there currently is an underfunding of scientific research in the budget proposals we have before us and in the appropriations bills which we have passed. I would like to review why that is dangerous for our Nation and why we must increase our spending on scientific research.

Let me first back up a year or two. A previous speaker, Mr. Gingrich, had a keen interest in science and technology and asked the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, chairman of the Committee on Science, to give me the responsibility of reviewing science and technology policy in the United States Government and make recommendations for improvement.

After all, the previous study had been done by Vannevar Bush in 1945 and, although it was outstanding, it is clearly out of date. There has been some excellent science policy work done recently by individuals outside of the government, but our government had not done anything official in that direction.

As a result of our work, after holding a considerable number of hearings, working hand-in-glove with the Speaker and with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), we were able to produce a new science policy report. It has just come out in paperback, and it has been very well received by the scientific community. It makes a number of arguments for the importance of scientific research in our Nation and explains what we should do in the way of Federal funding. I believe the recommendations are well founded and should be followed.

I would also like to briefly display the number of letters I received just in the past few weeks from leaders of scientific associations protesting the lack of funding in this year's budget. I have a letter, for example, from Jerry Friedman, President of the American Physical Society; from the American Association for the Advancement of Science; American Association of Engineering Societies; American Astronomical Society; American Ceramic Society; American Chemical Society; American Electronics Associations, which represents one of the bigger industries in our Nation; American Geological Institute; American Institute of Biological Sciences, the Chemical Engineers, the Mathematical Society, et cetera, all expressing the great concern in the scientific world about this particular issue.

Similarly, there was an op-ed piece in the Washington Post just a week ago by Allan Bromley, outstanding physicist and former presidential science advisor, who has been a leader in the scientific community for many years. The title of his article is No Science and No Surplus, and I would like to at this point enter that into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, August 26, 1999]

NO SCIENCE, NO SURPLUS

(By D. Allan Bromley)

America is on a roll. We're balancing the federal budget, reforming welfare and making retirement secure. Sound like a breakthrough in fiscal management? Not exactly. Our awesome economic success can be traced directly to our past investments in science. The problem is, this year's federal budget for science is a disaster, and it compromises our nation's economic and social progress.

Here are the latest budget numbers: NASA science is slashed by $678 million; science at the Department of Energy is cut by $116 million; and the National Science Foundation ends up with $275 million less than the president requested. Clearly, Congress has lost sight of the critical role science plays in America.

Federal investments in science pay off—they produce cutting-edge ideas and a highly skilled work force. The ideas and personnel then feed into high-tech industries to drive the U.S. economy. It's a straightforward relationship: Industry is attentive to immediate market pressures; the federal government makes the venturous investments in university-based research that ensures long-term competitiveness. So far, it's been a powerful tandem.

Thirty years ago, the laser and fiber optic cable were born from federal investments in university research. Over time, those two discoveries formed the backbone of a multi-billion-dollar telecommunications industry.

The fusion of university research and industrial development now generates about 5,000 new jobs and contributes a quarter-billion dollars in taxes to the federal coffer every day. It accounts for 70 percent of our economic growth. The result is undeniable. The fusion is primarily responsible for our booming economy and our growing federal surplus. So the consequences of a budget cut to science are equally undeniable: no science, no surplus.

The benefits of the science investment go deeper than just the surplus. Three years ago this month, welfare underwent dramatic reform. No one knew what the fallout from that would be. But the high-tech economy eased the burden. Unemployment was dropping to a 25-year low, and jobs were being created at a record pace. As it turned out, half of those jobs were generated by the high-tech sector.

The legislative challenge before us is patching up Social Security. Again, we'll rely on the science and technology juggernaut. Whether the solution lies in stimulating private investment or in steady federal surpluses, the proposals all rely on a familiar friend—the strength of our nation's booming economy. And while Congress dithers, the public already is taking steps of its own.

Americans hold more than $5 trillion in communications and technology stocks. Our mutual funds, our 401K plans and IRAs are stuffed full of high-tech investments. The retirement security of Americans now depends upon the steady flow of innovations from technology companies. In turn, those companies rely on the steady flow of discoveries and trained work force generated by the scientific community. No science, no savings.

Scientific research at our universities and national labs is now a foundation of the economy and thereby vital to the success of social legislation. But rather than reinforcing the foundation, Congress is eroding it. That action couldn't come at a worse time.

America's science infrastructure is in decay—aged science buildings on our campuses, dated laboratory equipment, antiquated computers. During the Bush administration, the Office of Science and Technology Policy estimated the cost of rebuilding our science infrastructure at $100 billion. The Clinton administration has done little to address the problem. The budget Congress is proposing guarantees continued decay.

Congress must significantly increase science funding. Senators recognized the need last week when, with the support of Sens. Trent Lott and Tom Daschle, they passed the Federal Research Investment Act, which calls for doubling the federal investment in science by the year 2010. But appropriators haven't followed through. It's not too late—budgets won't be settled until October.

For the sake of the country, I hope Congress will recognize the significant role science plays in society. Without science, there won't be a surplus.

Mr. EHLERS. The key point is this: when we analyze what is causing our economic boom of the past few years, the first major cause is monetary policy, which has largely been headed by Alan Greenspan; next is tax and regulatory policy, where the Republicans in the Congress have made tremendous improvements; and the final and very vital cause is scientific research. If we analyze the economic development taking place today we will find that over half of all economic development is directly related to scientific research, whether it is the Internet, whether it is medical research, any of the other research projects going on.

Dr. Bromley's thesis is very simple. He says: no science, no surplus. Why? Because the economic boom we are enjoying now, which has resulted in the first surpluses in the Federal Government since 1969, is to a large extent caused by the scientific research that has been done in the last 2 to 4 decades. If we do not continue to do that research, we are doing a grave disservice to our children and grandchildren, because we are condemning them to a United States which will not have as much economic growth and which will not have the resources and the surplus which will enable them to enjoy a good economy as we enjoy it today.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate very strongly that we review the appropriations bills that have passed the House and are before the Senate, and that we make every effort to increase the funding for scientific research.

As it stands now, NASA science is slashed by $678 million; science of the Department of Energy is cut by $116 million; and the National Science Foundation ends up with $275 million less than requested.

I think it extremely important that we review these bills and that we increase funding for scientific research so that we may continue to enjoy not

only the results of the research, but also the economic benefits that will arise from the fruits of that research.

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

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

CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this evening to take this opportunity to address a very important subject. Tomorrow this House will once again consider legislation that would improve our campaign finance laws.

I know that my colleagues will say well, we have been here before. In fact, we have been here before many, many times, because this Congress and previous Congresses have considered year after year various forms of campaign finance legislation and none of those have ever passed both Houses, signed by the President and actually become law. So there is a growing frustration and cynicism among the American public.

I believe that this is a cause still worth fighting for, that there is a consensus still yet to be maintained and to be gained and I hope that we can do that this Congress; whether it is this vote tomorrow or whether it is later on.

The bill that I am proposing is the Campaign Integrity Act of 1999, which we have worked hard to draft in a fair and bipartisan manner and will address the greatest abuses in our campaign system. I am delighted to have two of my colleagues joining me in this discussion tonight, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). I want to hear what their views are on this and why this is important for us to address this subject of campaign finance reform, and particularly this bill that we have all cosponsored, the Campaign Integrity Act of 1999.

So I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), who has done such a tremendous job in showing leadership on an issue that I think is vital to our political process. I know he has been active as a State party chairman in Montana. He understands the political process. He understands the role of parties and candidates, and I am very grateful for his support, and I want to yield to him so he can talk about why this is needed.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding, and let me compliment the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his untiring effort at trying to help reform the campaign finance laws of this country.

We started this process as freshmen in the last Congress, holding hearings, drafting legislation, bringing together Democrats and Republicans in a bipartisan bill, and it was his leadership that helped us accomplish that.

It seems to me that we need to accomplish three things when we are going to reform the campaign finance laws. At least from my judgment, there are some things that are broken in the current system and we need to accomplish some changes.

One of those is that we need to have more competitive campaigns. Over 90 percent of the Members of this House who stand for reelection are reelected election after election after election. Even in the great revolutionary election of the 104th Congress in 1994, nearly 90 percent of the Members who stood for reelection were reelected.

One of the reasons for that is that it is difficult for challengers to raise the resources necessary to have a viable election. In fact, I find it kind of interesting that there are some who helped sponsor legislation similar to this in the last Congress, when they came as freshmen Members who this was their first time in Congress and they had maybe run a challenger's race who are now incumbents, some might say are entrenched incumbents, who do not support campaign finance reform that would allow us to have competitive elections, but I appreciate the gentleman's untiring effort.

The other thing we need to do is deal with the issue of soft money. As the gentleman knows, soft money are large corporate contributions, labor union contributions. It has been the tradition of this country for almost all of this century that large organizations, corporations and labor unions, should not be able to contribute unlimited sums of money to the political process because the view is that they would overwhelm the process. This bill that we are advocating would put restrictions on soft money to the political parties.

The other thing that we need to accomplish when we reform finance laws is to maintain our commitment to the First Amendment. Some people would advocate changes in the campaign finance laws that would have the effect of stifling the competitive thought that is out there; the outside groups and others who want to express themselves about what we do here. So there are some who in closing the soft money loophole want to close the loophole of the First Amendment, the right for people to express their views, and we cannot allow that to happen, too.

So what this bill does is it says to the political parties, the political parties cannot accept soft money but allows independent groups to be able to continue to express their views about what we do and how we go about doing it and in the process not chilling free speech.

So those three things, this bill does. It protects our First Amendment freedoms, reinforces them. It eliminates the potential problems that soft money and the corrupting influence that that might have on our political parties but it also endeavors to make campaigns competitive again, which is so important to this country.

So I just want to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his hard work. This is a good bill. Our colleagues are going to have an opportunity to vote on this this week. I think this is the right alternative to reform our system, and I know that the gentleman has been a strong advocate for that, and I thank him for yielding to me this evening.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Well, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. He is exactly on point, that we do not want to harm the First Amendment and the freedoms we all enjoy in the political process in order to just do something and make a change in the law.

So I believe that we can have a balance, that we can actually stop the flow of soft money into our national political parties; we can stop the greatest abuse; we can still have a significant and critical role that the parties play but still not infringe upon those groups that are out there expressing themselves in election.

Imagine how counterproductive it would be if we burdened these outside groups and said, you cannot participate in the political or we are going to put so many regulations on you that your participation will be really rendered meaningless.

So I do not think that is the direction we want to go. This bill is very balanced. It addresses the abuse in our system, but like the gentleman said, it makes sure that we protect our First Amendment freedoms.

So I am delighted also to have my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), here, who has been so outspoken in favor of reform and particularly supportive of the Campaign Integrity Act. So I would just like to yield to him for his comments on this bill.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding, but also for his leadership on this issue.

As freshmen together 2 years ago, the gentleman played the leadership role in working together, Republicans and Democrats, over a very thoughtful 5-month period, meeting with experts on constitutional law, citizens who felt the way we finance campaigns ought to be changed, people who thought the status quo was fine, listening to all opinions and approaches before, I

think, developing a very reasonable, balanced, thoughtful approach that is real reform. It is not, as some of these measures are, hidden as a campaign advantage bill, which gives an edge to one party or the other.

This bill is designed to create more of a citizen Congress, to push us back toward a Congress as a representative of the people that we have the privilege of representing, and that is why I am so glad to be a part of this effort.

I think we are drifting away from a citizen Congress here in this Nation.

□ 1945

The average cost of a congressional campaign, a competitive, open seat is just a little under $1 million, and it is doubling about every 4 years.

Now, there are a lot of good people in my communities who would do a great job in the U.S. House of Representatives or in the U.S. Senate, but they do not have $1 million and they do not know where they would get a hold of it; and as a result, they are not going to raise their hand to run for Congress. My concern is not that the very wealthy cannot make the decisions, many of them can. But for a country founded on a representative democracy where people from all walks of life, and whether they have a big wad or they have made some choices in life that they have pursued other goals, and so that they do not have that, but they would be great here in Congress are not going to be able to run.

So what this bill does is really start to push us back toward a citizen Congress, start to close that national loophole on soft money, preserves free speech for individuals, groups, even for States to remembering soft money the way they have very responsibly. It increases and indexes, which is long overdue, the individual contributions which again, to move people into Washington and back home where we want that support to come, and increases disclosure so that people who are watching our campaigns, who are trying to decide which person to vote for can quickly and electronically determine who our backers are and that that represents part of their decision-making in this process.

And, as importantly, which the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) have stressed, we encourage people to get involved in the process, groups who want to do score cards, individuals who feel so strongly about an issue they want to take out ads to get involved, and we preserve and encourage that free speech, but we start that very important first step back toward a citizen Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us believe that the first step in any campaign finance reform is first to enforce the laws that we have already on the books, because it does not make such sense to add new ones if we are not going to enforce them either. Secondly, we have to preserve free speech. But after that, the real choice tomorrow when Congress meets on campaign finance reform is this: do we go with the Shays-Meehan bill which has gotten a lot of attention, and those two sponsors have worked very hard on behalf of that bill. I take nothing at all away from them. But my concern is that Shays-Meehan will pass the House again, not much of a margin, but it will pass again and it will die exactly where it died last year, in the Senate. They have debated it fully, they have had a great discussion on it; it is not going to pass the Senate. Even if it were, it could never pass constitutional muster. It would be struck down and never be the law of the land. I guess my concern is that each year we raise campaign finance reform and each year it fails.

I think we turn off another group of voters who are hoping for more of a citizen Congress, who want these changes. People say today, well, campaign finance reform does not rate very high in all of these polls they take by the day and the hour anymore around here. My thought is that I think people still want campaign finance reform. They want to change the way we do business in Washington. But I think they have given up hope that we will do it. I think they have given up belief that we will do something that makes life a little tougher on us, and it will; that gives more of a fair chance to challenges, and it will; that forces us out of Washington and back in our districts; more of a citizen Congress, and it will.

None of those are easy tasks, but it is the right thing to do, and rather than pass a bill forward that I sincerely know will die, and it will die again next year and it will die again the year after, I think the HUTCHINSON bill is a substantial, significant reform measure that can pass the Senate, that we know, we know can pass constitutional muster and can become the will of the land to start to restore that faith in what Washington is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good measure, and I would say to the gentleman that I am here tonight mainly to tell him that with his integrity that was shown throughout the impeachment proceedings, the integrity shown throughout his service here in Congress and before in Arkansas, the gentleman has shown he is not afraid to take on the tough issues. I know that this is a balanced bill, it does not give an edge to our party, and I love being a Republican, but I am glad this does not give us an edge necessarily.

I do not think we ought to take one for the Democrats either. It ought to be balanced. The gentleman has worked hard to do that. I think this is a great, solid, significant step for people who still have hope that Washington will change, bring a little more moderation and balance into how we finance our campaigns. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and his leadership on this important issue. In addition to my friend from Montana and my friend from Texas, we have had the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) who has been extraordinarily instrumental this year in moving this legislation forward, as well as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) who is former president of the class, who has really pushed this legislation and has been a real leader on this effort.

The gentleman mentioned how we got here and where we started with this as a freshman class, when I think back about the process and the history as to how we got here. When we look back, whenever we first came here as freshmen, we were still warm from the campaign trail; we understood that there needed to be some changes, we understood what people were telling us to get up here and make a difference and work with our colleagues from the other side of the aisle. So I will never forget our first term whenever we had six Democrats from the freshman class and six Republicans from the freshman class that were assigned together to work out and hammer out together in a bipartisan fashion this legislation. So we met together. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) led the Democrat side, and I chaired the Republican side; and we met over a period of five months.

This is not something that happened quickly. As the gentleman mentioned, we heard from constitutional experts; we heard from the political party leaders, we heard from the ACLU and the National Right to Life. We heard from candidates. And through that process, we reached some conclusions as to what we needed to do to get this passed.

First of all, we said, if we are going to pass legislation, we have to avoid the extremes. That is what has killed reform in the past, is that everybody moved to their perfect bill, to their perfect idea which was usually sort of an extreme position over here and said, this is what is going to work, and we find out there was not anyone else who supported that position, or there was not a majority that did. So if we are going to pass something, we have to avoid the extremes in legislation. That is what we propose to do.

The second thing we have to do is we said we have to be realistic. We have to figure out what can pass this body, what can pass the Senate, and what can be signed into law. And as my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) said, we have to follow the Constitution. We cannot just fight against the Supreme Court; we cannot just move in that direction and say we are going to ignore the First Amendment, we are going to hope that they change their position. We have to follow the Constitution, and that was the guideline that we had.

Finally, we said we have to seek common ground. If we are going to work, Democrats and Republicans together,

we seek the common ground, and those are the principles that we followed. The result was that we gave up some things that we wanted, but we came up with a bill that we genuinely believed in our hearts could pass this body, could pass the Supreme Court, could be signed into law and really change our society in terms of our campaigns.

So we did that, and we introduced the bill the last Congress, and we fought an enormous battle against our leadership many times. Our leadership was not excited about this. We said this is important for the people and so we have to stay engaged in this.

Finally, we moved this forward with other reformers and we had a huge debate on the floor of this House. We advocated for our bill, the freshman bill of the last Congress. There were our good friends, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), who said well, ours is a better bill, and they worked very hard on their bill. It was what we considered not seeking the common ground, but going for that ideal, some of the extreme positions, and they said, give us a shot at this comprehensive reform. It will pass the Senate. We said, there is not the votes over in the Senate. They said give us a shot, give us a shot. So we sent that bill over to the Senate, and as was predicted, it could not break filibuster; it could not get the votes necessary and it died.

Once again, that increases the cynicism of the American people. It says, Congress cannot deal with this issue. So it tears our hearts out. We come back to this Congress, and I do not know about my friends, but I really see a change in America. I see that they are more interested in reform now than ever before. I would just like to yield to my colleagues to comment about what they are hearing in their town meetings, what the American people are telling them. That is the sense I get, is that they are more excited, but there is a real malaise in this Congress about it.

Could my friend from Montana comment?

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the things that I believe is that oftentimes people do not say that they want campaign finance reform as high on their list of reforms more because I think they believe that Congress is incapable of reforming campaigns as opposed to what they really want. There is no doubt in the minds of the people that when I talk to that, they believe that there is something pretty wrong with the system the way it is now.

The gentleman was commenting earlier, the gentleman from Texas's comments that we have to follow the Constitution. I do not feel following the Constitution is an obligation; I think it is a privilege to follow the Constitution. There are some who have the arrogance to say that the Constitution gets in the way of how we would reform campaign finance laws. Some of my colleagues have proposed an amendment that would allow us to put restrictions on people's freedom of speech in order to change how we finance political campaigns.

The fact of the matter is, the tradition, the history of this country is that individuals and individual groups have a right to speak out about the political leadership in this country before we ever had the Constitution. The fact is that that is not only part of the Constitution, but a part of the tradition.

I just want to comment on one thing. Because what people are saying to me as much as anything, they are concerned about the abuse of soft money because they read about it in the paper; but they also know that today, elections are not competitive. They know that incumbents get reelected and the power of incumbency and the ability of the resources to gain reelection has created a tremendous advantage for incumbents. Many of the other reform measures, particularly the Shays-Meehan measure, my greatest objection to that bill is the fact that it does not do anything to help with competitive elections.

In fact, I met last week with one of the public interest groups that have been strong advocates for campaign finance reform, and I raised this objection to them. I said, but the problem with Shays-Meehan is that it does not do anything to get us back to competitive elections, and their comment to me was, so what? That is the way the system is now.

Well, if we are going to reform this system, one of the things that we should try to accomplish is to restore the idea that people can compete for elections. Now, there are two thoughts about that. One is public financing of elections. I do not happen to support that. The other is to allow people to get the resources from the party that they are affiliated with. That is what this bill does. This bill says there is no limit to how much your party can support you to help you get the resources to your campaign, but it has to be hard money; it has to be appropriate money.

Now, what the Shays-Meehan bill does and what the greatest flaw in it is it creates an environment where the parties are going to be competing with candidates for money. So what we are going to have is, parties will raise money and incumbents will raise money, but challengers are not going to be able to raise money. We know that is how the system will work.

Our bill fixes that by saying there will be a separate limit. Parties can raise a limit that they can use to support candidates, and candidates have a separate limit; and there is no money going back and forth between those. So it eliminates that competition. And by lifting the limits of support that parties can give to challenger races, it means we can have a competitive race in every district in America. That is what the goal of our bill ought to be.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the point the gentleman is making, if you have an incumbent, a United States Congressman who has $1 million in his war chest, and he is very, very difficult to compete with financially and you have a challenger, he can raise money individually, but that the party can put more money into his campaign to make that race more competitive. Is that what you see in this bill?

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly right. As the gentleman knows, the Shays-Meehan bill perpetuates a situation where the parties cannot do that. So what happens around here, and you know that, is incumbents build these huge war chests and that discourages a challenger from ever entering the race because they know that they could never compete. One of the interesting things, if we study campaigns, is that challengers actually win with less money than incumbents do, but there is a certain minimum threshold that they have to get across. What most incumbents do is they try to keep their challenger from crossing that threshold.

Under this bill, under the bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, every, every challenger out there would be assured of the opportunity to cross that threshold because their party could help them get over that threshold and we could have competitive elections again.

□ 2000

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just go through the basic revisions of the bill and then yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for some additional comments.

But so that my colleagues will understand, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act does the most important thing, it addresses the enormous abuse in our system, which is to ban soft money to our national parties. This is where our Federal candidates, our Federal officers are going out and raising enormous sums of money usually in the chunks of $100,000, $200,000, sometimes $500,000 for the parties, and then it flows into the different campaigns through ads.

This has been the abuse in the 1996 election. It continues to be an enormous problem for our political system. So we ban that soft money to the national parties.

Then these people raise the objection that, well, how about if the State parties raise the soft money? We do not prohibit that. Well, the State parties try to do get out the vote efforts, some basic things that build the party structure, that help our candidates locally, but it has not been a problem.

But to make sure that it does not become a problem, we say that there cannot be any transfer of soft money from the State party that is using it for a get out the vote effort might have some excess cash and will transfer it from the national party. Well, they cannot do that. The national party

cannot take any soft money from the State parties or from anyone. It is prohibited. So we address that.

The second thing that we do is that we assist the parties. If we take this soft money away, we have to help the parties. So we help them to raise the hard money, we call it the honest money, the regulated money. So it increases the individual contributor limits to all candidates, PACs going to the parties from $25,000 per election to $25,000 per year. The contribution limits to the parties is raised.

As the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) said, we remove the party candidate coordination limit. So we strengthen the parties, but it is all hard dollars. It is all the honest money.

Then we help the candidates out there. They have to raise the money. We finally help the individual by indexing the contribution limits for individuals to inflation. So as inflation goes up, it will not just erode that contribution limit, but we strengthen the role of individual by indexing it to inflation.

Then we increase disclosure. We are simply trying to provide the American public more information as to what the candidates are spending so that they are required to report more regularly, monthly, and more timely, and more information.

Then to the third party or the issue advocacy groups, they are required to disclose information as to who they are and how much money they are spending.

So we are providing information to individual voters out there to strengthen them in that way. We are reducing the influence of special interests by banning soft money to the national parties. Then we are strengthening the parties by allowing them to be able to raise the hard money, the honest dollars, according to the law much easier.

So I think that this is a good bill, is balanced, and this is the main provisions that we try to address.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for pointing out the key parts of this bill, because it is very reasonable. As he says, it puts a premium on hard money, which sounds like a hard phrase, but the principal of hard money is so sound for America.

What it says is that we think a contribution ought to come from a person, from their pocketbook, from what they have earned, what their family has decided to contribute to another person, to a party, to a cause that they believe strongly in. I want everything to be hard money. I want it to come from a person directly to a party, principle, a cause that they believe in.

I watch our Republican women's clubs in parties. Each year, they will host a fundraising, barbecue, or catfish fry, or silent auction that one will go to. They will work for 2, 3 months ahead of time. They will get a local business person to donate the food. They decorate the tables. There are silent auction items, quilts that they have made, local restaurants donate a dinner. They have got American prints. Flags have been flown over the Capitols, just good solid American products.

People are out there, and they get their neighbors to come to bid on these. Together, they might, they might net maybe $2,000, maybe $800 that they will net, they will make off one of these events after 2 or 3 months of hard work to give to their local candidates in their State and the people that they support.

To me, I put so much more value on that $800 or that $2,000 that has come in hard money from real people than a check written that same day for $200,000 from some company, some industry, some group that goes in soft money to one of the parties or some other direction. Because I really think for the future of democracy, for the citizen Congress, that hard money is so valuable long-term, getting people involved, keeping us close to the people that we represent.

Let me destroy two myths for my colleagues if people out there have bought into this at all that we hear quite a bit. One is that the Republicans and Congress do not support campaign finance reform. Everyone knows historically that the party that is in majority up here has tended to resist some of the reform because, frankly, they used the current system, they fought hard, played by the rules to get to that majority. So human nature says they are a bit resistant.

Since we had campaign finance reform under Richard Nixon, the Democrats held the House for more than two decades and resisted campaign finance reform for all that period, or most that period themselves. So, historically, whoever is in the majority tends to resist a bit, and those that are in the minority use it as campaign tools. So that is what has happened again. Do not believe this. We have found so many good solid Republicans who want to change the way business is done.

It is really to Speaker HASTERT's credit that he has scheduled a very reasonable timetable this year. Rather than rush into it, rather than just let one bill be anointed, Speaker HASTERT set a September timetable which was very fair. He said first things first, let us tackle our budget. Let us be the first Congress since 1974 to get our budget done in time. Let us focus on rebuilding our defense, on quality education, on local control, on tax relief. Let us make first things go first and schedule a good time for campaign finance reform.

Let us go through the committee process so that all the good ideas, and there are a lot of them, on campaign finance reform can be heard, which was done. Then the four major bills are set for debate tomorrow. I think that is a very fair timetable. We are already in the election process. If we made a change today in haste, we would only be giving the advantage to one person or another in these campaigns.

Rather than to rush through this, let us do it right. It is so important that we do it right, that we have a full and open debate. We are getting that. That is to Speaker HASTERT's credit. I am very proud that he has given us this opportunity.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I will make a few closing remarks here to my colleagues. Tomorrow's debate I believe is critically important for the Nation. I would like to think as a result of this debate we are going to pass out of this House a legislative proposal that will go to the Senate, that will garner the support necessary there, and be passed by the Senate, get over the filibuster, and be sent to the President.

But I am a realest here in this Congress, and I understand the battle we are up against. I know the temptation is, well, we passed Shays-Meehan out of the last Congress. Let us come back in and just cast the same vote. We had about 150 votes for our bill here, but the Shays-Meehan got the majority, and it went to the Senate, and it failed over there.

I would just make a comment here that I think is instructive that we can learn from it. I actually used this quote in the last debate in the last Congress. This was from RollCall, a publication here on Capitol Hill. It is dated August 6, 1998, a year ago, when we were engaged in this debate. It says, ''One leadership source said that the Republican leaders favored the Shays-Meehan bill going to the Senate because the Senate already voted on it, and it has no chance of passing. While the freshman bill would pose a slightly greater threat in the Senate because, when you offer something new, and streamline, it becomes a new fight.''

I just yearn for a new fight. I think that we ought to learn from our past mistakes. We gave the best shot for Shays-Meehan. It has been voted on in the Senate once. It has been voted twice. It has never broken the magic number in order to get it passed. So we do not know what would happen over there. But we do know what would happen if we repeat the same actions of the last Congress.

So I would just urge my colleagues to support reasonable, realistic, commonsense reform that addresses the greatest abuse in our campaign system. I believe the Campaign Integrity Act, the old freshman bill, is much wiser now since we are upper classmen. We have been here, but we are not frustrated. We are not cynical. We believe that we can do this for the American people.

If, perhaps, that we send this over to the Senate, we repeat the same action of the last Congress, we send Shays-Meehan over there once again, and they do not break filibuster, then that is three times. Perhaps then we can

take the ideas of this bill, we can work together in a common way, Democrats and Republicans, and we can move forward a bill and actually get it passed this Congress. It is still my goal. It is still my desire. It is my yearning, and I believe it is the yearning of the American public.

THE INFLUENCE OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH ON MILITARY VICTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PICKETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, early this year the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the NATO alliance achieved a military victory in Yugoslavia. The military objective of the 3-month long campaign in the Yugoslav province of Kosovo was to drive the Serbian armed forces out of Kosovo.

This objective was achieved largely through the use of air power applied in a sophisticated and comprehensive manner. The bulk of the sorties flown were executed by fighter-bomber aircraft based in Italy between 200 and 300 miles away from their objectives in Yugoslavia.

These sorties were accomplished largely by F–15E, AF–8B, and F–16 aircraft operated by the United States, Belgium, the Netherlands, and other European countries, and Tornado attack aircraft operated by Great Britain and Germany and also French attack aircraft used by the Air Force of France.

In addition, heavy, long-range bombers, B–52s and B–1Bs based in England and B–52s based in Missouri delivered a substantial fraction of the weapons on the targets.

Finally, unpiloted reconnaissance aircraft were used extensively for the first time in this conflict.

Although air power has been a significant component of all warfare since 1939, it can be argued that this was the first campaign where air power was absolutely the dominant factor.

Given what has happened in Kosovo, it is a legitimate question to ask how the air power that achieved that victory was created. The record shows that it did not happen overnight. In 1944, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Army Air Forces, General Henry H. (Hap) Arnold said, ''the first essential of air power is preeminence in research.'' The key word in this statement is research. It is important to understand how this research was performed, who paid for it, and how the results were used.

In 1917, a provision was put in the Naval appropriations bill to create a National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics called NACA because the inferiority of American aircraft during World War I was patently obvious, not a single airplane of American design or manufacture was used in combat during World War I.

The decision to create NACA changed that circumstance for all time. A research laboratory in Hampton, Virginia, the Samuel Pierpont Langley Aeronautical Laboratory was established a year later, and from then on, the United States of America has been preeminent in military aviation.

For a short period, the Germans and the Japanese built more airplanes than the United States during World War II. However, after less than 2 years, American air power emerged in vastly superior numbers with aircraft that were decisively superior in quality. The reason why the United States could accomplish this end was due in large measure to the research done in the laboratories of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics between the First and Second World Wars.

All-metal airplanes, efficient radial engines, accurate flight control systems that made dive-bombing possible were all developed during those years in the NACA laboratories with the assistance of the military.

A strong and independent civilian research agency had been created to advance knowledge in aeronautics. The chairman of the committee was always a civilian, but both the Commanding General of the Army Air Corps and the Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics were statutory members of the committee. Thus, a close connection to the military was assured.

Things have changed since the end of the Second World War, but the aeronautical strength of the United States still depends on the successor institution to the NACA that was established after the end of the Second World War.

□ 2015

In 1958, the launch of the Sputnik by the Soviet Union as the first man-made object to orbit the Earth stimulated the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA. This organization consisted of all of the facilities of the old NACA plus some military facilities that were added to enhance the space mission of the new agency.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 made the new agency responsible for continuing the support of military aviation. This most important mission has been successfully accomplished for the past 40 years and the results were evident in the Kosovo campaign.

The most successful fighter-bomber of the 20th century is undoubtedly the F–16. The facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration were used extensively during the decade of the 1970s to develop the flying qualities of this aircraft. Many thousands of hours of wind tunnel and flight simulator time were devoted to the creation of the F–16.

The former commander of the Israeli Air Force and the current president of the state of Israel, Ezer Weitzmann, has called the F–16 the ''Spitfire'' of the 1980s after flying the F–16 himself. Weitzmann became famous in 1948 when he flew a black painted ''Spitfire'' in the Israeli war of independence. Thousands of pilots across the world have agreed with his assessment.

The F–15 aircraft was also a product of NASA technology through the employment of NASA's extensive facilities. The conically cambered wing on the F–15 was a product of NASA research and the attack version of this airplane, the F–15 ''Strike Eagle,'' is one of the most potent attack aircraft in the world.

Finally, the concept of vertical takeoff in land combat aircraft originated in the United States and was picked up by British aerospace concerns. The first version of the aircraft that eventually became the ''Harrier,'' the ''Kestrel,'' was extensively tested in NASA facilities in the 1960s. The ''Harrier'' eventually evolved into the AV–8B, which was also tested extensively in NASA flight simulators and wind tunnels. The former was particularly important in developing the complex flight control system for this aircraft.

As previously mentioned, a remarkable feature of the Kosovo air campaign was that a significant fraction of the damage done on the ground was due to aircraft that were based more than a thousand miles from the combat zone. B–52 and B–1B bombers based in England delivered thousands of tons of bombs and other guided weapons on targets in Kosovo and Yugoslavia.

Even more impressive was the achievement of the stealthy B–2 aircraft which flew its missions from Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri, 5,000 miles from the target zone. An F–16 can carry two thousand-pound bombs, and a B–1B can carry 24 of these so that a single mission by a B–1B bomber might be equivalent to 12 sorties by an F–16.

Both the B–1B and the B–2 were the creations of an industry supported by NASA facilities. Neither would have been built without thousands of hours of wind tunnel and simulator time devoted to them in government-owned NASA facilities.

Even more important was the application of NASA research results to both aircraft. These results range from aerodynamics, materials, and flight controls to the human factors that had to be considered to protect the pilots and the crew from the environments that they would face in accomplishing their missions.

Finally, the Kosovo campaign was the one in which unpiloted aircraft were extensively used for reconnaissance that turned out to be a decisive factor in the campaign. Unpiloted vehicles have been around for a long time and were used as target drones and as experimental test vehicles during experiments that traditionally involved the destruction of the vehicle.

However, recent advances once again pioneered by NASA in flight control

systems and in sensors have made it possible to use unpiloted vehicles for many other purposes. Probably the first application of unpiloted vehicles requiring sophisticated technology was the highly maneuverable aircraft test vehicle. This was a small, unpiloted aircraft with a sophisticated flight control system designed to perform experiments in maneuvering regimes that had not yet been explored with piloted aircraft. The experiments done by NASA with this vehicle during the 1970s demonstrated to all concerned the utility of unpiloted aircraft for sophisticated purposes.

In the last two decades, a large variety of unpiloted aircraft have been developed and with the recent advances in control systems and communication systems and in the ability to transmit intelligence data in real-time to command posts, unpiloted reconnaissance aircraft have come into their own.

A special example is the ''Predator'' unpiloted reconnaissance aircraft that played a very important role in Kosovo. In one incident, a ''Predator'' vehicle spotted a concentration of Serb troops on the ground and with accurate pictures transmitted by satellite link reported the concentration and its location to the command post. This information was then used to divert a flight of B–52 bombers that had already been on another mission to the troop concentration which was accurately located by the GPS signal transmitted by the ''Predator.''

The B–52s bombed the troops, killing most of them on the ground. This kind of coordinated attack with heavy bombers guided to the target using unpiloted aircraft and a sophisticated command and control system was a decisive element to secure the victory in this campaign.

The technology to do all of this could not have been developed without the aeronautical research performed in NASA's research centers. The research performed to create the aircraft systems described here dates back to the 1970s, somewhere between 20 and 30 years ago.

In 1970, the aeronautics budget of NASA was approximately 25 percent of the agency's budget, some $1 billion out of a total of $4 billion. It was this heavy investment in aeronautical technology that in a very real sense made the victory this year in Kosovo possible.

Today, however, we have a very serious problem. The aeronautics budget in NASA today is a much smaller fraction than it was in 1970, about $2 billion out of $14 billion or just 14 percent. In terms of spending power when inflation is factored into this calculation, NASA's investment in aeronautical research today is about half of what it was 30 years ago.

One result of this massive reduction in aeronautical research has been that many important NASA aeronautical research facilities have had to be shut down entirely or perhaps mothballed. This has forced some U.S. aerospace firms to use European facilities. More important, it has become difficult to attract the best talent into NASA's aeronautical research enterprises.

In the past year, this situation has reached the crisis stage because further reductions in NASA's aeronautics research are now being proposed. In view of this circumstance, it is legitimate to ask the question where the knowledge and the technology will come from to make victory possible in another Kosovo perhaps 20 years from now.

The sad fact is that we are no longer making the investments necessary to maintain the kind of Air Force that has the capability that we have today. This situation can only be changed by reversing the trend in aeronautical research funding and reinvesting in this critically important technology. An investment in NASA aeronautics program of about $4 billion annually is what is required to maintain our effort.

General Arnold's statement of more than half a century ago is as valid as it is was then. The security of the United States and the stability of the world depend on a relatively small investment in advanced aeronautical technology so that NASA can continue to do the work which will allow the United States to maintain its leadership and superiority in military aviation.

I urge all Members to support this effort.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. WICKER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. ROGAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. SHAW (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. KINGSTON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and September 14 on account of impending Hurricane Floyd.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, September 15.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 14, 1999, at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4020. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flood Compensation Program (RIN: 0560–AF57) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4021. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Horses From Morocco; Change in Disease Status [Docket No. 98–055–2] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4022. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Small Hog Operation Payment Program (RIN: 0560–AF70) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4023. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the New England and Other Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders [DA–97–12] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4024. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Avermectin B1 and its delta-8, 9-isomer; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300916; FRL–6380–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4025. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Chlorfenapyr; Re-Establishment of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300910; FRL–6095–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4026. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cymoxanil; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300903; FRL–6094–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4027. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300904; FRL–6094–3] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4028. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance; Statutory Merger of Section 8 Certification and Voucher Programs: Change in Effective Date [Docket No. FR–4428–N–02] (RIN: 2577–AB91) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4029. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Truth in Savings [Regulation DD; Docket No. R–1003] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4030. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Training of Interpreters for Individuals Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing and Individuals Who Are Deaf-Blind—received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4031. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—William D. Ford Federal District Loan Program (RIN: 1840–AC68) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4032. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Department of Education, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, transmitting the Department's final rule—Administration of Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; Direct Grant Programs; State-Administered Programs; Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations; Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments; Protection of Human Subjects; Student Rights in Research, Experimental Programs and Testing; Family Educational Rights and Privacy—Received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4033. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program (RIN: 1840–AC67) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4034. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Projects With Industry—received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4035. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 96F–0176] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4036. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—General and Plastic Surgery Devices; Effective Date of Requirement for Premarket Approval of the Silicone Inflatable Breast Prosthesis [Docket No. 91N–0281] (RIN: 0910–AZ17) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4037. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coating [Docket No. 99F–0487] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4038. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Additives Permitted in the Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Menadione Nicotinamide Bisulfite [Docket No. 94F–0283] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4039. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Additives Permitted in the Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Menadione Nicotinamide Bisulfite [Docket No. 98F–0195] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4040. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee: Approval of Revisions to the Tennessee State Implementation Plan [TN 190–9930a; TN 196–9931a; FRL–6433–4] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4041. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Maryland; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [MD–091–3041a; FRL–6433–7] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4042. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Texas: Final Authorization and Incorporation by Reference of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [FRL–6422–1] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4043. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [FRL–6428–6] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4044. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Alaska [AK–21–1709-a; FRL–6412–7] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4045. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementations; Ohio Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Ohio [OH 121–1c; FRL–6425–1] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4046. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Virginia; Enhanced Inspection & Maintenance Program [VA092/098–5044; FRL–6428–8] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4047. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Volatile Organic Compound Regulation [MA–19–01–5892a; A–1–FRL–6421–8] received August 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4048. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California—Owens Valley Nonattainment Area; PM–10 [CA–221–158; FRL–6430–7] received August 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4049. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Approval of Miscellaneous Revisions [DE101–1–25a; FRL–6434–6] received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4050. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District and Tehama County Air Pollution Control District [CA 192–0161; FRL–6434–2] received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4051. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Rule Making a Finding of Failure to Submit a Required State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide; Nevada—Las Vegas Valley [FRL–6434–4] received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4052. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL–6430–4] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4053. A letter from the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Judsonia, Arkansas) [MM Docket No. 99–98;

RM–9483] (Del Norte, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 99–148; RM–9556] (Dinosaur, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 99–149; RM–9557] (Poncha Springs, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 99–150; RM–9558] (Captain Cook, Hawaii) [MM Docket No. 99–152; RM–9560] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4054. A letter from the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Review of the Commission's Regulations Governing Television Broadcasting [MM Docket No. 91–221] Television Satellite Stations Review of Policy and Rules [MM Docket No. 87–8] received August 31, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4055. A letter from the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule—Review of the Commission's Regulations Governing Attribution of Broadcast and Cable/MDS Interests [MM Docket No. 94–150] Review of the Commission's Regulations and Policies Affecting Investment in the Broadcast Industry [MM Docket 92–51] Reexaminiation of the Commission's Cross-Interest Policy [MM Docket No. 87–154] received August 31, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4056. A letter from the Attorney, Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Child Restraint Systems; Child Restraint Anchorage Systems [Docket No. NHTSA–99–6160] (RIN: 2127–AH65) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4057. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Changes to Requirements for Environmental Review for Renewal of Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses (RIN: 3150–AG05) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4058. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Personal Investment Company Personnel [Release Nos. 33-7728, IC–23958, IA–1815; File No. S7–25–95] (RIN: 3235–AG27) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4059. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12924 has been extended, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 106–118); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4060. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); (H. Doc. No. 106–119); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4061. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the President's bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlementof the Cyprus question, covering the period February 1999 and March 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); (H. Doc. No. 106–120); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4062. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting Progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question covering the period June 1 to July 31, 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); (H. Doc. No. 106–121); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4063. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2751 nt.; to the Committee on International Relations.

4064. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List Additions and Deletions—received August 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4065. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List Addition—received August 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4066. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Office of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Permits; Amended Certification of Compliance and Determination that the States of Vermont and West Virginia Meet Federal Falconry Standards (RIN: 1018–AE65) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4067. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Endangered Status for 10 Plant Taxa from Maui Nui, Hawaii (RIN: 1018–AE22) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4068. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Approval of Tungsten-Iron and Tungsten-Polymer Shots and Temporary Approval of Tungsten-Matrix and Tin Shots as Nontoxic for Hunting Waterfowl and Coots (RIN: 1018–AF65) received August 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4069. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator For Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Closure of the Red Porgy Fishery [Docket No. 990823235–9235–01; I.D. 061699F] (RIN: 0648–AM55) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4070. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock by Vessels Catching Pollock for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Bering Sea Subarea [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 082699E] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4071. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 990506120–9220; I.D. 082399b] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4072. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 081799D] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4073. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fisheries by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062; I.D. 081799E] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4074. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Adjustments to the 1999 Summer Flounder Commercial Quota [Docket No. 981014259–8312–02; I.D. 081199A] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4075. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Vessels Catching Pollock for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Bering Sea Subarea [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 081899A] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4076. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Halibut Bycatch Mortality Allowance in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 99030463–9063–01; I.D. 072199B] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4077. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—VISAS: Regulations Regarding Public Charge Requirements under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended [Public Notice 2903] (RIN: 1400–AA79) received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4078. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Nevada, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–40] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4079. 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 737–100, –200, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes [Docket No.

99–NM–187–AD; Amendment 39–11283; AD 99–18–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4080. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision to the Legal Description of the Riverside, March Air Force Base (AFB), Class C Airspace Area; CA [Airspace Docket No. 99–AWA–1] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4081. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, A Division of Textron Canada, Model 206L, L–1, L–3, and L–4 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–30–AD; Amendment 39–11265; AD 99–17–19] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4082. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Allison Engine Company, Inc AE 2100A and AE 2100C Series Turboprop Engines [Docket No. 99–NE–14–AD; Amendment 39–11257; AD 99–17–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4083. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Petitions Involving the Effective Dates of the Disclosure of Code-Sharing Arrangements and Long-Term Wet Leases Final Rule, and the Disclosure of Change-of-Guage Services Final Rule [Docket Nos. OST–95–179, OST–95–623, and OST–95–177] (RIN: 2105–AC10, 2105–AC17) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4084. A letter from the Program Assistant, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99–NE–22–AD; Amendment 39–11263; AD 99–17–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4085. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model 600N Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–16–AD; Amendment 39–11264; AD 99–17–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4086. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC–8 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–55–AD; Amendment 39–11262; AD 99–17–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4087. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757–200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–06–AD; Amendment 39–11266; AD 99–17–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4088. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC–12 and PC–12/45 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–10–AD; Amendment 39–11256; AD 99–17–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4089. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fort Rucker, AL [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASO–11] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4090. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Removal of Class E Airspace: Arlington, TN [Airspace Docket 99–ASO–16] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4091. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class D Airspace; Tupelo, MS [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASO–10] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4092. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Sheridan, IN [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–31] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4093. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Minneapolis, MN [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–33] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4094. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Eau Claire, WI [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–28] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4095. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; La Crosse, WI [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–29] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4096. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace Mankato, MN [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–30] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4097. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–700 and -800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–179–AD; Amendment 39–11267; AD 99–18–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4098. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe 146 and Model Avro 146–RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–129–AD; Amendment 39–11260; AD 99–17–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4099. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Chelsea Street Bridge Fender System Repair, Chelsea River, Chelsea, MA [CGD1–99–141] (RIN: 215–AA97) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4100. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96–NM–29–AD; Amendment 39–11259; AD 99–17–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4101. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Category Effluent Limitations Guidelines, Pretreatment Standards, and New Source Performance Standards; Correcting Amendments [FRL–6431–8] (RIN: 2040–AA13) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4102. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd., Model Astra SPX Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–204–AD; Amendment 39–11254; AD 99–17–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4103. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 93–NM–125–AD; Amendment 39–11255; AD 99–17–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4104. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–120 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–233–AD; Amendment 39–11253; AD 99–17–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4105. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Schweizer Aircraft Corporation Model 269A, 269A–1, 269B, 269C, 269C–1 and 269D Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–31–AD; Amendment 39–11258; AD 99–17–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4106. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Frederick Municipal Airport, MD [Airspace Docket No. 99–AEA–04FR] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4107. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Expedited Procedures For Processing Rail Rate Reasonableness, Exemption and Revocation Proceedings—received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4108. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Liquidation of Collateral and Sale of Commercial Loans—received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

4109. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Delegations of Authority; Tort Claims (RIN: 2900–AJ31) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4110. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Textiles and Textile Products; Denial of Entry [T.D. 99–68] (RIN: 1515–AC94) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4111. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Accreditation of Commercial Testing Laboratories; Approval of Commercial Gaugers [T.D. 99–67] (RIN: 1515–AB60) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4112. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Start-up Expenditures [Announcement 99–89] received August 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4113. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—BLS–LIFO Department Stores Indexes—July 1999—received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4114. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Capital Gains, Installment Sales, Unrecaptured Section 1250 Gain [TD 8836] (RIN: 1545–AW85) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4115. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Coordinated Issue: All Industries-Research Tax Credit-Internal Use Software [UIL: 41.51–10] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4116. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Coordinated Issue: All Industries-Research Tax Credit-Qualified Research [UIL 41.51–11] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4117. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Rev. Rul. 99–37] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4118. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Treatment of Distributions to Foreign Persons Under Sections 367(e) and 367(e)(2) [TD 8834] (RIN: 1545–AU22 and 1545–AX30] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4119. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Kentucky: Approval of Revisions to the Louisville State Implementation Plan [KY–75–1–9910a; KY–97–1–9911a; FRL–6435–4] received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. Shuster: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2681. A bill to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents (Rept. 106–313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. Shuster: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 171. Resolution congratulating the American Public Transit Association for 25 years of commendable service to the transit industry and the Nation (Rept. 106–314). 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. BASS:

H.R. 2839. A bill to amend the Act which established the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, in the State of New Hampshire, by modifying the boundary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 2840. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide for the establishment and operation of asthma treatment services for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for greater fiscal autonomy consistent with other United States jurisdictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, concerning the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program, to enable the Federal Government to enroll an employee and his or her family in the FEHB Program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee but the employee fails to provide the coverage; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HAYES (for himself and Mr. FLETCHER):

H.R. 2843. A bill to provide emergency assistance to farmers and ranchers in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and International Relations, 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. ISTOOK:

H.R. 2844. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to convey to the city of Bartlesville, Oklahoma, the former site of the NIPER facility of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky:

H.R. 2845. A bill to encourage the use of technology in the classroom; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2846. A bill to confer citizenship posthumously on Jose J. Casillas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2847. A bill to provide for the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate if there were violations of Federal law in the raid on the Branch Davidian compound in Waco, Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. TALENT, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. BAKER) (all by request):

H.R. 2848. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and the Small Business Act to establish a New Markets Venture Capital Program, to establish an America's Private Investment Company Program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a New Markets Tax Credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CARSON (for herself, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WYNN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FORD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 287. A resolution to commend Serena Williams on winning the 1999 U.S. Open Women's Singles and Doubles championships; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 110: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 133: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 188: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 274: Mrs. BONO and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 354: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 443: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LARSON, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 505: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 534: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 585: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 590: Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 623: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 664: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 673: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 712: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 713: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 782: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 783: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 797: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 810: Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 860: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 919: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 933: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 997: Mr. MOORE and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 1071: Mr. FROST and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1080: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1102: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1111: Mr. BARCIA and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1115: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1145: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 1193: Mr. ISAKSON and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1221: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1228: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1248: Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1283: Mr. ROGAN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1322: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1355: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1366: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 1409: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1413: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 1432: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 1505: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. DANNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BOYD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 1593: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 1620: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1685: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1728: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1731: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 1747: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1798: Mr. DEUTSCH and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1814: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. COOK, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1870: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 1883: Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1916: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1926: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RILEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1933: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 2066: Mr. OXLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 2130: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2149: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2170: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. WISE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 2221: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 2247: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2319: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2325: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 2338: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2364: Mr. PITTS and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 2403: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 2455: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 2662: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2673: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2691: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2720: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2736: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2788: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 2792: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2808: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 2814: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.J. Res. 59: Mr. TALENT and Mrs. EMERSON.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H. Res. 16: Mr. MINGE.

H. Res. 41: Mr. GIBBONS.

H. Res. 285: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WU, and Mr. TIERNEY.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1999 No. 118

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Our guest Chaplain, Father Paul Lavin, pastor of St. Joseph's on Capitol Hill, Washington, DC, will now give the prayer.

The guest Chaplain, Father Paul Lavin, offered the following prayer:

In Psalm 103 David sings:

Bless the Lord, O my soul
and all my being bless His holy name.
Bless the Lord, O my soul
and forget not all His benefits.
He pardons all your inequities,
He heals all your ills.
He redeems your life from destruction,
He crowns you with kindness and compassion.
He does not always chide,
nor does He keep His wrath forever.
Not according to our sins does He deal with us,
nor does He requite us according to our crimes.
For as the heavens are high above the Earth
so surpassing is His kindness toward those who fear Him.
As far as east is from the west,
so far has He put our transgressions from us.

Let us pray.

Almighty and eternal God, You have revealed Your glory to all nations. God of power and might, wisdom and justice, through You authority is rightly administered, laws enacted, and judgment is decreed. Let the light of Your divine wisdom direct the deliberations of the Senate and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws formed for our rule and government. May they seek to preserve peace, promote national happiness, and continue to bring us the blessings of liberty and equality.

We likewise commend to Your unbounded mercy all citizens of the United States, that we may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Your holy law. May we be preserved in union and that peace which the world cannot give; and, after enjoying the blessings of this life, be admitted to those which are eternal.

We pray to You, who are Lord and God, for ever and ever. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable PAT ROBERTS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, 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 (Mr. ROBERTS). The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the Interior appropriations bill. As a reminder, cloture motions were filed on Friday on S.J. Res. 33 denouncing the offer of clemency to Puerto Rican terrorists and on the Hutchison amendment regarding oil royalties. These cloture votes have been scheduled for 5 p.m. today and may be followed by additional votes on judicial nominations. It is hoped that action on the Interior appropriations bill can be completed by tomorrow and that the Senate can begin consideration of the bankruptcy reform bill.

I thank colleagues for their attention.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes. Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. shall be under the control of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS.

SENATE CHALLENGES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as was noted, there are 2 hours of morning business. My associates are going to undertake for the first hour to talk a little bit about the challenges that we face over the next month, 2 months. By the end of this month, of course, we are to have completed the appropriations, and we will be moving forward with that. We will be dealing with the administration and with the President on their completion. We hope that it will not end up in a closing down of Government but, rather, finding some consensus as to how we deal with our budget for next year.

We are challenged by different philosophies, of course, as to what that spending ought to be; we are always challenged by a difference of view as to what the priorities are. That is the nature of our body.

So, Mr. President, I would like now to yield to my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the Chair.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to address for a few minutes the tax relief package that the Senate passed before the August recess.

I had the opportunity during the August recess to travel much of Arkansas.

● 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 was in 27 counties in Arkansas in about a month. So we were very busy. In each one of those counties there were opportunities for people to express their opinions and to talk about issues that were of concern to them. We heard much about the farm crisis. I know the Presiding Officer has been very involved in trying to fashion a farm policy that is going to allow family farmers to survive, be viable, and has been very involved in the ag policy of this country. We have heard a lot of concerns about agriculture.

I also heard a lot about the tax package, and there were a lot of questions. I want to take a few minutes today to talk about what I heard and what I shared about the tax relief package that we passed in the Senate and the conference that was agreed upon with the House. I think it is responsible and provides much-needed relief for the American taxpayer.

I think that is the first thing we have to realize—how much there is a need for tax relief. People say, well, the economy is booming; we are doing fine; people are fine; no one really wants a tax cut. I think the reality is far different.

Under the Clinton administration, taxes have risen to the highest level in peacetime history—almost 21 percent of the gross domestic product. When you compare that to the 1950s and the Eisenhower years, the tax burden upon the American people measured—there are lots of ways of measuring ''tax burden,'' but one of the most helpful, I think, is in terms of the gross domestic product. At that time, it was about 15 percent of GDP; it is now 21 percent of GDP. And it took that last leap when Congress passed and the President signed the 1993 tax hike.

When we are talking in terms of the tax relief package, the $792 billion—and for a farm boy from north Arkansas that is a lot of money, $792 billion—it is over 10 years, and when you realize that what we are doing is rolling back the tax burden on the American people by a grand total of 1 percentage point of GDP; we would take it from about 21 percent to about 20 percent, there is nothing draconian—an overused word these days—there is nothing irresponsible about the tax relief package that was passed by the House and Senate.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, total Federal receipts amounted to 19.9 percent of GDP in 1998 and will be 20.1 percent of GDP in 1999.

Now, in Arkansas, that amounts to about $7,352 in taxes per capita, in 1998.

In a State such as Connecticut, it is about twice that; $15,525 was paid in taxes for every man, woman, and child in Connecticut. It was Ben Franklin who said a penny saved is a penny earned. I think maybe we could adjust that motto and say: A dollar earned is 38 cents spent by the Federal Government. The typical American family sees 38 percent of its income paid in taxes, as opposed to 28 percent of its income for food, clothing, and housing and only 3.6 percent that goes to savings.

I believe at a time of surplus, it would be unthinkable, it would be unconscionable for us not to allow the American people to keep more of what they have worked so hard to make. As Ronald Reagan once remarked: The taxpayer is someone who works for the Federal Government but doesn't have to take a Civil Service exam. When we think about the increasing percentage of our income going to taxes, that is, unfortunately, more true today than it was when President Reagan said it. The American people are laboring under a heavy burden of taxation and an intrusive Tax Code and tax system.

There are many provisions in the tax relief package. I want to address two that are particularly compelling. One is the marriage penalty tax.

Approximately 42 million American couples, including 6 million senior citizens, must pay an average of $1,400 extra in taxes for simply being married. The marriage penalty punishes in two ways. It pushes married couples into a higher tax bracket, and it lowers couples' standard deduction. So two married income earners with combined income must pay their income tax at a higher rate with a lower deduction than they would if they were two single people. It is unfair. It is wrong. Most Americans are absolutely perplexed why such a quirk in the Tax Code would be allowed to continue.

Keep in mind, it is not a one-time penalty. Under our tax system, marriage is not a freeway; it is a toll road. For 10 years of marriage, couples must pay an average of $14,000 extra; for 20 years, couples must pay $28,000 extra. The tax relief package that passed would finally achieve equity and fairness by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

The other aspect of the tax relief package we passed that I think is especially helpful and important and about which people feel strongly in Arkansas is the death tax. Small business owners and farmers can lose their lives and all they have saved for their children because of death taxes. Since the value of a business is added to the estate and taxed after exemption, sometimes as high as 55 percent, many small businesses and farms must be sold in order to pay the death tax. It is wrong. Just as the marriage penalty, it is something we should not allow, it is something we should not tolerate, and it is something we have the ability and capacity to change this year. It is a form of double taxation. The most obvious inequity is the death tax.

It also doesn't make a lot of sense. It taxes investment and savings. It taxes the American dream. Part of the American dream is, if you work hard and save and invest well and are able to accumulate something in life, you will be able to pass that on to your children and your grandchildren so they can start their lives with better prospects than what you did. It is not all of the American dream, but it is part of the American dream. The death tax is absolutely contrary to what we hold out as being something Americans should strive toward—investment, savings, building for the future.

Right now, the survival rate for a family farm from the first to the second generation is only about 30 percent. The odds are against a family farmer being able to pass along that farm to their children or grandchildren. I know our farmers are working hard, and these are difficult times for them. We keep having emergency bills to help alleviate the problems, but they are kind of a Band-Aid solution. We have one the Senate passed before the August recess.

Eliminating the death tax is something we can do that will permanently benefit agriculture and farmers in this country. Only a fraction of 1 percent of small businesses make it through to four generations. Just as the family farm, which is, in effect, a small business, other small businesses are also having a difficult time surviving and certainly being passed on to future generations.

Consider the case of Clarence who owns a farming and lumber business in North Carolina. He provides jobs to 720 people in his community through three small farms, a fertilizer and tobacco warehouse, and a small lumber mill. His family has worked hard for four generations to build this business to what it is today. All of that may well be lost when Clarence dies and his family is faced with a huge Government death tax bill. Clarence has worked hard to try to reduce the burden of the death tax. He slowed the growth of his business. He has hired lawyers. He has purchased life insurance. He has established trusts—all with the hope that he could create a plan to enable his children to keep the family business when he dies. All of that work and planning still may not be enough.

Clarence figures that his son will owe the Federal Government about $1.5 million upon his death, an impossible amount to pay for a man who makes only $31,000 a year. His son will almost certainly have to sell all or part of the business in order to pay the consequences of the death tax. Over four generations, Clarence's family businesses have been whittled down to a sliver of what they once were.

Then consider the case of Mr. Kennard, whose spirit of free enterprise is being stifled by the death tax. He owns a small septic tank company in Virginia. He began his business in 1963. Today, he employs 15 people, including his son and daughter who have worked with him since they were teenagers. His son runs one of the businesses and takes home about $30,000 a year, hardly enough to pay the $2 million bill the Government will hand him when his father dies.

Death should not be a taxable experience. In order to reduce the estate tax,

Mr. Kennard has stopped expanding his businesses and is considering transferring shares of his business to his children now rather than wait until his death. He would like to invest in insurance and put some of his money back into the business, but it doesn't make sense when his family will have to pay exorbitant taxes on any new appreciation. In fact, Mr. Kennard may have to liquidate one or two of his businesses in order to pay the death tax on the remaining businesses.

The tax refund bill would provide relief by lowering the 5-percent surtax on estates and replace the unified credit with the unified exemption of $1.5 million. We would ultimately be rid of the death tax altogether. It is something we should do. It is something we have within our power to do. We have passed it. We will send it to the President. It is our hope, still, that the President will change his mind and not veto this very important legislation.

There are many other important provisions in the bill as well. People say: Why spend your time on tax relief when the President said he is going to veto it? Because it is important, because it is the right thing to do, because our responsibility to our constituents is not what the President may or may not do. I recall well my early years in the House when we passed welfare reform and had to send it to the President not once, not twice, but three times, before the President finally decided the American people wanted welfare reform. He signed an important piece of reform legislation that has transformed welfare in this country and cut the rolls in half in State after State, including my home State of Arkansas.

I hope the President will reconsider, and I hope the American people will let us and the administration know how important tax relief is. When they understand what is in it, they do support it. In 27 counties in Arkansas, I did hear some concerns, primarily because of the myths that have been perpetrated about this tax relief bill.

One of the concerns was the myth that this tax relief bill somehow trades debt reduction for tax cuts. The fact is, the budget and the tax relief bill we passed will reduce public debt by 60 percent and achieve over $200 billion more in public debt reduction than the President's plan over the next 10 years. It is not a matter of either/or. It is not a matter of whether you are going to have debt reduction or we are going to have tax relief. We can and should have both.

Another one of the myths people are concerned about, and understandably concerned, is that somehow, if you pass a meaningful tax relief bill, as we did, it is going to erode and eat into the Social Security surplus. In fact, that is nothing but a myth. We would lockbox Social Security. We would not touch any of the Social Security surpluses, and we shouldn't. We should not perpetrate the wrong that has been done by previous Congresses by dipping in and using those revenues which are designated and should be designated for Social Security only.

Then there is, perhaps, one of the greatest myths of all; that is, the tax relief bill will primarily benefit the wealthy. This tax relief package would provide broad-based tax relief. It cuts every bracket 1 percent. That is not much. But it cuts across the board of tax brackets by 1 percent. It doesn't take somebody trained in math to figure out that if you are in the 15-percent tax bracket and you lower it from 15 to 14 percent, it is a much bigger personal tax cut than for somebody who is in a lower tax bracket who also sees only a 1-percent reduction in taxes.

The fact is that this tax relief package benefits low-income earners in the lowest tax bracket more than any other taxable group. We not only lower the rate, we expand the bracket to include yet more hard-working Americans.

In a State such as Arkansas, where we have one of the lowest per capita incomes, lowering the tax by even 1 percent for the lowest tax bracket has a significant benefit for hard-working Arkansans and hard-working Americans.

One of the other myths I heard while I was traveling across Arkansas was that there was concern that somehow these surpluses might not become reality. Conservative Arkansans who look at the Congressional Budget Office projections a decade out, I think, are right to say: What happens if, in fact, the surpluses don't become reality? Are you going to give all of this back in tax cuts? And are we going to go back up in deficit spending?

I was glad to be able to report that there was an important provision including a trigger—maybe it is better to call it a safety valve—that ensures that if the surpluses do not become reality, the tax cuts don't kick in. They don't become reality either. That, I think, is the ultimate fallback to ensure that we don't return to the big spending, red-ink, deficit spending ways of the past.

The bottom line is that in Arkansas 683,741 people would have tax reductions under this bill. That is, 750 million Americans would see their tax bills reduced. It is not something targeted for the wealthy, but it is something that would benefit every taxpaying American.

Opponents of tax relief insist that money must be left on the table in the name of debt reduction. The reality is that if you leave it on the table in Washington, it will be spent.

Therein is the great divide philosophically between those who believe the American people can better decide and determine how they ought to spend what they have earned and what they have worked for than people in Washington, DC—Government officials and bureaucrats in Washington. For those who believe we have to keep that money up here because we have to reserve it on the table for more spending programs because, truly, wisdom is found here inside the beltway, we reject that. I reject that.

I ask my colleagues to request of the President his reconsideration of what is desperately needed for the American people—lowering that tax burden from 21 percent to 20 percent. There is nothing too dramatic nor too drastic about it, but it is a small step in providing the American people the tax relief they deserve and they desire.

I thank the Chair.

I thank Senator THOMAS for providing this time and this opportunity to discuss what we have done in the area of tax relief.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas stated very clearly the strong feeling that I have received from folks in Wyoming. As I went around as well, when I first talked about tax relief, people kind of rolled their eyes. But when you start talking about the specifics of it—estate taxes and marriage penalty taxes—when you talk about the kinds of things that are there to encourage retirement funding and educational funding, you really get a great deal more interest in it.

I think the Senator pointed out clearly the real philosophical difference. If the money is here, it will be spent for increased government and increased programs rather than going back to the people who really own the money.

I thank the Senator.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be granted to David Stewart, an intern in my office, during the course of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding.

Even though I am not going to speak on the issue of taxes, I just heard the remarks by the Senator from Arkansas. Obviously, voting for that bill was difficult. I agree with the statements and plead with the President to sign the bill and give the people back some of the money or let them keep the money rather than running it through Washington. We are overtaxing the people at the highest level of taxation in the history of our country.

NURSING HOME INDUSTRY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I chair the Committee on Aging. We

have been holding some hearings about the nursing home industry over the last several months. I would like to make a comment.

First of all, I would like to speak about credibility. It is similar to an old maple tree. It takes years to develop, but a big storm can wipe it out just like that. I have a story that makes the point.

The nursing home industry challenged the credibility of nursing home inspectors. The nursing home industry, after this challenge, lost.

When I refer to the nursing home industry, I mean the American Health Care Association. This group represents the for-profit nursing homes. It has thousands of members across the country.

Nursing home inspectors operate in every State. They inspect every nursing home that accepts Federal money. The inspectors gauge whether nursing homes follow the Federal laws that were passed to protect nursing home residents. They evaluate everything from the most severe problems to the most minor problems. The most severe problems include malnutrition, dehydration, bedsores, inadequate medical treatment—matters that can be life-threatening. The most minor problems might include things such as comfortable lighting and access to stationery.

At my request, the General Accounting Office has issued a series of reports documenting severe problems in too many nursing homes, thus pointing up the shortcomings of the inspection.

On March 18, when I released one of these reports, the American Health Care Association issued a critical news release. The association said:

> Inspectors have closed down facilities, without consulting residents and their families, for technical violations posing no jeopardy to residents.

The association also said:

> Unfortunately, the current Federal inspection system has all the trademarks of a bureaucratic government program out of control.

These, of course, were very serious charges made by the association of nursing homes, and I took those charges very seriously. The Federal inspection system is responsible for the welfare of 1.6 million nursing home residents. If that system fails, these frail individuals will bear the brunt. That is something that should concern every one of us in the Senate.

Following up, I asked the American Health Care Association for proof of its claims issued in that news release critical of what the General Accounting Office had to say at my behest to study the issue. On May 6, I received an information packet from the American Health Care Association describing 10 examples that the association saw as proof of overzealous regulations. I turned this information over to the General Accounting Office and asked for its analysis.

The GAO did not find evidence of overzealous regulation. In fact, the General Accounting Office found just the opposite. There was adequate information for an objective assessment for 8 of the 10 industry examples. In each of those 8 cases, the General Accounting Office found that regulators acted appropriately.

I am not going to go through all eight examples, but I will use three. I think they show that there is a big difference in what the industry presented and what the General Accounting Office found; in other words, the industry's accusations that the inspection system was a bureaucratic thing out of control and that it was based upon just technicalities was wrong.

Example No. 1: The industry complained that a Michigan nursing home was severely punished for providing complimentary coffee to family members, staff, and residents. The General Accounting Office said that the nursing home inspectors saw two vulnerable residents pulling at the spigot of the hot coffee urn. The inspectors believed that the residents were in immediate danger of suffering serious burns from the coffee. Of course, with this, the General Accounting Office agreed.

Example No. 2: The industry complained that a California nursing home was cited for bed sores on a resident's foot that predated his admission, and in fact the bed sores were healing. The General Accounting Office said the inspector found conditions that actually had worsened the bed sores. The resident was wearing leather shoes when in a wheelchair. His feet were not elevated when in bed. His bedsore dressings were changed without proper techniques to prevent infection. There again, the example given by the nursing home association was wrong.

Example No. 3: The industry claimed that an Alabama nursing home was cited for a bald kitchen worker who failed to wear a hair net. The GAO reported that the industry did not identify the nursing home involved nor provide any documentation; therefore, the General Accounting Office could not assess what had happened.

I could go on in more detail from the General Accounting Office report. I have that report here, and I would like to point out to my colleagues that they should look at it, read it. Hopefully, everyone is interested and they will do so. It tells a valuable cautionary tale. Members of Congress, as I felt a responsibility to do, should always seek out both sides of every story. Industry associations work hard to seek our agreement with their side and, of course, in our system of government, and whether individual, or an association of individuals, that is their right. But it is our obligation as representatives of the people to weigh every issue with all the facts at hand. It is equally our obligation to consider the credibility of every source.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of time for Senator THOMAS.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator. Certainly, he has been the leader in rural health care, which is very important to my State, as it is for the State of the Presiding Officer.

I am pleased to have the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, join us this morning for some comments on our future activities. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I want also to join in the Senator's praise of Senator GRASSLEY for his leadership on many of the issues affecting senior citizens and rural health care in America.

MEDICARE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, Senate Republicans are committed to enacting legislation to preserve, strengthen, and save the Medicare system for current and future generations. The Republican congressional budget plan has set aside $505 billion over the next 10 years specifically to address domestic issues such as Medicare. Moreover, $90 billion of this amount has been set aside in a reserve fund that is dedicated exclusively to strengthening Medicare's financing and modernizing its benefits, including the provision of coverage for prescription drugs. Prescription drugs are as important to our senior citizens' health today as the hospital bed was back in 1965 when the Medicare program was first created. Medicare clearly should be restructured to reflect these changing priorities.

The money to address this challenge has been set prudently aside as part of the Republican budget. We have the resources, we have the determination, and we have the will to address this critical issue. Now it is up to Congress to come up with the plan, which I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will help us devise. We need to strengthen and modernize this critically important program to meet the health care needs of elderly and disabled Americans into the 21st century.

In addition to addressing the long-term structural issues facing Medicare, it is essential that Congress also take action this year to address some of the unintended consequences of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, as well as regulatory overkill by the Clinton administration, which is jeopardizing access to critically important home health care services for millions of senior citizens.

The growth in Medicare spending has slowed dramatically, and that is due, in part, to the reforms that were enacted as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. While it was Congress' intent in enacting this legislation to slow the rate of growth, it has become increasingly clear that the payment policies implemented by the Clinton administration as a consequence of the Balanced Budget Act have gone too far and that the cutbacks have been far

too deep, jeopardizing our seniors' access to critical hospital, skilled nursing, and home health care.

Nowhere is this problem more serious than in home health care. America's home health agencies provide services that have enabled a growing number of our most frail and vulnerable senior citizens to avoid hospitals, to avoid nursing homes, and to receive the care they need and want in the security and privacy of their homes, just where they want to be.

I have visited with home health nurses in Maine who have taken me on home health visits. I know firsthand how vital these important health care services are to our frail seniors. I know of couples who have been able to stay together in their own home solely because of the services provided by our home health agencies. In 1996, home health was the fastest growing component of the Medicare budget. That, understandably, prompted Congress and the Clinton administration to initiate changes that were intended to make the program more cost-effective and efficient.

There was strong bipartisan support for the provisions in the BBA that called for the implementation of a prospective payment system for home care. Unfortunately, until this system is implemented, home health agencies are being paid under a very flawed interim payment system, or IPS.

In trying to get a handle on cost, Congress and the administration created a system that penalizes efficient agencies and that may be restricting access to care for the very Medicare beneficiaries who need the care the most. These include our sicker patients with complex chronic care needs, like diabetic wound care patients, or IV-therapy patients who require multiple visits.

According to a recent survey by the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, almost 40 percent of home health agencies indicated that there were patients whom they previously would have accepted for care, whom they no longer serve due to this flawed interim payment system and the regulatory overkill of the Clinton administration. Thirty-one percent of these agencies admitted they had actually discharged patients due to the inadequate payment system. The discharged patients tend to be those with chronic care needs who require a large number of visits and are expensive to serve. Indeed, they are the very people who most need home health services.

I know that Congress simply did not intend to construct a payment system that inevitably discourages home health agencies from caring for those senior citizens who need the service the most. These problems are all the more pressing because they have been exacerbated by the failure of the Clinton administration to meet the original deadline for implementing a prospective payment system. As a result, home health care agencies will be struggling under a flawed IPS system, the interim payment system, for far longer than Congress ever envisioned when it enacted the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Moreover, it now appears the savings from the Balanced Budget Act were greatly underestimated. Medicare spending for home health care fell by nearly 15 percent last year and the CBO now projects that the post-Balanced Budget Act reductions in home health care will exceed $46 billion over the next 5 years. This is three times greater than the $16 billion that CBO originally estimated for that time period. That is another indication that the cutbacks have been far too deep, far too severe, and much more wide-reaching than Congress ever intended.

Again, the flaws in the Balanced Budget Act have been exacerbated by regulatory decisions made by this administration. Earlier this year, I chaired a hearing held by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. We heard firsthand about the financial distress and cash-flow problems of very good, cost-effective, home health agencies from across the country. We heard about the impact of these cutbacks on our senior citizens. Witnesses expressed concern that the problems in the system are inhibiting their ability to deliver much needed care, particularly to chronically ill patients with complex needs. Some agencies have actually closed because the reimbursement levels under Medicare have fallen far short of their actual operating costs. Many others in Maine and throughout the Nation are laying off staff or declining to accept new patients, particularly those with the more serious health problems that require more care and more visits.

This points to the most critical and central issue: Cuts of this magnitude simply cannot be sustained without ultimately affecting the care that we provide to our senior citizens. Moreover, the financial problems that home health agencies have been experiencing have been exacerbated by a host of onerous, burdensome, and ill-conceived new regulatory requirements imposed by the Clinton administration through HCFA, including the implementation of what is known as OASIS, the new outcome and assessment information data set; new requirements for surety bonds; sequential billing requirements; IPS overpayment recoupment; and a new 15-minute increment home health reporting requirement requiring nurses to act as if they were accountants or lawyers, billing every 15 minutes of their time.

Witnesses at our hearing before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations expressed particular frustration with what the CEO from the Visiting Nurse Service in Saco, ME, Maryanna Arsenault, termed as the Clinton administration's regulatory policy of ''implement and suspend.'' She and others pointed to numerous examples of hastily enacted, ill-conceived requirements for surety bonds and sequential billing. No sooner had HCFA imposed the cost burden of a specific mandate on America's home health agencies, than it then had second thoughts and suspended the requirements—but only after damage had been done, only after our home health agencies had invested significant time and resources they do not have, trying to comply with this regulatory overkill.

Responding to the excessive regulation of the Clinton administration, as well as the problems in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, and I have together introduced legislation titled, ''The Medicare Home Health Equity Act,'' which is cosponsored, I am pleased to say, by a bipartisan group of 26 of our colleagues. It makes needed adjustments in the Balanced Budget Act and related Federal regulations to ensure that our senior citizens have access to necessary home health services.

One of the ironies of the formula enacted in the Balanced Budget Act is that it penalizes the low-cost nonprofit agencies that had been doing a good job of holding down their expenses. The program needs to be entirely revamped.

The most important provision of our bill eliminates the automatic 15-percent reduction in Medicare home health payments that is now scheduled for October 1 of next year, whether or not a prospective payment system is enacted. I am not overstating the situation when I say that if another 15-percent cut is imposed on America's home health agencies, it would be a disaster. It would threaten our ability to provide these services to millions of senior citizens throughout this country.

A further 15-percent cut would be devastating. It would destroy the low-cost, cost-effective providers, and it would further reduce our seniors' access to home health care. Furthermore, as I mentioned earlier, it is entirely unnecessary because we have already achieved the budget savings that were anticipated in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. We have not only exceeded them, we have exceeded them by a factor of three.

Our legislation also provides for what we call supplemental ''outlier'' payments to home health agencies on a patient-by-patient basis. This is needed because there are some patients who are expensive to care for because they have complex and chronic health conditions that need a great deal of care. We heed to have a formula that recognizes that there are certain higher cost patients who are higher cost in a legitimate sense. It is still far cheaper to treat those patients through home health care than in a nursing home or hospital setting.

The provision in our bill removes the existing financial disincentive for agencies to care for patients with intensive medical needs. We know from the recent studies from GAO and the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission that those are the individuals who

are most at risk right now of losing access to home health services under the current interim payment system.

To decrease total costs in order to remain under their per-beneficiary limits, too many home health agencies have had to significantly reduce the number of visits, which in turn has increased the cost of each visit. We need to deal with the regulatory issues that I have mentioned, including OASIS, surety bonds, sequential billing, and the 15-minute incremental reporting requirement. Our legislation accomplishes these goals.

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 our senior citizens have access to medically necessary home health services.

It has been a pleasure to work with the Senate majority leader, Senator LOTT, as well as Senator ABRAHAM, Senator SANTORUM, Senator BOND, and others who have been real leaders in this effort to come up with a solution to this very pressing problem. My hope is that we will make reforming the payment system for Medicare home health services a top priority this fall.

I yield back the remainder of my time to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator from Maine, not only because of the good job she does all across the board but particularly on this matter of health care, rural health care. As cochairman of the Rural Health Care Caucus, I am particularly interested in those kinds of things. For example, in Wyoming, home health care is so important and sometimes quite expensive, particularly because of the amount of miles that have to be traveled. But for the patient, and because of the cost, home health care is the right way to go.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri to talk a little more about the future and our plans with respect to taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maine for her sensitivity to a crisis which is looming in American health care and that she is willing to constructively deal with that crisis. I thank her for her thoughts on this matter and for her cosponsorship of important legislation.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, as we look to the future, most of us, in our families, in our businesses, in our civic organizations, in our churches, like to deal with some sort of plan. As a matter of fact, there is a lot of buzz or talk these days about financial planning, making sure we have the capacity to meet the demands of the future when they come to us and when they fall upon us.

It is incumbent on the Congress of the United States to engage in some planning, to take a look at the future and find out exactly where we ought to be going and how we ought to get there, and the things that are important and what we ought to do to protect our interests. It is with that in mind that we, the Members of the Congress, are delivering to the President a financial plan for the next decade. He will have an opportunity to act on that plan this week. That plan has been talked about, the tax relief contained in the plan, but it has not been spoken of very generously in terms of the other major features of this financial plan for America for the next 10 years. I think we can only understand the plan by looking at it as a whole, understanding what we are doing to protect the interests of this country in the years ahead.

The first thing I think people want us to start to do is to be more responsible in the way we in Washington handle their money. One of the areas of irresponsibility in the past has been the Social Security trust fund. When there has been a little bit more in the trust fund—or a lot more in the trust fund—than was needed for that particular year, Members of the House and Senate have been a part of budgeting that money for expenditures not related to Social Security, to support the operational costs of Government.

Americans are duly concerned because they know the reason there is a surplus in the Social Security trust fund is that big bulge of us baby boomers are paying in, but they know when this big bulge of baby boomers starts to consume instead of contribute to the trust fund, we are going to need the surplus. So the first thing we have done in our financial plan for the future is to put an end to that. We are going to stop the practice of spending the trust fund. So the financial plan which will go to the President this week says $1.9 trillion—trillion being a thousand billions and a billion being a thousand millions; I mean, it is almost impossible to think of it that way—$1.9 trillion is going to be reserved for Social Security, a major step forward. Americans have a right to expect us to plan to do that and we are doing it. That is a big part of the financial plan for the future.

No. 2, people say over time most families, most organizations want to reduce their debt; they would like to get their debt down to manageable levels. Most of us take 30 years to pay off a home. We have decided to start paying down the national debt. In a part of the plan which I think is very important, we are taking the publicly held debt of the United States of America from $3.8 trillion down to $1.9 trillion, a 50-percent decline in the national debt held by the public of the United States of America. What a tremendous decline in debt. As part of a rational plan, the debt to the gross domestic product ratio goes from 43 percent to 14 percent over that 10-year plan we are sending to the President. First, we protect Social Security. Second, we pay the debt down by 50 percent.

No. 3, as the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, has indicated, we put aside about $505 billion for contingencies over the next 10 years, things we might want to spend money on over and above what we are spending now. So not only do we have a reservation of $1.9 trillion for Social Security, not only do we cut the publicly held debt of this country in half, but we also reserve a half trillion dollars for expenditures we are not now making.

It is only in the context of these three items—the saving of the Social Security surplus for Social Security; reducing the national debt, the publicly held debt of America, by 50 percent; putting aside a half trillion dollars for contingencies—that we understand what the tax relief is all about. The tax relief is what is left over. Americans earn the money. We trust Americans to earn this money; we should trust them to spend it. The question is whether we are going to fund families or bureaucracies.

We got the President to agree with us on saving Social Security to the extent of putting $1.9 trillion aside, and I commend him for getting there. He wasn't there in his State of the Union Message. I commend the President for being willing to pay down the national debt. But the President, after that, wants to spend so much more of what is left over on more Government programs.

Frankly, we ought to be giving a tax relief package, 1 percent, to every bracket. We ought to be doing away with the marriage penalty tax. We ought to allow parents and grandparents to invest money so their kids can have money for education, and the growth of that money can have a tax preferred status. We ought to allow people to buy health care in a more tax beneficial way, especially the self-employed who do not get it on their jobs.

It is with that in mind I think this package is delivered to the President to say this is a comprehensive financial plan for the future. The tax relief only amounts to 23.8 percent of the total surplus as we have defined surpluses historically because we have been so responsible as to set that Social Security surplus aside. It is not part of what we will spend. And we start to knock down the national debt, take down the publicly held debt of the country 50 percent in the next 10 years and set aside a half trillion dollars for contingencies, and then work on abolishing the marriage penalty and tax, saving for education and expanded IRAs, and knocking every tax rate down by 1 percent—a 1-percent decline for folks at the top brackets and a 1-percent decline for folks at the bottom brackets.

It seems to me that is the kind of plan upon which a nation can march

forward. I call upon the President of the United States to reevaluate his position. He has expressed real doubts, serious reservations about this. Seeing it in the context of a financial plan for the future of the United States is to see it as a roadmap to opportunity and success and prosperity.

I close with this. Because we had the two biggest tax increases in history in this decade, Americans have paid in far more money than we are going to need. It is like going to the grocery store and you hand the man a $10 bill for a $2.45 gallon of milk. You expect change. You expect to get something back when you pay more than is needed for what you have ordered. You would not think much of the grocer who said: I'm going to give you two more gallons of milk and a pound of bacon, whether you need it or not. That is what has happened. The President said we have the Government covered, the costs are covered, but they have overpaid. Now we are going to give them a whole bunch more Government, whether they have ordered it or not.

I think we need a little change. Americans deserve some tax relief, and I am pleased to have had this opportunity to present this financial plan which the President should sign.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think we have used the time that has been allocated. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes. Since I am the only one present, the chances are probably pretty good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very pleased my associates could come over this morning and talk about some of the programs that are before us, to talk about some of the directions we will be taking. I think there is another area, in addition to what has been talked about, that is right before us. We are dealing now with spending. We are now in the process of finishing the appropriations process. Congress must adopt 13 different appropriations bills for future spending of the Government and we are in the process of doing that.

We also have some budget limitations that we have placed on ourselves, some caps that we have to honor. We are dealing also with emergency spending. We have talked some now about the surpluses that have been available. The surpluses that are available this year, however, are generally Social Security dollars. But there are $14 billion in the regular budget and those will, of course, be available. Most of those have already been set aside as emergency spending.

What we have before us is an opportunity to continue to work and complete this matter of funding the budget for this year. At the same time, we must pass it on to the White House. We must find some agreement, either that or have some continuing resolutions that will put us into the future or, in fact, we are faced with the possibility of the President vetoing the legislation and of having the Government shut down, as happened in the past. I hope this will not be the case.

I noticed in the paper the other day the President has indicated he would like nothing better than a bipartisan compromise. Hopefully, that is what will happen. Yet he has suggested ''if only the Republicans could be a little more reasonable.'' I am not sure that is necessarily a part of it. Probably his White House aides are happy about this partisan combat because, as we know, the last time the Government was shut down, the Congress shouldered all the responsibility. I do not believe that ought to be the case, and hopefully it will not be this year. We are looking forward to working in those areas.

In terms of Social Security, there are some changes that need to be made. We are talking about saving Social Security. We ought to do that. We are committed to doing that. The method of doing it currently, of course, is to put the Social Security surplus in to replace the publicly held debt. The fact is, it then becomes debt that has to be covered by the taxpayers when the time comes to use it.

We also are looking at a change in the Social Security Act which responds to what is happening with Social Security. The demographics are changing. When Social Security started, there were 34 people working for every 1 beneficiary. People paid about $30 a year into the program. Now there are three people working for every beneficiary, and it is moving toward two. They are paying 12.5 percent of up to nearly $80,000 into this fund.

The fact is, over a period of time, probably in 20 years, there will not be enough money to continue as we have, so we have to make some changes. The choices are very simple ones basically:

We can increase taxes. Nobody really wants to do that. The Social Security tax is the largest tax paid by almost all taxpayers in the lower-income brackets.

We can reduce benefits. People are not much interested in that.

The third alternative, of course, is to increase the revenue that comes from the moneys that are in the trust fund. We are very anxious to do that. It also gives an opportunity to take that money when it comes in and put it somewhere other than into additional national debt loans and put it into individual accounts that people would have as their own, to be invested in the private sector for a much higher yield.

These are some of the things with which we grapple. Certainly, we are going to be working with the administration to see if we can do something in that respect. I do not think there is willingness on this side to trade off tax relief for increased spending. I hope not, and I do not believe we will do that.

On the other hand, we can find, I am sure, agreement in the appropriations areas, and we can move forward with that.

Mr. President, our time has expired. I see there is a Senator on the other side of the isle, so I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. shall be controlled by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Wyoming, I did not hear all of his remarks, but I always appreciate what he has to say, agree or disagree.

ECONOMIC CONVULSION IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will not speak for a long time about the economic convulsion in agriculture. I think my colleague sees some of this in Wyoming as well. I said last week I was going to come to the floor and talk about what is happening to family farmers in Minnesota and around the country. I want to speak about this briefly today and announce a bill that I will be introducing. I also want to say to my colleagues, as I see us moving forward over the next couple of days this week, that I do intend to be back on the floor with amendments that relate to how we can get a decent price for family farmers and how we can get some competition and how we can put some free enterprise back into the food industry.

I am also prepared—and I am sure other Senators would feel the same way if they came from an agricultural State—I am also prepared, starting this week and every week, to spend a considerable amount of time before the Senate talking, not so much in statistical terms but more in personal terms, about what is happening.

I give, by the way, a lot of credit to Willie Nelson and Neil Young and John Mellencamp for putting together Farm Aid. I had a chance to be there yesterday morning with my wife Sheila. It was an important gathering. I thank them for bringing some attention to the crisis in agriculture and what is happening to family farmers.

They are not Johnny-come-latelys. They have been at this for some time. There was a rally this morning, a ''Save the Family Farm'' coalition rally, and then the Farmers Union was meeting with Secretary Glickman. I know there are hundreds of Farmers Union members who are going to be meeting with Republican and Democratic Senators.

What everybody is saying right now is, we have this convulsion in agriculture. When I was a college teacher in the mid-1980s in Northfield, MN, in Rice County, I did a lot of organizing with farmers. I had some friends who took their lives. I am not being melodramatic, unfortunately. I was at more

foreclosures than I ever wanted to be. I saw a tremendous amount of economic pain.

What we are experiencing now in agriculture in this country is far worse. On present course, we are going to lose, as I said last week, a generation of family farmers. I simply say, in an emphatic way, the political question for us is whether we stay the course or whether we change course. I do not believe that any Senator, Democrat or Republican, who comes from a State like the State of Minnesota and who has been traveling in communities and seeing the pain in people's eyes and seeing people who literally are almost at the very end, could not take the position that we have to do something different when it comes to agricultural policy.

I am not going to be shrill today—or hopefully any other day—but I am telling my colleagues, the status quo is unacceptable. It is unacceptable. The piece of legislation we passed several years ago called Freedom to Farm—I believe it's really ''Freedom to Fail,'' though others can take a different position—at minimum has to be modified. If we do not take the cap off the loan rate and we do not have some kind of target price and we do not do something to make sure that farmers have a decent price for what they produce so they can get the cash flow to earn a decent living, they are going to go under. Many of them are going under right now as I speak.

The second thing I want to talk about is a piece of legislation I will offer this week as an amendment to the bankruptcy bill. I will have plenty of data. For example, five firms account for over 80 percent of beef packing market. That is a higher concentration than the FTC found in 1918 leading up to enactment of the Packers and Stockyards Act. Six firms account for 75 percent of pork packing. Now we have a situation where Smithfield wants to buy out Murphy. And the largest four grain buyers control nearly 40 percent of the elevator facilities.

The legislation I am going to introduce—I am now waiting for the final draft from legislative counsel—will impose a moratorium on mergers, acquisitions, and marketing agreements among dealers, processors, commission merchants, brokers, or operators of a warehouse of agricultural commodities with annual net sales or total assets of more than $50 million. The moratorium would last for 1 year, or until Congress enacts legislation that addresses the problems of concentration of agriculture, whichever comes first. I think Senator DORGAN is working on a similar piece of legislation. I am sure there are other Senators who are going to be talking about this.

Going back to the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, or Senator Estes Kefauver's work in the 1950s, Congress has said there was a role for Government to protect consumers and also to protect producers. In fact, a lot of the history of the Sherman Act and Clayton Act goes back to agriculture and the concerns of family farmers.

What I am saying in this legislation is, obviously, the status quo is not working. These conglomerates have muscled their way to the dinner table. They are pushing family farmers out. There is no real competition in the food industry any longer. In order for our producers to get a decent price, and in order to make sure our producers and family farmers have a future, in order to make sure the rural communities of my State of Minnesota have a future, we are going to have to take some action. Our action and our legislation ought to be on the side of family farmers.

So I intend to introduce this bill later today. I will also draft this as an amendment to the bankruptcy bill. I also will be on the floor with other amendments. Unfortunately, the bankruptcy bill applies all too well to family farmers in my State of Minnesota and to family farmers all around the country.

There are other colleagues who want to speak, so I am going to try to conclude in the next 3 or 4 minutes, I say to my colleague from Oregon. I will not take a lot of time because we only have an hour and others want to speak as well.

But I have had a chance to travel a lot in Minnesota. I have had a chance to spend time in other States—in Iowa, in Texas, in Missouri. I have met with a lot of organizers around the country—in the Midwest and in the South—and I am telling you that I think rural America has to take a stand. I do not care whether we use the language of modifying legislation or amending legislation.

I personally thought the Freedom to Farm was really ''Freedom to Fail'' from the word ''go.'' Others can have different opinions. But for sure, time is not on the side of family farmers. A lot of people in Minnesota, a lot of farmers are 45, 50 years old. They are burning their equity up. They look at me hard, and they say: Look, Paul, do we basically take everything we have and try to keep this farm going? We will. We want to. It has been in our family for four generations. We love farming. But if there is no future for us, tell us now.

I do not want to tell family farmers in Minnesota there is no future for them. I do not want to tell our rural communities there is no future for them. I do not want to tell our country that a few conglomerates are going to own all the land. Then what will the price be, and what will be the quality of the food? Will there be an agriculture that respects the air and the land and the water and the environment? I think not.

I do not think our country is yet engaged. I hope the national media will cover this crisis. And it is a crisis. I will be coming to the floor of the Senate with longer and longer and longer and longer speeches, backed up by lots of data and statistics of what is happening in Minnesota, backed up with a lot of personal stories of hard-working people who have now lost their farms, where they not only live but where they have also worked. I will have amendments on legislation, in an effort to change things for the better.

If my colleagues have other ideas about how to change things for the better, great. Then get out on the floor of the Senate—this week, next week, the following week. Personally, at this point in time, I am focused on family farmers in the State of Minnesota. I am focused on our rural communities. I am focused on family farmers and rural communities all across our country.

I intend, as a Senator, to do everything I can on the floor of the Senate to fight for people, everything I know how to do to fight for people. I also am going to spend as much time as I can organizing the farmers because I am convinced, I say to Senator REID and Senator WYDEN, we are going to need farmers and rural people to come and rock this capital before we get the change we need. But we are going to keep pushing very hard. An awful lot of good people's lives are at stake.

I think in many ways this is a question that speaks to what America is about as well. I cannot be silent on it. I know of many Senators from other agricultural States who feel the same way. We have to push this on to the agenda of the Congress, and we have to do it now.

EAST TIMOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, in the final 1 minute—and I did not bring any talking points; I do not have it written now—I would like to thank the President. I was critical of the President last week about East Timor, but I think we ought to give credit where credit is due.

I am glad he spoke out. I am glad he put pressure on the Indonesian Government. I know there are a number of important questions to resolve about the nature of whatever kind of peacekeeping force goes in, but the sooner the better because this has been genocide. An awful lot of people have had the courage to stand up against the repressive government, or in this particular case, stand up for the independence of East Timor, that have been murdered. The sooner we get an international presence, an international force in there, the better.

I think the President was forceful this past weekend and should continue to be forceful. We should not let the Indonesian Government delay. The sooner we get a force in there to protect people, and to follow through on the mandate of the people—which was something the United Nations sponsored and supported, where the people voted for their own independence—I think the better off the world will be because whenever our Government can be on the side of human rights, then we

are living up to who we are as a Nation.

I thank my colleagues and yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for an excellent statement. I happen to think those statements reflect his commitment to justice, both here at home and overseas. I commend him for an excellent statement.

I also, before I begin, thank my colleague, the distinguished whip from Nevada. I understand he had the time, and he was gracious enough to give me this opportunity to speak briefly. I thank my good friend from Nevada for the opportunity to speak this afternoon.

CUSTOMER SERVICE PROTECTIONS FOR AIRLINE TRAVELERS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, for many months now the Nation's airlines have been doing their utmost to prevent the Congress from enacting meaningful customer service protections for airline travelers. The airline industry lobbyists have fanned out across the Nation's capital telling our colleagues that meaningful protections for consumers—such as the right to timely and accurate information—are going to increase the costs for airline passengers, reduce service, and to hear them tell it, it is practically going to bring about the end of Western civilization as we know it.

As part of their campaign to prevent the enactment of enforceable legislation to protect the consumer, the airline industry has made a host of voluntary pledges to improve passenger service.

Today, I am releasing two reports, one done by the General Accounting Office and the other done by the Congressional Research Service, that show the voluntary pledges made by the airline industry are worth little more than the paper on which they are written.

Let me be specific.

After evaluating the airline industry's proposals, it is clear the airline industry provides passengers rights in three categories:

First, rights that they already have; second, rights that the airline industry is reluctant to write into the legalese that constitute the contract between the airline and the customer; and finally, their rights that are ignored altogether.

For example, among the several rights airlines refuse to provide is disclosure about overbooking on flights. If you call an airline this afternoon and ask about a particular flight and it is overbooked, the airline is not required to tell you that before they take your money. When I and other advocates for the consumer have asked them to provide just this information—we are not calling for a constitutional right to a fluffy pillow on an airline flight but just the information about overbooking—the airline industry simply won't follow through. The fact is, the industry's voluntary pledges are gobbledygook.

To determine if there was any substance to them at all, I asked the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Research Service to compare the voluntary pledges made by the industry to the hidden but actually binding contractual rights the airline passengers have that are written into what are called contracts of carriage. The General Accounting Office found that of the 16 pledges the airline industry has made to consumers, only 4 are actually provided in the contracts of carriage. Three of them are mandated already by Federal regulation, and most of them are left out altogether, including informing the customers of the lowest fare, informing customers about delays, cancellations and diversions, returning checked bags within 24 hours, providing credit card refunds within 7 days, informing the passenger about restrictions on frequent flier rules, and assigning customer service representatives to handle complaints and other problems.

Moreover, the airlines are not exactly tripping over themselves to rewrite these contracts of carriage, the actual contract that protects the consumer. When General Accounting Office officials contacted the airlines to inquire about actually putting teeth into pledge language, the officials at 10 of the major airlines said they were ''considering revisions'' to their contracts of carriage to reflect at least some of the customer service plans. Even more importantly, if the passenger wants to know what their actual contractual rights are to these key services, the airlines have made it very difficult for the consumer to find out. The Congressional Research Service points out:

> Frontline airline staff seems uncertain as to just what contracts of carriage are.

The Service found:

> Even if the consumer knows that they have a right to the information, they must accurately identify the relevant provisions of the contract of carriage or take home the address or phone number, if available, of the airline's consumer affairs department, send for it, and then wait for the contract of carriage to arrive in the mail.

As the Congressional Research Service puts it, with their usual diplomacy and understatement:

> The airlines do not appear to go out of their way to provide easy access to these contracts of carriage.

I hope my colleagues will read the actual specifics included in the airlines so-called ''customer first'' pledge. What they will see is a lot of high sounding rhetoric about improving service to the passengers, but the harsh reality is, it is business as usual.

Last year, there were an unprecedented number of complaints about airline service. Based on the figures I have just obtained for the first 6 months of this year, there has been another huge increase, in fact a doubling, in the number of consumer complaints about passenger service. It is easy to see why, when you examine how hedged and guarded the airline industry is with respect to actually giving consumers meaningful and timely information that will help them make their choices about travel.

For example, let us look briefly at the pledge to offer the lowest fare available on airline flights. What this means is if a consumer uses the telephone to call an airline and asks about a specific flight on a specific date in a specific class, the airline will tell them the lowest fare, as they are already required to do. But not only will they not provide you relevant information about lower fares on other flights on the same airline, they won't even tell you about lower fares that are probably available on their web page. The reason why is simple: They have got you when they have you on the telephone, and they will sell you the ticket when it is an opportunity to sell it and they can make money on it. But when it is a chance to help the consumer and the consumer can get a break by knowing about other fares available on the web page, there is no disclosure

The purchase of an airline ticket today in America is like virtually no other consumer choice. Unlike movie theaters that sell tickets to a movie or a sporting goods store that sells soccer balls, the airline industry provides no real assurance that you will be able to use their product as intended. Movie theaters can't cancel shows because they don't have enough people for a show, but airlines cancel flights when they don't have enough passengers. The sporting goods store can't lure you in with a pledge to give you that soccer ball at an attractive price and then give you a less desirable product at a greater cost after you get there. But the airline industry can do both of those things. They can make arbitrary cancellations. They can lure you in for a product and, after they have you, not make it available. The fact is, the airline industry is insisting they ought to be outside the basic laws that protect consumers in every other economic field from coast to coast.

I conclude by saying that over the next few weeks the Congress is going to have the chance to right the wrongs spelled out by the Congressional Research Service and the General Accounting Office studies that I release today. I look forward to working with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to make sure airline passengers across this country get a fair shake.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and thank my colleague from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Oregon, I have appreciated his presentation. It reminds me of the work he has done since he has been in Congress. We served together in the

House of Representatives, and the Senator from Oregon was known in the House as being someone who dealt with substance. The same tradition that he established in the House, is being carried over to the Senate, as indicated by his remarks dealing with airline travel.

COMMERCIALISM OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am a great fan of public broadcasting. I listen almost every day to public radio. I am tremendously impressed with programs such as ''Prairie Home Companion'' and all the news stories in the morning that are extremely in depth. With public television, we all recognize the contributions made by the series on the Civil War, which is a classic and will continue to be in American television. The ''MacNeil, Lehrer News Hour,'' which is now the ''Lehrer News Hour,'' is the most in-depth news coverage that we have any place in America. There are many other programs on radio and on public television which I haven't mentioned that are quite good as well.

I am struck by the amount of commercials I endure and we all have to endure when we listen to public radio and watch public television. In my estimation, it is out of hand. These commercials are technically called ''enhanced underwriting.'' You can call them whatever you want, but they are commercials.

An article appeared a short time ago in the Washington Post entitled ''Now a Word About Our Sponsor.'' Critics say public radio's on-air credits come too close to being commercials, and, as indicated in that article, they are absolutely right. People are getting more disturbed every day with commercialism of public broadcasting.

I point this out because I am not the only one who has noticed the increasing sponsored announcements. According to this article, one survey shows a 700-percent increase in corporate funding over the past 5 or 6 years. It is just not listeners who are noticing the change. If I were the owner of a private broadcasting station, I would be up in arms. And some private station owners are tremendously disturbed about the increasing commercialism of this so-called public broadcasting.

Private stations aren't tax exempt like public broadcasting stations are. The private stations are now voicing their concerns about the existing uneven playing field. I don't want to sound as though I am beating up on public broadcasting because, as I have indicated in my opening statement, I really do like public broadcasting. I enjoy the programs on National Public Radio and public television. I believe public broadcasting should remain just that—public. That means we have to do a better job with public funding.

We can trace very clearly what has happened to public broadcasting. Newt Gingrich, and others with whom he associated, came out with the bad idea that they wanted to eliminate public broadcasting. This group found that they could not do that. So, in effect, they cut back the funding and they are strangling public broadcasting to death.

Mr. President, we need to do the necessary things to make public broadcasting more public in nature. I believe it is time for us to decide whether we want to have a public broadcasting system or whether we don't want to have one. Either we fund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting so they can exist, or we end it. I prefer the former. Therefore, when the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education marks up its bill—and I am a member of that subcommittee—I plan to offer an amendment to increase the Corporation for Public Broadcasting appropriation to $475 million. This is $125 million more than their request. However, I also plan to include report language that would encourage public radio and television to scale back their so-called enhanced underwriting practices and to become, once again, a public broadcasting system that is publicly funded.

As long as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is leery of Congress cutting their funds or doing away with Federal funds altogether, they will begin to sound more and more like private broadcasting stations. The people who run those stations don't like it. You have people, as indicated in the Post article that I referred to earlier, who are continually talking about how difficult it is and how unfair it is. In this article, the author cites Bob Edwards from the NPR Morning Edition, which is a very fine program for news in the morning. He says:

> Underwriting has kept us alive, but there's also a downside. It has cut into our air time. If you have to read a 30-second underwriting credit [a commercial], that's less news you can do.

So as I stated, we have to either make public broadcasting public or do away with it. If we continue the road we are going on, we are going to wind up having public broadcasting in name only, and it is going to be unfair that they are competing with the private stations, in which we have people who have invested a lot of money, trying to make money on an uneven playing field because of the protections public broadcasting have.

A DEMOCRATIC PLAN WITH WHICH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE CAN AGREE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we had some good news last week when the majority leader, Senator LOTT, indicated that if the President vetoed the $800 billion Republican tax plan, that would be the end of it.

That is good news for the American public on the $800 billion attempt to cut taxes in this country because, in fact, it really wasn't a tax cutting measure. It was something that would give no immediate relief to the American taxpayer. There was relief in the outyears. In fact, what it would have done is prevent us from directing moneys toward the debt, and the debt of $5 trillion is something we need to address.

If the national debt were lowered, it would be a tax cut for everyone, rich and poor. We pay hundreds of millions of dollars every year in interest on that debt. If we lower that, it will be good for everyone. We are not going to continue to live in this great economy where everything is looking good, forever. Hard times may lie ahead, and I think we will rue the day we didn't use these good times to pay down that debt.

This massive tax package that was passed on a very partisan basis, and then withheld from the American public during the August break so there could be a public relations effort to have the American people accept this tax cut, never materialized. The American people would not accept it because it was not acceptable on its face. They realized there was no meaningful tax relief in this package. It was more of a public relations ploy. The fact is that there should have been more attention focused on paying down the debt and protecting Social Security and Medicare. We must pay down the debt. That would be a tax cut for everyone.

We must protect Social Security. The majority touted the Social Security lockbox in conjunction with the tax cut. But the Republican lockbox fails to extend the solvency in the Social Security trust fund by a single day, and it includes, in this so-called lockbox, a trapdoor, a loophole, that would allow Republicans to label anything Social Security reform and to raid the Social Security trust fund. Finally, the Republican lockbox does nothing to protect Medicare.

So by proposing targeted tax cuts toward working families, the minority believes our Democratic plan is able to prioritize paying down the debt and protecting Social Security and Medicare while still providing almost $300 billion in targeted tax cuts.

What would those cuts do? They would increase the standard deduction for all individuals and married couples. They would provide marriage penalty relief for those taxpayers who pay more as married couples than they would if they were to file their taxes as two single individuals. They would provide for a long-term-care tax credit to make it easier to care for elderly family members. They would provide for a 100-percent deduction for health insurance costs of the self-employed and include tax incentives to build and modernize more than 6,000 schools. That is important.

Clark County, Las Vegas, NV, has the eighth-largest school district in America, with over 200,000 schoolchildren. We are having to build over a dozen new schools every year. In one year

—and we hold the record—we dedicated 18 new schools in Clark County. We have to build one new elementary school every month to keep up with the growth in Clark County. We need some help to do that. The Democratic tax plan would give us some of that needed help.

Also, one of the things we have talked about, which is so important, is a tax credit for research and development for high-tech companies. That is part of the Democratic tax plan—something we hope the majority leader and others will take a look at and be willing to compromise on. Democrats have been out in front on the issue for a long time. We pushed hard for a permanent R & D tax credit. The majority talked about how they were in favor of a permanent credit as well, until it came time to actually do it. In the end, the minority, myself included, were pushing for a ten year R & D tax credit. The majority ended up only committing to a five year tax credit in their package. Due in large part to initiatives like the R & D tax credit, the high-tech industry exists and has flourished. Without knowing whether or not that tax credit will be around next year or the year after or the year after that, hinders these companies' long term planning.

ATHLETICS IN NEVADA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in Nevada we are very proud of a number of things. We have a beautiful State. We are the most mountainous State in the Union, except for Alaska, with over 300 separate mountain ranges, with 32 mountains over 11,000 feet high. Las Vegas, of course, is the entertainment capital of the world.

We are very proud of our universities for a number of reasons. We have a great engineering program at the University of Nevada, Reno. The Mackay School of Mines is there, and we are proud of that as well. We have a great school for biological sciences, which has a national reputation. At UNLV, we have the finest hotel administration program in the entire country. The universities in Nevada are very proud of the football teams that we had in the forties and fifties. Since the schools have been divided, UNR has been a power in division II football, and they have played for the national championship. They are now a division I team. UNLV has won national championships in basketball. The UNLV football team has had some bad years, losing dozens of games. Last year they didn't win a single game, but this year they were able to beat North Texas State in their first away game.

A week ago last Thursday and then this past Saturday, they played Baylor. Even though Baylor was favored by a couple of touchdowns, one of the most miraculous wins in the history of football at the professional or college level occurred when Baylor was ahead by four points with less than 10 seconds left. They had the ball inside the 10-yard line of UNLV. Rather than take their four-point victory, they wanted to run the score up a little bit and go for a touchdown. In the end zone there was a fumble picked up by a UNLV defensive back who ran 101 yards for the touchdown and beat Baylor with no time left on the clock. This was tremendous.

People are going to be very happy with their new football couch, John Robinson, who had a great career before coming to UNLV from the University of Southern California and, of course, coaching the Los Angeles Rams.

We offer our congratulations to John Robinson and UNLV for two victories, which is two more than they had during all of last year.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ANDRE AGASSI

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the main reason I wanted to talk about athletics in Nevada is not because of the team victories that we have had over the years in Nevada but because of a great young man who was born and raised in Nevada who has been part of the Nevada athletic scene for some 25 years, even though he is only 29 years old.

Andre Agassi and his family have been great for the State of Nevada. Andre, when he was a little boy still in elementary school, it was said by Poncho Gonzales, who was a tennis great. ''He will be better than I someday.'' This is when he was a little, tiny boy. Poncho Gonzales was right.

Andre Agassi has already proven himself to be even greater than the great Poncho Gonzales. This was certainly the case as proven yesterday when he won the U.S. Open Tennis Championship.

I want to, on the Senate floor, congratulate Andre Agassi on this remarkable comeback yesterday in the U.S. Open and, of course, his comeback victory in the French Open.

Andre, as I have indicated, is a native of Las Vegas and dominated this summer with 35 victories in 39 matches. That is almost unheard of.

Andre Agassi is the No. 1 ranked tennis player in the United States. Not too long ago, because of an injury and other problems, Andre Agassi was ranked 141. He is now ranked the best tennis player in the world, as he should be.

I was watching the tennis matches over the weekend. John McEnroe, one of the great tennis players of all time, commenting about Andre Agassi, said his ability to return service is the best there has ever been in the entire history of tennis. His reputation and his abilities are still being proven. He is getting better with every match he plays.

But yesterday he closed out one of the greatest summers in tennis history. He came up with some of the most impressive shots ever seen in tennis in a dominating fifth set to capture his second U.S. Open.

Andre has made his place in tennis history. When he won the French Open, he joined Roy Emerson, Rod Laver, Don Budge, and Fred Perry as the only men to win all four major tournaments in their career.

Andre not only won the French and the U.S. Opens this year, he was also in the finals at Wimbledon, making him the first man since Ivan Lendl in 1986 to have gone to three grand slam finals in the same year.

No man had fought back to win the U.S. Open from a 2–1 deficit in sets since John Newcombe did it 26 years ago. But that is exactly what Agassi did in a 3-hour and 23-minute match yesterday.

The match was only the fifth all-American men's final at the U.S. Open in 32 years. The matchup of these two men who are almost 30-years-old, was the oldest since 39-year-old Ken Rosewall lost to 22-year-old Jimmy Connors in 1974. Even though these two men had not reached the age of 30, they played great tennis. They will be talked about as being old men at tennis, I repeat, even though they were not even 30 years old yet. They set a great example for tennis generally and for American tennis in particular.

I have to agree with Andre when after the match he said, ''I'll tell you what. How can you ask for anything more than two Americans in the final of the U.S. Open playing a great five-set match?''

Andre turned pro when he was 16 years old. We can all remember—I shouldn't say ''we can all'' because that was 13 or 14 years ago—a lot of us can remember when he turned pro. In those 13 or 14 years, he has changed. He won Wimbledon in 1992, the U.S. Open in 1994, and was the No. 1 player in the world by 1995.

But by 1997, Andre had, as I have indicated, come across some tough times. But he has fought back remarkably well. He finished sixth in the world last year. Earlier this year, he was ranked No. 1. He is now No. 1 again.

In a period of 4 months, he won the French Open—coming back from two sets down in the final—reached the Wimbledon final, and won the U.S. Open, a truly phenomenal comeback.

Andre deserves to be congratulated not only for his tremendous tennis, but for all the great work he does for at-risk youth in Las Vegas. He truly has put his money where his mouth is.

The Agassi Foundation has helped poor kids in Nevada. That is an understatement. He personally raises millions of dollars. He is going to have an event this month. He has gotten some of his friends to come from Las Vegas. He will raise $3 million at that event, all of which will go into his foundation to help the youth of Las Vegas.

His exhibition against Todd Martin yesterday was exciting. Todd Martin is a great champion in his own right. His towering stature of 6-foot-6 was as towering on the tennis court. These two men were interviewed after the tennis

match, and that should certainly be an inspiration to all young people who want to compete because as winner and loser, they both talked as winners and indicated how important it was that they were able to represent the United States at the U.S. Open.

Andre Agassi is good on the court and off the court with the tremendous work he has done with the Andre Agassi Foundation. He has helped the youth of Las Vegas by giving them a helping hand in growing up to be successful individuals. His foundation even branched out to a program to help women and children who have become victims of domestic abuse.

Today on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I congratulate a great American, Andre Agassi, someone who will go down in the annals of history as a great athlete and who will go down in the annals of history in the State of Nevada as a good person. Andre Agassi is someone who is willing to help those who certainly aren't as fortunate as he.

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. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the two cloture votes scheduled for 5 p.m. today, and regardless of the outcome of those cloture votes, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 210, the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry to be the U.S. circuit judge for the Third Circuit. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate. I finally ask consent that following that vote, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, other than to say it would be nice if the majority leader would allow that one to go to voice vote. But if he will not allow that, I will be happy to withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. 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. BRYAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2466, which the clerk will report by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Gorton amendment No. 1359, of a technical nature.

Hutchison amendment No. 1603, to prohibit the use of funds for the purpose of issuing a notice of rulemaking with respect to the valuation of crude oil for royalty purposes until September 30, 2000.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator's request is granted.

AMENDMENT NO. 1588

(Purpose: To make certain modifications to the Forest System budget)

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1588, which I believe is currently at the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 1588.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 63, beginning on line 1, strike ''$1,239,051,000'' and all that follows through line 6 and insert ''$1,216,351,000 (which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 in accordance with section 4(i) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–6a(i))), to remain available until expended, of which $33,697,000 shall be available for wildlife habitat management, $22,132,000 shall be available for inland fish habitat management, $24,314,000 shall be available for anadromous fish habitat management, $29,548,000 shall be available for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species habitat management, and $196,885,000 shall be available for timber sales management.''.

On page 64, line 17, strike ''$362,095,000'' and insert ''$371,795,000''.

On page 64, line 22, strike ''205:'' and insert ''205, of which $86,909,000 shall be available for road construction (of which not more than $37,400,000 shall be available for engineering support for the timber program) and $122,484,000 shall be available for road maintenance:''.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, today I am offering an amendment with my colleague from Illinois and my colleague from Oregon that is a win-win for the American taxpayer and the environment.

Our amendment reduces the subsidy for the below-cost timber program administered by the Forest Service and for the construction of logging roads in our national forests.

In addition, our amendment reallocates needed monies to those Forest Service programs underfunded by the committee, such as road maintenance, wildlife and fish habitat management, and threatened and endangered species habitat management.

Each year, the American taxpayers spend millions of dollars to subsidize the construction of roads needed for logging on national forest lands.

The appropriations bill before us today contains over $37 million for the Forest Service to assist in the construction and reconstruction of timber roads in our national forests. This assistance is in the form of contract administration, construction oversight, and engineering, planning, and design work performed by the Forest Service for the logging companies which are merely left with the task of building the roads to extract the timber.

Our amendment would reduce this subsidy by a modest amount, $1.6 million, which is the amount the program was increased above the administration's budget request.

Similarly, this bill contains $228.9 million for the administration of the timber sale program, which is more than $32 million above the administration's budget request.

These expenditures for a money losing timber program are an enormous drain on the Treasury.

In their most recent Forest Management Program Annual Report, dated July 1998, the Forest Service acknowledges losing $88.6 million from their timber program in fiscal year 1997.

This was the second consecutive year that the Forest Service reported a loss.

In addition to the reported loss, the $88.6 million figure excludes a full accounting of all costs associated with logging.

In past fiscal years, independent analyses estimate the loss from below-cost timber sales are far greater than those reported by the Forest Service.

The General Accounting Office estimated that the timber program cost

taxpayers at least $1.5 billion from 1992 to 1997.

Our amendment would reduce funding for timber sale management by $32.015 million to the level requested by the administration.

In spite of the fact that our National Forests supply a mere 4 percent of our nation's annual timber harvest, this bill continues to reflect the dominance of the timber program at the expense of other programs designed to improve forest health and enhance the public's enjoyment of our national forests.

More than 380,000 miles of roads criss-cross the national forests. This is a more extensive road network than the National Interstate Highway System.

The Forest Service estimates that over 80% of these roads are not maintained to public safety and environmental standards.

As a matter of public policy, I would argue that it makes more sense to maintain the roads we already have than to spend money building new roads we don't need.

Many scientists have found that road building threatens wildlife because it causes erosion of soils, fragments intact forest ecosystems, encourages the spread of noxious weeds and invasive species, and reduces habitat for many animals needing refuge from man.

It has been found that when roads wash out they dump rocks and soil on lower slopes and into streambeds, and even when they remain intact, roads act as channels for water and contribute further to the erosion of lands and streams.

Scientists say that the overall effect is that the streams and rivers fill with silt and the shallower waters mean degraded fish habitat and more flooding.

In my home state of Nevada, the road network throughout the Lake Tahoe basin has been identified as a major contributor to the degradation of water quality and decline in clarity of Lake Tahoe.

An important component of the Forest Service's road maintenance program involves the decommissioning of old logging roads.

This program has been essential to efforts in the Lake Tahoe basin to improve erosion control and the overall water quality of the lake.

The bill before us today cuts the administration's request for road maintenance by $11.3 million.

The Forest Service has indicated that their annual road maintenance needs total $431 million per year, and that their backlog for deferred maintenance totals $3.85 billion.

The bill before us today provides less than a quarter of the funding the Forest Service requires to address their annual road maintenance needs.

Addressing this need would have considerable environmental benefits, such as reducing erosion from roads and storm proofing existing culverts.

It is important to remember that the timber industry's responsibility for maintaining logging roads ends with the end of the timber sale, leaving all future maintenance costs to the taxpayer.

Our amendment adds $5.3 million for important road maintenance projects throughout our national forests.

The National Forests include nearly 200,000 miles of fishable streams and more than 2 million acres of lakes, ponds and reservoirs that support hundreds of inland fish species with important recreational, commercial, and ecological values.

The inland fisheries habitat management program allows the Forest Service to protect and restore inland streams and lakes, along with the fish and aquatic life they support.

The bill before us today cuts the administration's request for this program by $7 million.

Our amendment proposes to restore $3.115 million in funding for this program.

This additional funding would allow the Forest Service to enhance or restore several hundred miles of stream and over 400 additional acres of ponds, lakes, and reservoirs.

The National Forests also provide critical spawning and rearing habitat for Pacific, Great Lakes, and Atlantic stocks of anadromous fish, such as salmon, sturgeons, and lampreys.

These stocks contribute significantly to the quality of life, recreational and commercial fishing, and the economy of local communities.

The Interior bill cuts the administration's funding request for anadromous fisheries habitat management by $6.4 million.

Our amendment proposes to restore $1.6 million for this program.

This funding will enable the Forest Service to complete critical work on over 100 additional miles of anadromous streams and 1,000 acres of additional acres of anadromous lakes and reservoirs, complementing the efforts of our state, federal, and tribal partners.

The wildlife habitat management program of the Forest Service for fiscal year 2000 will focus on prescribed burns to improve wildlife habitat.

It will help to develop and protect wetlands and water sources in arid habitats for waterfowl, quail, and wild turkey, in addition to restoring riparian habitat that benefits big game.

The subcommittee cut $5 million from the wildlife program.

Our amendment would restore $1.6 million in funding for this program.

This funding would provide for an additional 8,000 acres of important habitat improvement, which would benefit both game and nongame species, and result in enhanced opportunities for wildlife-related recreation.

The activities of the threatened, endangered, and sensitive species program serve to achieve recovery goals for threatened and endangered animals and plants.

The Forest Service has indicated that this program continues to be essential to the mission of their agency.

The committee cut the endangered species program by $5 million.

Our amendment would restore $2 million for this program, which would allow the Forest Service to pursue conservation strategies to prevent the need for listing, thereby avoiding the loss of management flexibility and increased operating costs once listing occurs.

Mr. President, the $20 million our amendment adds to wildlife, fisheries, and rare plant habitat management programs would enable the Forest Service to increase Challenge Cost-Share partnerships with organizations throughout the country, enabling the agency to leverage funding, better serve the public, and improve vital habitats for fish and wildlife.

This funding is an investment for the nation's 63 million wildlife watchers, 14 million hunters, and 35 million anglers who spend approximately 127.6 million activity days hunting, fishing, and observing fish and wildlife annually on national forests.

This result in local community expenditures of billions of dollars and over 230,000 full-time equivalent jobs.

One out of every three anglers fish national forest waters nationally, and two out of three anglers in the West fish national forest waters.

That is why our amendment is supported by groups like Trout Unlimited, the American Sportfishing Association, and Wildlife Forever.

Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to join a strong coalition of environmental, hunting, fishing, and taxpayer organizations in support of the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, 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. BRYAN. 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. 1623 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1588

(Purpose: To make available funds for the survey and manage requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan Record of Decision)

Mr. BRYAN. 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 Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FITZGERALD, proposes an amendment numbered 1623 to amendment No. 1588.

Mr. BRYAN. 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:

Beginning on page 1, line 3, strike ''$1,216,351,000'' and all that follows through ''management'' on page 2, line 4, and insert

''$1,225,351,000 (which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 in accordance with section 4(i) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–6a(i))), to remain available until expended, of which $33,697,000 shall be available for wildlife habitat management, $22,132,000 shall be available for inland fish habitat management, $24,314,000 shall be available for anadromous fish habitat management, $28,548,000 shall be available for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species habitat management, $196,885,000 shall be available for timber sales management, and $10,000,000 shall be available for survey and manage requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan Record of Decision, for which the draft supplemental environmental impact statement is to be completed by November 15, 1999, and the final environmental impact statement is to be published by February 14, 2000''.

On page 2, line 6, strike ''$371,795,000'' and insert ''$365,795,000''.

On page 2, line 11, strike ''$122,484,000'' and insert ''$116,484,000''.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I note that my colleague, one of the prime sponsors of the amendment, has joined us on the floor. I yield the floor at this point.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Nevada for all his effort in working with me and other colleagues from the Pacific Northwest on this issue. Folks in your part of the United States want to be sensitive to environmental values and economic needs in our communities. As a result of recent court decisions and other problems, instead of that win-win, we have essentially had a lose-lose, where we are not doing what is needed to protect environmental values; nor are we doing what is needed to protect communities—particularly rural communities—that have very legitimate economic concerns as a result of having resource-dependent economies.

The Senator from Nevada has been working with us. I will begin my remarks by saying what we are trying to do in the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment is incorporate some of the thinking that has been behind what the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator GORTON, has talked about on the floor and some of what Senator ROBB tried to do last week with respect to environmental values. I think if you look at the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment, you will see, to some degree, efforts to try to reconcile some of the important points that Senator GORTON has made and the important points Senator ROBB has made that are brought together in our amendment so we can take advantage of an opportunity to both improve the environment and move timber more quickly from the forests to the mills.

When President Clinton took office in 1993, he came to the Pacific Northwest with a promise to help resolve the battle over owls and old growth. The administration put in place the Northwest Forest Plan which promised protection for my State's ancient forests, and also sustainable forestry for a State that has long been dependent in rural communities on forestry for family wage jobs.

Over the past few months, the plan, which has already been failing to deliver what it promised, threatened to come completely undone when a Federal judge ruled that the Forest Service had failed to conduct biological surveys—an obligation known as survey and management—as required under the court-approved Northwest Forest Plan.

Later this week, in the Forestry Subcommittee, chaired by my friend and colleague, Senator CRAIG, we are going to talk about who exactly is to blame for that fiasco. But today, we in the Pacific Northwest are left with dozens of suspended timber sales as a result of the Forest Service's failure to follow through on environmental protection obligations.

The Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment would earmark resources for this costly environmental work and place a stringent timetable on the completion of the surveys' environmental impact statement. Thus, by making sure these environmental surveys get done, and done quickly, we will help both the environment and timber workers do well.

Building on the philosophy that we heard from Senator GORTON, that the program has not worked very well, and what we heard from Senator ROBB about the importance of environmental values, what Senator BRYAN, Senator FITZGERALD, and I are trying to do is incorporate some of the thinking behind both of those approaches so we can try to put this survey and management program on track but also bring to it some of the accountability that Senators GORTON and CRAIG are absolutely right in saying has been lacking in the past.

I have shared, as I say, many of the concerns of the manager of the bill. But I don't think we can simply waive survey and management requirements altogether because what will happen is that will lead to a full employment program for lawyers if it were adopted and, even if in the short term, very serious problems because the bill would be vetoed by the President if section 329 survived conference in its present form.

In August of this year, right after the first Northwest Forest Plan timber sales were enjoined, Senator MURRAY and I sent a letter to Under Secretary Lyons asking that the Forest Service and BLM meet with our offices to discuss how and why the survey and management requirements were stopping the Northwest Forest Timber Program and what could be done about it.

Initially, in the August meeting between agency staff and the congressional staff, held both in D.C. and in my hometown of Portland, the Forest Service stated that $10 million more funding for personnel and addressing the scientific issues was necessary in order to get the survey and management program back on track. So let's be clear; the survey and management program is an unparalleled undertaking. It is going to provide new scientific protocols and data that can be useful in forests across the country. But it has to be done in a way that addresses the legitimate issues with respect to accountability that our colleague from Washington State, Senator GORTON, and Senator CRAIG of Idaho have addressed on this floor.

So the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment directs $10 million for survey and management requirements to help the Forest Service conduct surveys on judicially stalled timber sales for species with known survey protocols. It will help the Service create protocols for the species currently lacking such data. This money starts us toward completion of the environmental scientific work that is necessary to move timber sales toward harvest.

During the August meetings, the Forest Service was initially optimistic about the time it would take them to complete the environmental impact statements which they believe will answer the questions with respect to the success of the Northwest Forest Plan. At first, the Forest Service told me in a draft response to the letter Senator MURRAY and I sent them that the environmental impact statement, draft statement, would be completed this fall, and that the final would be ready early next year. Now the Forest Service is telling us that the draft will be available for public comment by December and perhaps the final environmental impact statement will be ready in May or June of next year. They have not given us any indication, other than overlap of this work with the holidays, why the timing of the work had to change.

The Forest Service has been working on this project since 1997 and knew since 1994 that the survey and management requirement was coming down the pike. I certainly wasn't one who succeeded in getting his homework always done on time, but the Forest Service's timetable reflects extraordinarily poor planning, by any calculus.

It is time for some accountability. We are going to have a chance to discuss those accountability issues later this week. I note the chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee has arrived. He knows I share many of his concerns about the lack of accountability with respect to the Forest Service on survey and management, and in other key areas.

The Forest Service needs administrative deadlines to move this process along. They need to make this environmental impact statement a priority and get it done. The Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment states the survey and management draft environmental impact statement should be completed

by November 15 of this year, and the final version of that impact statement should be published by February 14, 2000.

Those deadlines also allow for the public a comment period required by law, plus some additional time for open and public discussion.

This administration for years has been promising Congress they will get to work on the Northwest Forest Plan. The time for those empty promises is over. This administration needs some direction, and they need the extra money to achieve it.

Finally, let me reiterate what I think the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment does. I say this to colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It incorporates much of the important analysis done by Senator GORTON and Senator CRAIG with respect to why the survey and management program has not worked and why the administration has dragged its feet on it while at the same time trying to incorporate the environmental concerns Senator ROBB has legitimately addressed to ensure this program gets carried out.

Under the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment, we would add the money necessary to carry it out. But we would finally have some real accountability and some real deadlines to make sure these important obligations, both in terms of environmental protection and in terms of meeting economic needs of rural communities, are addressed.

I hope my colleagues on both sides will support it. If we adopt this amendment, I believe the end result will be healthier forests and a healthier timber economy.

I, again, thank my colleague from Nevada for all of his assistance. I know my colleagues from Idaho and Washington as members of our Senate delegation from the Northwest have strong views on this as well. The Senator from Idaho knows how much I enjoy working with him. We are getting ready to go forward with our accounting payment legislation which gives us a chance to break some gridlock in that area. I am hopeful as we go forward on this important Interior bill we can also break the gridlock with respect to survey management and have additional funds that are needed but also additional accountability. That is why I am hopeful my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, as we debate the Interior appropriations bill—and now the amendment and the substitute amendment offered by Senators BRYAN and WYDEN—I guess I can say at the outset that the only thing I arrive at in trying to consider a $34 million cut in a very essential program to the U.S. Forest Service, especially when the advocacy of the cut comes from the two Senators from large public land Western States such as Nevada and Oregon, is ''frustration'' over the lack of understanding by a Senator from Nevada who is responsible for representing his State which is predominately a public lands State where grazing on public lands and mining the natural resources from those public lands are two of the primary economies of that State, that he would not be supportive of programs within the U.S. Forest Service that deal with public land resources in an appropriate and responsible way.

I say that before I get to the specific issues of the amendment because I find it fascinating that in a publication called ''Public Lands Forests, What We Get, What We Pay For''—an interesting publication from the Political Economy Research Center which deals with the subject that the Senator from Nevada knows a great deal about, and in fact knows a great deal more about than I do as the chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee. That the Tahoe Basin, a beautiful and unique area in his State that is being dramatically impacted at this moment by a lack of forest management in a responsible way as we begin to see a relatively affluent urban interface grow around Lake Tahoe and into a forest that is dramatically different than what it was 40, 50, or 100 years ago.

Let me quote from this article. I am trying to set a tone for my frustration over why the Senator from Nevada is doing what he is doing and the Senator from Oregon would join with him. Let me quote from this publication, and the title to the article is called ''One Spark From Disaster.''

I quote:

> As the road dropped out of the Sierras into the Lake Tahoe basin below, the scenery made an abrupt change from healthy, green forests to dead and dying stands of timber. The congressmen on their way to the June 1997 Presidential Summit on the problems facing the lake and surrounding basin were taken aback by what they saw. Later, during a session on forest health, U.S. Senator Richard Bryan of Nevada exclaimed, ''This fores looks like hell!'' It appeared as if someone had drawn an imaginary line across the landscape and then nurtured the trees on one side, while destroying those on the other.

What the Senator was experiencing was what many are now experiencing on a Forest Service landscape across our Nation where we have constantly put out fires over the last 75 to 100 years and have not gone in and done selective logging or fuel reduction on our forest floors. We have literally created jungles—jungles that some would like to portray as beautiful, sweeping landscaped timbered vistas when it is quite obvious they are jungles that in the right environment—and the Tahoe Basin gets that environment every so often—could explode into total disaster of the landscape by the kinds of fires California has experienced this year and as have other parts of the country. Those of us more to the North in the Pacific Northwest have been fortunate enough this year in that our relatively unmanaged forests—and mismanaged in some instances—have been wet enough that we haven't had the fire threat.

The article goes on to say:

> Ironically, forest management practices on surrounding federal lands have put at risk the very qualities they were supposed to preserve: the integrity of the forest and the clarity of the lake below—

Talking about the beautiful Lake Tahoe—

> Environmental regulations have delayed some management actions and restricted timber harvests for forest treatments.

It has resulted, of course, in the situation that I described around the Tahoe Basin.

Of course, the reason the Senators from Nevada are appropriately concerned about the Tahoe Basin is not timber production per se because I don't think you would view the Tahoe Basin as being an area where you would expect timber production, but it is the recent interfacing of resort homes—summer homes, many of them going in the millions of dollars—that use Lake Tahoe and find Lake Tahoe to be a marvelous place to live and, of course, coupled with the thousands of tourists who come there on an annual basis to see this tremendously beautiful high mountain alpine lake.

Why, then, would a Senator from Nevada want to cut a program where the money is utilized to do the necessary surveys and the preparations for the kind of fuel unloading or fuel decreases that Tahoe Basin would need because most of our timber sales are no longer green sales, they are sales of dead and dying timber. They are sales that are a product of forest health and not an ongoing aggressive timber program of the kind that brought the environmental outcry of a decade or two ago.

I must say the Senator from Oregon has a bit of a different circumstance. He and I joined ranks on the floor last week on a very critical issue. As you know, when this administration came to town a few years ago, they were faced with the situation of a timber industry imploding in the State of Oregon, imploding as a result of a spotted owl decision that took a tremendous amount of the timbered landscape of that State—both Forest Service and BLM timber—off the table, or at least had locked it all up in the courts.

This President, with the right intention—with the right intention—went out to try to solve the problem and basically said: Let me reduce your cut by 80 percent and for the other 20 percent remaining, or something near that, we will focus all of our intent there, all of our energy, and do the finest environmental assessment possible, and that you will be able to log.

We know the court decisions have gone well beyond the intent of the Endangered Species Act—reasonable and right surveys—and basically even stopped all of that logging.

I can understand why the Senator would want to try to divert money to solve his problem. But he also probably

fails to recognize that, in that diversion, he is affecting timber sales or timber management programs everywhere else in the country because while he is supporting taking 34 million dollars out of that sales and preparation base and putting some of it over into surveys, he is denying the States of Arkansas, Idaho, and others the very resources they need to keep their people working and to keep an industry that is now staggering to stay alive on its feet.

That is what brings Members to this point. Yes, we come to the floor now after having dramatically reduced these programs in the name of the environment—and in many instances appropriate reductions—and say we have to notch them down even more.

For the next few moments I will talk about the adverse effects on rural communities and jobs that the Bryan-Wyden substitute will have. That substitute takes money away from the program that supports good family jobs. I am talking about good-paying jobs. The two Senators plan to redirect funds out of the timber program into wildlife surveys and road maintenance, which I think will be counterproductive because we are already putting millions of dollars into that program.

For me to oppose their amendment does not mean we oppose the surveys. We know we have ramped up the amount of money that goes into those surveys and, of course, in ramping up the surveys, added costs to every timber sale. Then the Senator from Nevada can come to the floor and talk about these timber sales being too expensive and we ought to eliminate them. The reason they are expensive is that the court and some in the environmental community are demanding the money be transferred over to do the surveys.

It is a Catch-22. We shove these costs off on to the price of a timber sale. We escalate it to the point it is not a cost-effective timber sale. Therefore, we give some Senators a basis to come to the floor and argue we ought to eliminate them because we can't make money at them when, in fact, the politics have pushed the cost of the surveys well beyond what would be reasonable, appropriate, and responsible, for the purpose of cutting those trees. That is the ultimate Catch-22 in forest management today that has nearly laid the State of Oregon low and has dramatically impacted the State of Idaho.

Regarding the timber funding and the Forest Service that prepares the administrative forest activities, the committee already has an appropriate amount for wildlife and for road funding. Redirecting funds, as I have said, will harm the timber program. It will not be consequence free. It will cost jobs in Arkansas, in Idaho. It could cost jobs in other forested States across the Nation where there remains a struggling timber program.

The President traveled this summer to several sections of the country suffering from poverty. I applaud him for dramatizing where poverty still exists in a country today that is nearly at full employment. It is almost ironic that in nearly the same breath it could be said that we are at full employment yet we have in certain areas high degrees of poverty. Most of that poverty exists in rural areas today. Most of that poverty exists in rural areas where those communities of working men and women are tied directly to the public lands and tied to the resources of those public lands.

Nearly one-third of the counties adjacent to national forests suffer poverty levels that are at least one and a half times higher than the national average. Let me refer to a fascinating chart that comes from the U.S. Forest Service's TSPIRS employment figures.

I refer to the solid bars on this chart showing employment from the harvesting and processing of national forest timber between 1989 and 1997—just over a few years—has dropped from 140,000 working men and women to 55,500. Let me repeat that. That is more dramatic than any other employment sector in our country, except in the making of buggies and buggy whips, and no young person on this floor even knows what I am talking about because that industry died a long time ago. In a decade we have lost from a 140,000 high down to 55,000 jobs for working men and women. The Senator from Nevada wants to take that down even further by the action he proposes today.

I am not quite sure I understand why, but let me show the very real impact. I am tremendously familiar with this because not only in my lifetime but in my tenure in the Congress, from when I started serving in 1981 until today, what I speak of has happened. I have watched it happen. I have been to the locations. I went to Grangeville, ID. I watched grown men sit on stacks of lumber and cry, literally, tears rolling down their cheeks because there were no more trees to cut under the Federal forest plan and they had lost their job. The mill was going to be unbolted, placed in shipping containers, and sent to Brazil to cut the rain forests because the environmentalists decided that the Nez Perce Forest in Idaho was no longer producing trees—although it was growing 10 times more trees than it was cutting.

What happened? Here are the very dramatic figures from a tremendously narrow period of time. The State of Washington, 1989 to today, 55 mills closed and the loss of 3,285 jobs; Oregon, 111 mills closed and the loss of 11,600 jobs; Montana, 13 mills closed and 1,083 jobs lost; Idaho, 17 mills and 707 jobs lost.

Let me talk about Midvale, ID, my hometown. If I am a little sensitive today, I should be. I used to go to that mill and buy lumber. It employed 45 men. The attitude on the floor is: What is the big deal? It is only 45 jobs. But it was 45 jobs and 45 homes in a community of 300 people—not 30,000, not 50,000, not 100,000, but a community of 300 people. To lose 45 jobs is to lose a lot. That mill has closed. Why? Because on the Payette National Forest, argumentatively, at least by national forest standards, there were no more trees to cut.

That is why I can responsibly and legitimately turn to the Senator from Nevada today and say: Senator, your bill destroys jobs. Your bill destroys high-paying jobs, $35,000, $45,000, $55,000-a-year jobs for men and women, important jobs in rural communities, in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, California, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alaska.

In talking of mill closures—and I referred to the dramatic numbers—let me also quote the Western Council of Industry Workers, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. It is their people, in many instances, who are losing these jobs. They say:

> Legislative efforts to reduce funding for forest management programs seriously jeopardize the livelihoods of our members and tens of thousands of forest products workers nationwide. Job loss within our industry has been severe, as the timber sales program has been reduced by 70 percent since the early 90s.

A 70-percent reduction in the timber program, a reduction in jobs from 140,000 to 55,000, and the Senator from Nevada wants to cut it even deeper. It is pretty hard to understand why, especially when you look at the new environmental standards of today and what the Forest Service is demanding of a timber sale as it relates to the survey and the kind of mitigation plan that comes because of the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act and, of course, the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act and all of those kinds of rules and regulations and processes and procedures that by law are required. I am not sure I understand why.

I do know several years ago the National Sierra Club developed as one of their policies, zero cut on public lands. I know that is what they believe. I know that is what they advocate. I know they are champions of this kind of amendment because if you cannot stop logging altogether, you stop it a little bit at a time until it is all gone, even if the health of the forests are at the point of explosion from wildfires like those being experienced in California today, and even if the Tahoe Basin runs at a high risk, with the risk not just to the trees but the loss of hundreds of multimillion-dollar homes where the wealthy come to play and reside in the urban/rural interface. That is the issue at hand.

I will go on to quote from those men and women who work in the industry. They say:

> More than 80,000 men and women have lost their jobs as that timber program has reduced by more than 70 percent since 1990.

We know that is real. The Senator from Oregon knows it is real. The Senator from Idaho knows it is real. I have

attended the mill closures. My guess is, so has the Senator from Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these letters from the Western Council of Industrial Workers and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, opposing reductions in the timber program.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN COUNCIL OF INDUSTRIAL WORKERS, UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,

Portland, OR, July 19, 1999.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the 20,000 men and women of the Western Council of Industrial Workers (WCIW), I urge you to oppose any effort to reduce funding for the U.S. Forest Service timber sale and related programs when the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill comes to the Senate floor for consideration.

Legislative efforts to reduce funding for forest management programs seriously jeopardize the livelihoods of our members and tens of thousands of forest products workers nationwide. Job loss within our industry has been severe as the timber sale program has been reduced by almost 70 percent since the early 1990s. More than 80,000 men and women have lost their jobs due to this decline and further cutbacks in these important programs will only add to the unemployment.

Additionally, adequate funding for forest management programs is critical to protect the health of our forests. According to the Forest Service, approximately 40 million acres of our national forests are at high risk of catastrophic forest fire. Active management is the single most effective tool for reducing the risk of wild fires and protecting nearby communities, as well as maintaining forest health and limiting the spread of insects and disease.

The WCIW urges you to support land management policy that provides an adequate balance for all concerns—environmental and economic. Please support the current funding levels in the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill and oppose any effort to cut funding for these important active management programs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MIKE PIETI,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,

Washington, DC, July 21, 1999.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, I urge your support for the federal timber sale program as the Senate debates the Fiscal Year 2000 Interior Appropriations bill. Additionally, I urge you to oppose any harmful amendment that seeks to reduce timber sale funding.

The livelihoods of U.S. forest products workers—including tens of thousands of our lumber, sawmill, pulp and paper workers—rely on Forest Service programs that promote active management. Timber harvests on federal lands have fallen by almost 70 percent over the last decade, resulting in mill closures and job loss. Further reductions in funding for the federal timber sale program will only exacerbate the economic devastation to working families and rural communities. Also reductions in timber supply continue to contribute to the rising U.S. trade deficit in the forest products sector, as wood and paper imports reach record levels.

In addition, the health and vitality of our nation's forests are being crippled by crisis. Twenty-six million acres are in jeopardy from insect and disease, while forty million acres are at risk to catastrophic wildfire. Our union supports responsible efforts to protect our forests, including thinning and harvesting to maintain forest health, limit the spread of insect infestation and reduce the risk of forest fires.

We must continue our nation's global leadership in environmental stewardship without sacrificing the livelihoods of thousands of working families. The UBCJA urges you to help protect forests, jobs and communities by supporting the current funding levels for the federal timber sale program in the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill and by opposing any effort to reduce funding for this essential program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS J. MCCARRON,
General President.

Mr. CRAIG. Unemployment in rural timber-dependent communities is in double-digit figures despite rosy employment figures in the rest of America. The Senator from Oregon and I visited similar communities—he in his State, I in my State—over the August recess. I can go from my community of Boise where there is near zero unemployment—it is a growth community, it is a high-tech community, it is doing very well—and I can drive 100 miles to a community that has 14 to 16-percent unemployment. Why? That community is right here. That community is right here. That is because they were dependent upon the public lands and our Government and the politics of the public lands said: Stay off the land. Don't cut a tree. The mills closed or the mill is closing or the mill is at risk. Those people are unemployed.

They cannot identify with a job in the high-tech industry. Why? Each of them would have to move 100 miles and uproot their family and they would have to be retrained and educated. A 45-year-old man does not want to do that. He cannot understand, if we are growing five times more trees than we are cutting, why we cannot at least create a balance in a program that will afford him or his son, who is graduating from high school and does not want to go on to college, a job in the forest products industry.

While the national average unemployment rate hovers at around 4 percent, more than 30 forest-dependent counties have three times that rate. Over a dozen forest-dependent counties have an unemployment rate of 16 percent. I believe the Bryan amendment will bring even further economic harm to the people of those rural areas.

When I first got here in 1981, there was a mantra about the debate on the forest products industry and about forest management: Take away a few jobs and we will replace them. We will replace them with tourism and recreation. It was America wanting to go to the public lands to enjoy the environment of the public lands.

To some extent that has happened but only to a minor degree compared to what was projected during the decade of the early 1980s. But remember, while some of it happened, the kind of jobs that were created were fundamentally different jobs from those $30,000, $40,000, $50,000-a-year jobs that I am talking about in the forest products industry. A maid or waitress or a gas station attendant or a tour guide does not make that kind of money. They work at slightly above minimum wage. They have no health benefits. They have no retirement program. Their work is seasonal. They are oftentimes out of work 4 or 5 months out of the year. And, yes, they are on welfare. And, yes, they qualify for food stamps.

I must say these once were the proud men and women of the forest products industry that we politically destroyed. We politically destroyed it. We are here today for politics. We are politically trying to destroy what remains of a responsible way of managing our forests today, not because it is the right thing to do from a management point of view but because it is the right thing to do politically. I know of no other reason. I cannot understand why the Senator from Nevada, who comes from the great public land State that he does, would want to turn his back on one segment of the economy of a public land State such as Idaho or Nevada.

He and I stand arm in arm together on mining issues. I was in Elko, NV, last week in a community that 15 years ago was 5,000 people; today, 25,000 people, not because of the high-tech industry but because of gold, gold in the Carlin Trend; mining, high-priced jobs being paid to thousands of men and women in the mining industry. So when we battle on that issue, the Senator from Nevada and I stand arm in arm. But when we try to work on a reasonable and responsible forest management plan that allows some tree cutting, I am tremendously frustrated the Senator from Nevada and I cannot stand arm in arm on that issue also.

It is an issue of jobs. It is an issue of right and responsible ways of managing our forests. It is political. I am saddened that it is.

The substitute amendment transfers $10 million of the reduction that I have talked about, $34 million in timber funds to pay for surveys on rare species. I do not think that is responsive to the problem of the unreasonable wildlife survey requirements in the President's Northwest Forest Plan, which we discussed in this body last week.

First of all, the Forest Service timber sale budget is what pays for the surveys. Thus, rather than a $10 million increase for this purpose, the net effect of this proposal is a $24 million decrease. So we give them not even a half a loaf. We give them a quarter of a loaf.

Second, the Clinton administration has agreed that many of these surveys should not be done; indeed, many cannot be done. That is precisely why the administration is writing an EIS in an

attempt to change these requirements. Unfortunately, timber sales are enjoined until the EIS is completed.

I happen to agree with the editorial statement this past Sunday in the Portland Oregonian, the largest and most respected newspaper in Oregon. The Oregonian correctly notes that:

The surveys of rare species of animals and plants required in the Northwest Forest Plan are ''technically impossible'' and [they use the right word] ''preposterous. . . .''

The Senate didn't use the word ''preposterous,'' but last week the Senate said no to the judges; they are not going to let the judges in the Eleventh Circuit and the Ninth Circuit write policy. That is our job. That is what we are elected to do. They are appointed to interpret the Constitution and not to write timber policy. The Oregonian calls it ''preposterous.'' The Oregonian further describes the requirements as:

. . . a poison pill—a way to block all logging and prevent the plan from working as it was designed.

Yet we want to put more money into that. It makes no sense to spend $10 million for a prescription for a poison pill or for preposterous survey procedures. This Congress should not spend 10 cents in what I believe is a most inappropriate fashion.

That is the foundation of the debate as I see it. I believe that is a reasonable interpretation of why we are on the floor today. I know of no other. At a time when we have reduced the overall timber program in this country by 7 percent, we have reduced employment by almost 50 percent, and we have dramatically transformed the rural landscape to communities of unemployed people and empty homes. That is the policy of this Government at this time. And somehow we want to perpetuate that or increase it? I think not.

The only explanation possible that I believe is reasonable and right is the politics of it. We are on the floor today because the National Sierra Club and others said we ought not be cutting trees on public lands at all, zero, end of statement, not to improve health, not for fire prevention, not to create vibrant and youthful stands just do not cut them at all; let Mother Nature be our manager.

That is not good business. We know that is not good business, especially when man, for the last 40 or 50 years, has put out all the fires and not allowed Mother Nature to manage. Now when she has an opportunity to manage where there are 50 trees instead of 5—that would have been true 100 years ago—we create monstrous wildfires that not only destroy the stands but scald the land and make it sterile and nonproductive for decades to come. That is where man has to step back in as a good steward, a right and responsible steward, for all of the environmental reasons, the water quality reasons, and the wildlife habitat reasons for which we manage a forest.

I yield such time as is required to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Idaho for clearly laying out the issues in this debate, and I associate my remarks with his.

I rise to strongly speak against the Bryan-Wyden amendment for a variety of reasons but, most importantly, because it simply does not support healthy and sustainable national forests. Many Senators, I suspect, will speak today claiming this reduction to the Timber Management Program makes sound fiscal and environmental sense.

From my perspective as an Arkansan, as a Senator from Arkansas, I can tell you that is far from the truth and that there are 35,440 workers in my home State who make up the forest products industry who strongly oppose this amendment. If our forests are not healthy and if we continue to ignore the problems facing these public lands, we run the risk of jeopardizing these jobs and the future health and sustainability of our Nation's forests.

During the August recess, I met with the Forest Service on the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas. Sometimes our distinguished Senators from the West forget that there are national forests all across the South, and in the State of Arkansas, I say to my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, we have two large national forests, the Ouachita National Forest and the Ozark National Forest.

In a meeting with the National Forest Service on the Ouachita National Forest last month, I discovered, because of decreasing budgets in the timber sales account, they are doing only one-third of the vegetation management required by the forest plan. So forgive me if I find it ironic that this second-degree amendment, the substitute amendment, would shift $10 million from the Timber Management Program to the surveys in the Northwest when, in the State of Arkansas, in our national forests, they are only doing one-third of the vegetation management required by the forest plan.

Because of the severe erosion of funding that the Senator from Idaho has alluded to, the forest is unable to achieve the desired future conditions required for a healthy and sustainable ecosystem. Extremists, litigation, appeals, or lack of public support did not bring about this crisis. It is the result of a misguided effort by the administration to reduce timber harvests without taking into consideration the real impacts on the conditions of the forests and the communities associated with these national forests.

The Timber Management Program is funded at a level equal to the fiscal year 1999 funding level. There was level funding before this amendment. Before these additional cuts, there was level funding, no increase, and yet the demands on the program have increased dramatically.

The program objective for the timber sales program is ''a sustainable yield of forest products that contributes to meeting the Nation's demands and restoring, improving, or maintaining the forest ecosystem health.'' Yet the amendment before us reduces the funding level when more than 40 million acres of our national forests are at high risk of catastrophic fire due to an accumulation of dead and dying trees and an additional 26 million acres are at risk of insect and disease infestation.

We have a crisis now; we risk a catastrophe. We have level funding in the appropriations bill before us, and the amendment suggests we should cut even further in a program that has not the resources to do the job it has been charged with doing as it stands.

The addition of Senator WYDEN as a cosponsor of the amendment, the second-degree amendment, only exacerbates the problem that the underlying amendment creates in shifting an additional $10 million out of timber management and moving it to the Northwest. This impacts every national forest, every timber management program in the Nation. It dilutes what can be done in those areas where they are already suffering, where they are already short to move additional resources because of the situation faced in the Northwest. I think that is wrong. It is not economically or environmentally advisable.

The debate today will speak about doing right by the environment. How can you justify reducing a level-funded program that is dealing with millions of acres of land that are too crowded for new and healthy trees to grow?

We will also hear talk today about how the Timber Management Program is antienvironmental or environmentally destructive. That is not what I have seen in the management that is being done in the Ouachita, the Ozark, St. Francis National Forests in Arkansas. Our national forests are adding 23 billion board feet each year. While 3 billion board feet are being harvested each year, 6 billion board feet die each year from insects, disease, fire, and other causes, and the amendment before us will only make that situation worse.

The majority of the timber sales in the program are done for other ecosystem objectives—improving habitat for wildlife, reducing fuels that may increase fire risk, especially in the urban interface areas, combating insect and disease infestations, and improving true growth for future timber.

We cannot ignore the contributions that the Timber Management Program makes each year, even if it might sound politically advantageous. The byproduct of a healthy, sustainable timber program is equally as important as healthy rural communities. The timber sales program generates regional income of $2 billion—over $2 billion; in fact, $2.3 billion—in Federal income tax receipts. Seventy percent of

the timber from national forests is sold to small businesses that could be forced to close their doors if we support further reductions to the program.

A $1 million reduction in the timber sales program on the Ouachita, Ozark, or St. Francis National Forests simply means 10,000 acres of forest designated for treatment by the forest plan will go untreated. That is what it will mean: a $1 million reduction, 10,000 acres that will go unmanaged, untreated. Perhaps that is the goal. Perhaps that is the backdoor objective of such an amendment. The byproducts—round wood and saw logs —will be unavailable. Communities will lose 500 years of work and over $15 million from the local economy.

By any reasonable standard, the U.S. forest practices are the best in the world, ensuring forests are regenerated and that water quality and wildlife habitat are protected or enhanced. Decreasing this program is wrongheaded. It will only set us back environmentally. It will surely negatively impact us economically.

I suggest we do the right thing and support no less than level funding for this important program and oppose the Bryan-Wyden amendment.

I thank the chairman. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I yield the chairman of the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Senator MURKOWSKI, such time as he may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, let's start with some facts because what is appropriate is to recognize just what the current policy of the administration is towards the U.S. forests managed by the Forest Service.

Clearly, as we look at where we are today, as this chart shows in the dark purple, the U.S. Forest Service volume sold, vis-a-vis the annual mortality—the annual mortality are those trees that are dead or dying—that in the years 1990, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, the annual mortality, compared with the volume sold—and that is evident by the green spheres that come up through the chart—the mortality has exceeded the commercial volume sold.

The suggestion is, what has happened to forest health?

You have to manage for forest health based on professionals, professionals who are trained and have committed their lives to best forest management practices.

What we have in the debate that is occurring on this floor is a debate over emotions, the emotions over whether timber, trees, a renewable resource, should be harvested or not.

We have heard the Senator from Idaho expound a little bit on the attitude prevailing in the U.S. environmental groups, and particularly the Sierra Club, which, much to their credit, has come out wholeheartedly and said: We want to terminate harvesting in the national forests, all of the national forests.

They make no bones about it. That is just a fact.

The justification for Senator BRYAN's amendment, which would timber program in the committee bill by $34 million, leads to the environmental agenda, the agenda of the Sierra Club that wants to terminate harvesting in national forests.

The amendment isn't what it appears to be. While I am sympathetic to my friend from Oregon and his efforts to redirect $10 million to wildlife surveys in the Northwest, I again think we ought to go back and recognize where the objection is. The objection comes from national environmental groups who are opposed to logging in the national forests. The policies of the Clinton administration relative to logging in the national forests are evident, but the justification to support that is very lacking if we look at the facts.

The facts are that there is currently almost 250 billion cubic feet—more than 1 trillion board feet—of volume of standing timber in the national forests. That is a significant amount—250 billion cubic feet of volume. The annual growth—that is the growth that occurs every year—is about 23 billion board feet.

Do you know what we are cutting, Madam President? We are cutting somewhere between 2.5 and 3 billion board feet. What is the justification in the sense of forest management practices and the forest health when clearly the forests are not in danger of being overcut? The regrowth at 23 billion board feet each year, compared with the cut of 2.5 to 3 billion board feet, clearly shows we are growing timber faster, much faster than we are cutting it—in fact, about 7 to 8 times faster than we are cutting it. As evidenced by this chart, the mortality now is exceeding what we are cutting in commercial timber.

Good forest management practices would indicate something be done about the dead and dying trees that are infested with the spruce bark beetle and so forth, and that a program be initiated so healthy trees grow back in again. But, again, these decisions are not being made by those responsible for forest health, professional forest managers. They are being made by environmental groups, and they are being made on the basis of emotional arguments.

You should recognize the reality that timber is a renewable resource that can be properly managed, as evidenced by the existing volume that we have in this country, 250 billion cubic feet in the national forests—and I will repeat it again—with 23 billion board feet annual growth, and the realization we are only cutting 3 billion board feet a year.

We certainly need some changes. The changes need to move off the emotional arguments and get into what is good for the forests, what is good for the health of the forests. You clear out the diseased trees. You encourage programs that eliminate fire hazards.

I have worked with Senator BRYAN and his colleague from Nevada on mining legislation which is important to his State and important to Western States, important to my State of Alaska. I am disappointed that he has seen fit to again take this issue on to reduce by $34 million the Committee's recommended timber program. I recognize that is not a big issue in his State. But I think it basically addresses a policy within this administration that has prevailed for some time, and that is to oppose resource development on public lands, whether it be grazing, whether it be oil and gas leasing, whether it be mining, and certainly in the case of timber.

I would like to communicate a little experience that we had in Alaska relative to studies and the resource management associated with the wildlife of the forest and to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that these challenges on the adequacy of wildlife studies seem endless. You no sooner get a professional opinion on the adequacy or inadequacy of a certain species within the forest, and if it is unfavorable to those who want to terminate logging in the forest, they simply go to a judge, get an injunction, and suggest that the study was inadequate and lacked the thoroughness that it needed.

Let me tell you a little story about what happened in Alaska.

We had the U.S. Forest Service involved in what they called the TLMP, the Tongass Land Management Plan. They spent 10 years to develop a plan. They spent $13 million. Previously, we had been cutting about 420 million board feet a year. The TLMP came down, after this 10-year study and $13 million, and cut it, the allowable cut, to 267 million board feet.

What happened as a consequence of that? We lost our only two year-round manufacturing plants in our State. The Sitka and Ketchikan pulpmills, the combined workforce, plus those in the woods, amounted to some 3,400 jobs, most of which were lost.

What was the forest health issue regarding this reduction? All the timber in the Tongass, as most Members who have been up there know, is old growth timber. But what they do not realize is that 30 percent of that timber is dead or dying. It has no other use than wood fiber. So it is put in the pulp mills.

Without the pulp mills, we have no utilization of that timber. Much of those logs are now ground up in chips or exported to Japan or out to pulp mills in the Pacific Northwest.

Let me go back to the Tongass Land Management Plan where they cut the sales level from 420 million board feet to 267 million board feet. Within 9 months, the administration, after spending 10 years and $13 million, decided that volume of 267 million board

feet was too high. So they cut it arbitrarily, without any public hearing, as a consequence of pressure from national environmental groups who used an emotional argument, and also the reality that maybe the easiest place to terminate harvesting in national forests is in Alaska. We have two Senators and one Congressman. Alaska is a long way away. Nobody can go up and look at it and recognize that we have cut less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the Tongass forest in Alaska over the last 40 years and that our regrowth is 10 times what we have cut. They want to terminate harvesting, and the Tongass national forest in Alaska is a good place to start. So they came back and cut the proposed allowable sales level from 267 to 178 million—no public hearings, no input, no further studies. They spent, again, 10 years and $13 million for the first study, and they weren't satisfied with it.

So I say to my friend from Oregon, don't be misled by the question of the adequacy of wildlife studies in the Pacific Northwest. On the goshawk, we in Alaska are now under a challenge, on an issue we thought we had behind us because several years ago we had a challenge on a threatened and endangered species, the goshawk. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service spent several years working with the Forest Service to do an evaluation, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service came to the conclusion that the goshawk was not threatened by the timber harvest program in the Tongass. We thought we had that issue behind us. We didn't.

Environmental groups—from the Southwest, I might add—petitioned the judge on the adequacy of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service evaluation of the goshawk study and the judge said, go back and do it again. If you can't depend on the best experts to come to a conclusion, then this is simply an open-ended effort by either bureaucrats, or environmental groups, or both to terminate harvesting in the national forests. That is what has happened as a consequence of the attitude of this administration towards timber harvesting.

Again, we have 250 billion cubic feet of volume standing in the national forests of the United States. The annual growth is 23 billion board feet. We are harvesting between 2.5 and 3 billion board feet. We are regrowing seven to eight times our annual harvest. Yet we have those who would say the forest program is being subsidized. There is no realization of what timber sales and related roads offer in providing access for timber, availability to the public, jobs, payrolls and communities. The proposal by Senator BRYAN would reduce the program about 13 percent below the current 1999 program level.

I am pleased the Society of American Foresters opposes the amendment. I believe that letter has been introduced in the RECORD. If not, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS,
Bethesda, MD, July 26, 1999.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has come to our attention that Senator Bryan may offer an amendment or amendments to the Interior Appropriations bill designed to significantly reduce the amount of funding available for the Forest Service Timber Sale program or its Roads program. We believe this would be a mistake.

While we are sure that Senator Bryan is well intentioned in his efforts, he may not understand the significant contributions the timber sale program makes to improving our national forests. The Fiscal Year 1998 Report of the Forest Service states "today, national forest timber sales are designed to incorporate multiple objectives, including insect and disease prevention and control, wildlife habitat management, fuels treatment, and reconstruction or construction of roads needed for long-term access." Foresters in the private and public sector design timber sales for purposes in addition to producing timber.

There are many examples of timber harvests that benefit other resources. For example, the July 1999, edition of the Journal of Forestry has an article called "Designing Spotted Owl Habitat in a Managed Forest." The article describes how to harvest trees and manipulate the forest for the benefit of spotted owls. Natural resource management professionals can produce forest products and healthy forests; they just need tools like the Forest Service's Timber Sale program to accomplish their goals. We can harvest trees from the forest and still leave behind quality conditions for wildlife.

We are also very concerned about a possible reduction in funding for the Roads program. The Forest Service estimates that they have a $10 billion backlog in road maintenance. Now is not the time to reduce funding for these important forest assets that can turn into environmental nightmares without proper design and maintenance.

Thank you for your consideration and your support of professional forestry.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. BANZHAF,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I urge the Congress to support the significant contribution that the timber program, even though it is in decline, has been making to improve the national forests.

Again, recognize that the program is smaller than a few years ago. The BRYAN amendment would continue this harmful slide, because the ultimate objective is to terminate harvesting in the national forests. The redirecting of timber funds to wildlife activities in support of timber still has the same negative effect. That negative effect has been highlighted by my friend from Idaho, as he discussed the effects of a reduction in the timber program.

What we are talking about on this chart is that there is more timber dying than is being cut. That is the harsh reality of where we are. What kind of forest management practice is that? It is a preservationist practice.

What is the role of the Forest Service? Habitat management? Stewards of the forest? They are not aggressive in thinning programs, which are needed for the growth of new trees. What the Forest Service has become is a custodial management agency. They don't know where they are going. They are torn between past leaders that used to make decisions on the basis of what is best for forest health, and the new generation that is directed to a large degree by national environmental groups that want to terminate harvesting in the national forests.

It is OK if you are from a State that has large private holdings. Washington State has a number of large private land companies. It is OK if you have large State-owned forests. But if you are in my State of Alaska, where the Federal Government, the U.S. Forest Service—the entire Tongass National Forest is owned and managed by the Federal Government—you have a different set of circumstances. Our communities are in the forest. Our State capital, Juneau, towns like Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Haines, Skagway, Sitka, all are in the forest. People live in the forest. They were under the assumption they would be able to work with the Federal Government, when we became a State in 1959, to maintain, on a renewable basis, an industry base. They recognize that in our case our forest, as an old-growth forest, is in the process of dying. Thirty percent of that timber is dying.

I had an opportunity to fly over some of the Northeastern States over the recess, Maine and other areas. I noted that they have a healthy timber industry, managed, if you will, to a large degree through the private holdings of landowners and corporations and the State. They have jobs. They have pulp mills. They have a renewability. Yet we are strangled by policies that are dictated by environmental groups, that are dictated by Members from States who have no interest in the national forest from the standpoint of those of us who are dependent on it in the West and particularly in my State in Alaska.

Finally, I ask that my colleagues reflect that this amendment would really reduce the tools the Forest Service has available for stewardship activities, tools that improve forest health and improve wildlife habitat and improve other forest ecosystems as well. Don't be misled by the objective of those who have a different agenda with regard to the national forests. Let us recognize that forests live and die. With proper management, they can yield a bounty of prosperity, a bounty of renewability. But we have to have the recognition that those decisions with regard to the forest are not going to be made by the politicians in this body. They are going to be made by those professionals who are prepared to put their reputation behind their recommendations or, for that matter, the other way around, and do what is best for the forest. The Bryan amendment certainly does not do this, by cutting funding for timber sales and roads, and hence, decreasing the timber program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. Madam President, during the course of the debate, the Senator from Idaho propounded to the Senator from Nevada a query as to how I could be supportive of this amendment and then made reference to the fact of Lake Tahoe, with all the problems we have in Tahoe. My own previous statements on Tahoe indicated the extent of the devastation that has been caused with dying trees and timber.

To suggest that somehow increasing the commercial harvesting of timber would in any way ameliorate the problems we face at Tahoe would be a totally spurious argument. The problems at Tahoe are compounded because we had a 7-year drought, the most protracted in recorded memory, and as a result, the forest became very vulnerable to infestation from beetles that ultimately killed vast amounts of trees in the Tahoe Basin. So adding to the commercial harvest would in no way help.

Secondly, with respect to Tahoe, we are reaping a whirlwind of practices that involve the extensive cutting of road network to the Tahoe Basin. The clarity of the lake is declining rapidly. This is a lake that Mark Twain rhapsodized about. John C. Fremont, on Valentine's Day in 1844, was the first European to see Lake Tahoe, and perhaps that date has some significance because those of us who live in Nevada have had a love affair with Lake Tahoe ever since.

The problem in Tahoe is exacerbated because of this road network that was built throughout the basin during a period of intense harvesting in the last century. The timber at Tahoe was used for the great mining activities of Virginia City. But it is instructive and helpful because the primary contributing factor to the erosion that is causing the deterioration of waters and clarity is the runoff from these old roads, and road maintenance is what we need so desperately.

So I say that my friend from Idaho confuses the issue when he talks about the problems at Tahoe and the thrust of the Bryan-Wyden amendment, which is simply to take about $32 million from the commercial timber operations and reprogram those into some accounts that include road maintenance and fish and wildlife management.

Let me make the point about road maintenance, if I may, again. The Bryan-Wyden amendment does not eliminate commercial timber sales in the national forests. My friend from Alaska referenced that we should allow professionals to make the determination as to how much harvesting should occur. That recommendation is included by the managers of the Forest Service, and they recommended a number of $196 million. That was in the President's recommendation.

Now, what the appropriators did was, they stripped out $34 million from road maintenance and fish and wildlife accounts and added that back into the timber sales to bring that number up to about $228 million. My friend from Arkansas was talking about the need for forest health and to do a lot of things. Those are totally different accounts. We are talking, on the one hand, of reducing to the level of the President's recommended appropriation the commercial timber sale account of $196 million and to add $32 million to that account. What the appropriators did was to reduce by $11 million the road maintenance account.

It is the road maintenance account that helps to alleviate the erosion and the other adverse environmental consequences that attach to the neglect of that maintenance. The testimony is that the Forest Service would need $431 million a year for road maintenance alone, that there is a total backlog of $3.85 billion in road maintenance. By rejecting the Bryan-Wyden amendment, you make that backlog even longer because the appropriators have stripped $11 million from that account.

Now, every mile of new construction adds to that backlog because under the law, once the harvesting operation has been completed, the timber harvester has no responsibility for the maintenance of that road. That, then, is left to the Forest Service and the American taxpayer. We already have 380,000 miles in the National forests. As I commented in my opening statement, that is more mileage than we have on the interstate system in America.

The things my friend from Idaho was talking about, in terms of fire burns and removing dead timber, have nothing to do—absolutely nothing—with the commercial timber sale account. Those activities are included in other accounts, such as the Wild Land Fire Management Act. So I think we have a confusion here as we debate these issues.

The Bryan-Wyden amendment would simply reduce to the level of the professional managers' recommendation in the Forest Service the commercial timber sale account of $196 million and would restore, essentially, to the environmental accounts and road maintenance accounts much of that money that was taken out. That is where the management practices need to be addressed. That is the focus. That is where the environmental problems are —road maintenance and fish and wildlife habitat.

In effect, what the appropriators did is to strip those accounts and reduce them substantially to add to the timber sale account. There is no benefit to the environment at Lake Tahoe by increasing the commercial timber sale accounts. That simply does absolutely nothing for us at all. So I wanted to clarify the RECORD where my friend from Idaho has confused it. The Senator from Nevada is being absolutely consistent.

I might just say, in terms of the broad public policy, the General Accounting Office concluded that, from 1992 to 1997, the commercial sales in the national forests have cost the American taxpayer $1.5 billion. So there is another issue out here to be debated in terms of the public policy. The Bryan-Wyden amendment does not eliminate but simply reduces to the level of the Presidential recommendation in terms of the appropriation.

If the Senator from Idaho were interested in seeing the problems more adequately addressed, he would favor reducing the amount of the commercial sales and restoring the $11 million that was stripped from that account. We need far more dollars in the road maintenance account, in which the backlog is over $3 billion.

So every attempt to reduce the amount of the road maintenance account and add money to the new construction account makes the situation much worse. I argue that the more prudent and rational public policy is to deal with neglected road maintenance and provide additional money in that account rather than to add to the commercial sale account. I wanted to make that point for the record.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, this has been an important debate—important for the Northwest and important as it relates to the direction of the Forest Service.

I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be surprised to know that I agree with a number of the things they have said about the Forest Service not knowing where they are headed. Frankly, I have made much stronger statements than that in the last few days. It is very clear in the Pacific Northwest that the Forest Service is just flailing around.

The chairman of our subcommittee and I both read these Oregonian editorials talking about blame with respect to gridlock in the forests. In the Northwest, the Oregonian, our newspaper, editorialized that:

> Forest biologists searching for signs of the rare mosses listed above ought to look under the backsides of the federal officials managing the forest plan. That seems a relatively undisturbed habitat.

I think it is fair to say that those Forest Service officials knew for years they had to go forward with survey and management in a responsible fashion and haven't done so. So I think the comments that have been made by the chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee, Senator CRAIG, and the chairman of the full committee, with respect to the Forest Service not knowing where it is going, are ones that I largely share.

But where we have a difference of opinion and where I think the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden and the substitute help to bring together colleagues on both sides of the aisle is that the history of the last few years demonstrates very clearly that just spending more money on the timber sale program

doesn't help these rural communities either from an economic standpoint or from an environmental standpoint.

The fact of the matter is, Madam President and colleagues, for the last several years this Congress has authorized a greater expenditure for the timber sale program than the President of the United States has called for.

This Congress has appropriated more funds for the timber sale program, and the fact is the problems in many of these rural communities in the West, from an economic and environmental standpoint, are getting worse.

So I think the notion that throwing more money at the timber sales program is going to address the needs of these rural communities is not borne out by the events of the last few years.

What needs to be done—and what Senator BRYAN and Senator FITZGERALD and I are trying to do—is to put in place a program with real accountability.

My colleague from Idaho talked about the need for accountability of the Forest Service. The chairman of the full Senate Energy Committee has correctly said more emphasis needs to be placed on oversight. The fact of the matter is that under the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment, for the first time the Congress will put in place a program in the survey and management area which has essentially shut down the forests and that will have real accountability. Under our amendment, the survey and management draft environmental impact statement will have to be completed by November 15 of this year, and the final version of that impact statement would have to be published by February 14 of 2000.

That is allowing for public comment. That is accountability. That is giving some direction to the Forest Service on the key issue that has in effect shut down the forests in our part of the country.

So the choice is, do we do business as we have done in the past, which is to throw money, for example, at a particular program, the timber sale program, or do we try, as the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment does, to tie that amendment to dealing with the key concerns that have shut down our forests and put in place real accountability in the process?

Beyond that, I think the only other major difference I have, as some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is that they have correctly said they don't want the courts to make forest policy. Section 329, as it stands in this bill, is a lawyer employment program. This is going to be a huge bonanza for lawyers as it stands in its present form.

That is why I am hopeful that colleagues, regardless of how they feel about section 329 in its original farm, regardless of how they voted on the Robb legislation earlier, will see that the approach that Senator BRYAN and Senator FITZGERALD and I are talking about tries to borrow from the philosophy of both of the approaches that have been debated on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I happen to agree with Senator GORTON and Senator CRAIG that the survey and management program has not worked. The Forest Service has dawdled. They have known what they were supposed to do for some time.

We can read editorials to each other for many hours to compete for who is the toughest on the Forest Service. But the fact is they haven't known where they are going, and we are going to try to get them on track. But this amendment is the very first effort in the Senate to put them on track in a way that locks in the additional money they need with a specific timetable and a blueprint for ensuring accountability.

I think for that reason it is absolutely essential that we pass it. I think it will give us an opportunity to go forward in the days ahead, which is what we are going to try to do in the oversight hearing that Chairman CRAIG is holding on Thursday.

I am very hopeful that those Members of this body who understand how wrong it is for the courts to make forestry policy and how important it is to have a balanced approach that will tie additional funding with accountability—and a recognition that there is more to this than appropriating additional funds for the timber sale program—will support our bipartisan amendment.

I gather we will not have a final vote on this amendment until tomorrow, and perhaps we will hear from some additional colleagues. But I am very hopeful, regardless of how a Member of this body voted on those Robb amendments or felt about the original section 329, the Gorton language, that they will see what Senator BRYAN and Senator FITZGERALD and I are trying to do, which is pull together an approach that will give the Forest Service some direction, give them some accountability, and do it in a responsible fashion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Oregon. We have worked closely together for the last number of months to try to resolve a variety of timber issues and conflicts that have brought some of our rural communities to their knees.

Those are communities that not only in many instances have lost jobs in the sawmills that I have talked about in my opening comments, but these are communities that also lost their moneys to run their schools.

My colleague from Oregon has communities that only go to school 4 days out of 5 days of a week because they have no more money to run their buses and to keep their schools open. I have communities in my State that are now debating over whether to put their money in the hot lunch program or athletics and ask all of their high school and grade school students to brown bag all the time.

You say: What does this have to do with this debate? What does this have to do with cutting trees in the national forests? It has a great deal to do with these communities that are timber dependent because 25 percent of the stumpage fee that comes from a Federal timber sale goes to the local communities for their schools, their county roads, and their bridges.

That is historically what we believe is a fair treatment of those communities that oftentimes house the loggers and the mill employees and the executives of the timber companies and the Forest Service but have no private land base because all of the land around them is public land, and they should share in the revenue flowing from that public land. Those are what we call timber-dependent communities.

The Senator and I worked to try to resolve that issue. We are very close to what I think is some tremendously positive and creative thinking that results from, hopefully, minds coming together out of conflict to bring resolution. I am fearful this amendment does not do that. I say that because while the Senator suggests that he prescribes deadlines by which EISs ought to be done, this administration and this Forest Service isn't talking anywhere near that. They are suggesting the deadline for a draft EIS ought to be in February and that the final ought to be in June for the EISs we are talking about for these sales. Whether you could expedite that, I am not sure.

The one thing we want to be very careful about in light of the environment in which we are doing these kinds of EIS's and studies is that the work be done right. As the Senator from Oregon and I know, the judges and the environmental communities will be like vultures hovering over each one of those efforts to fine pick every bone to make sure the work is done well.

Accelerating some of those studies could put at risk—I am not saying ''will,'' but I think we need to be very cautious at this moment as we try to wrestle through this very difficult policy issue between whether the Eleventh Circuit is right or whether this Congress will finally get aggressive enough to lead in changing the law in a way that we will not have our judges administering forest policy through their own whim, be it law, or, in many instances, be it their politics as applied to the law that causes Eleventh Circuit or Ninth Circuit judges to do what they have done recently that the Senator from Oregon is so worried about, and that I, not only as the Senator from Idaho but as chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, literally go into the tank because the Congress of the United States has been unwilling to lead in this area and establish well-based policy that we can effectively defend and are willing to defend. That is part of

the problem we are dealing with, and I hope the work of the Senator from Oregon and me results in that.

Let me make a final comment to the Senator from Nevada. It was not my intent to make an inaccurate statement. As chairman of the Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee, I have spent the last several years and 45 hearings looking at every aspect of the forest management of our country to try to understand it. I have examined, not in person and not on the ground, but all the studies of the Tahoe Basin problem. I recognize the basin problem is a combination of things, particular to forest density, that has resulted in dead and dying timber and drought environments of the kind discussed. This has created the negative habitat today that changes the character of the lake's water quality because of the runoff. I also understand that this creates phenomenal bug problems with dead and dying trees because the ground cannot support the base.

As the Senator from Nevada and I know in looking at computer models, before European man came to this continent, many of the acreages we are talking about were sparsely timbered and were much more pastoral. That was partly because of fire moving through the habitat, creating a mosaic of young and old alike. The Tahoe Basin changed when we became the stewards of the land and put out the fires.

The Senator from Nevada and I both agree on the condition of the Tahoe Basin. The point I am trying to make: What the Senator is doing is, in fact, taking money away from the ability of the Tahoe Basin to manage itself because the Tahoe Basin money is not a single-line item issue.

Let me explain. The Senator is amending an account that is divided into three categories. I am looking now at Forest Service management program reports. In the timber revenues and expenses, there are three categories. There is the timber commodity program component, there is the forest stewardship program component, and the personal-use program component. Those are the three that make up the account the Senator has amended.

The last report we have is 1997. In that year, in the first account, the timber commodity program account, the Senator is absolutely right, the Tahoe Basin had not one dollar of revenue or expenses because it is not a timber-producing area. In the stewardship area in revenues produced by actions, about $377,000 and $1,383,000 spent on stewardship programs—the very kind the Senator wants to see that begins to change the culture, the environment, of the basin area. There was approximately $39 million in revenues from the personal-use program and about $181 million in expenses.

I believe I am right. It was not my intent to mislead or to distort the Record. The Senator and I should clarify this. This is the document from the Forest Service. The account the Senator amends and takes $34 million from is the account from which the stewardship programs from the Tahoe Basin are funded. There is not a line item specific to the Tahoe Basin that I know or that we can find in any research. If the Senator would clarify that—I think by accident he may well be cutting out the very moneys he has fought so hard to get to begin to ensure the forest health or the improved health of that basin area.

In our stewardship analysis of the basins that are in trouble around the Intermountain West, and primarily the Great Basin environment of the West—because that is where fire is a critical tool—let me read again from the article ''One spark from a disaster.''

On adjacent lands just above the national forests the trees remain vigorous and healthy with a similar history of early forest clearing followed by fire suppression. These stands have escaped the bug infestation and the high mortality of the lower basin area [which is Federal land]. These privately owned timber lands were intensively managed to ensure vigor and high productivity. Unlike the Federal forest lands, private timberland managers responded to the bottom line and protected their forest assets over time.

My point is, what the Senator has appropriately advocated in getting into the basin, to change the way it is managed, to bring stewardship programs to do the thinning and to do the selective burn, absolutely has to be done to restore the vigor, to create an ecosystem that is less dependent on moisture, so it can handle itself through the kinds of droughts that we in the West experience—especially those in Great Basin States.

If the Senator could clarify that for me, I would appreciate that. It is my knowledge at this moment that the account his amendment pulls money from is the very account from which the stewardship program for the Tahoe Basin finds its funding.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. Madam President, I thank the floor manager for an opportunity to respond.

When one looks at the totality of problems, they are tall: Runoff, the erosion control, and the declining clarity. These are the primary, but not the exclusive, problems in the basin.

The roads that were cut through many decades ago are in the road maintenance account. As the Senator understands, there is a new construction account; there is a road maintenance account. The appropriators removed $11.3 million from the road maintenance account. From our perspective, that is the most serious account reduction that would impact what we are talking about. The road maintenance money account has a backlog: $3.85 billion has been discussed by the Forest Service, or $431 million. I think it is a matter of priorities. Our priority is to get back the road maintenance account money.

Indeed, with respect to some of the prescribed burn and other forest practices the Senator talks about, I think we are in agreement that clearly there are things that need to be done to thin out some of the underbrush. Those are taken care of in other accounts such as wildlife fire management and a forest land vegetation program.

There are a host of programs that are line item. The two I just mentioned, the wildlife fire management account and the forest land vegetation management program, are where some of the controlled burns and thinning occur. Those are the programs, from our point of view, that have a priority over the Senator's priority which would lead to an increased commercial operation.

That is where the Senator from Nevada comes from.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Senator for responding.

It is important to understand that one third of that fund still goes to stewardship. That is not just commercial activity. That is thinning and cleaning.

Also, it is important for the Senate and the Record to show we increase road maintenance by $10 million this year over last year. There was a recommendation of $20 million; we increased it by $10 million. There has been an actual net increase of $11 million, and a fair amount goes to the Tahoe Basin.

So the Forest Service is responding. We believe the committee and the appropriators were responsible, going in the right direction. What I think is important to say is that there were no cuts. We did not cut the program. We raised the program by $10 million. While some suggested it ought to go $20 million, it is a net increase over last year's funding level of $10 million.

Mr. BRYAN. If I can respond briefly—I don't want to get into a semantic game—it is a reduction over what the President recommended, I think the Senator will agree. It is a reduction of $11.3 million over what the President proposed. It may very well be, as the Senator indicates, an increase over what was approved for the last program.

Mr. CRAIG. The Senator knows recommendations are recommendations. I believe his first words were the program has been cut. The program has been increased by $10 million over last year while some, including the President, suggested it ought to be increased by more.

Mr. BRYAN. I think I did use the term ''cut.'' What I meant to say, and what I stand by, is the appropriators, in effect, cut this money from the original appropriation of the President. That represents a difference in priorities, the $431 million annual backlog, with a total backlog of $3.85 billion. It would be the priority of the Senator from Nevada that the President's recommendation not be reduced as the appropriators did, and I appreciate the chance to clarify that point.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I believe, if I understand Forest Service accounts accurately, the likelihood of increased stewardship activities in the Tahoe Basin by this amendment could be reduced because of the very character of spreading the money, as I think the Senator from Arkansas so clearly spoke to.

Let me yield such time to the Senator from Montana as he should consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, this morning as I returned from Montana and I was listening to the local news, I heard a 30-second spot advising folks to call the White House to stand up, to stop this disappearance of the national forest lands. It was paid for by the Heritage Forest—some group. We have not been able to run it down yet. The message went on to say we have to stop this because our forests will be gone forever.

We can talk about semantics. We can talk about budgets. We can talk about where we apply the money. Let's face it; the $11 million for road maintenance that we increased is mostly being used for road obliteration.

It seems we fight these little fights every year because there are those who completely do not, and I say this in all disrespect, know one whit about what is a renewable resource and how we are to manage it. It seems to me this is the reason a person on his ranch or farm does not run that ranch or farm by a committee. If we did, we would not get a crop in; we would not grow anything, and we sure would not get a crop harvested. I would say the good Lord above does have a sense of humor. If you want to look at what a committee does, I always thought a horse was a camel put together by a committee. Everything is an afterthought.

Let's dispel some of this myth that seems to be going across our land. In the Flathead National Forest alone, we are growing 120 million board feet of lumber a year. The Forest Service, in their plans, only planned to harvest 19 million. Let me tell you, due to laws and roadblocks and lawsuits, we will be lucky to cut 6 million board feet. This does not include our wilderness areas or recreational areas. These are in managed forest areas. This is about a third of what historically has been responsibly forested and harvested. However, due to litigation and other roadblocks, only 6 million will be harvested.

We cannot survive with that scenario and neither can the forest. Understand that. Neither can the forest. It will burn. Trees are similar to any other renewable crop: they sprout, they grow, they get old, and like every one of us in this building, they will die. What happens to them? They hit the forest floor, there is a fuel buildup, there is infestation by the pine beetle, there is dry weather, there is lightning, and there is fire. I realize that doesn't mean much to those of us who sit in this 17-square miles of logic-free environment because we get our paycheck every 2 weeks. We are very comfortable. But out there, their paychecks stop right then. Their equipment is burned up. The cycle starts all over again. Is that an environmental benefit to this country? I don't think so.

We have seen what happened in 1988 in Yellowstone National Park, the crown jewel of all parks, we are told. Fire swept across that park; and you should have seen the water that ran from that park for the next 3 years because there was nothing to hold the soil that had been turned sterile by the heat of the fires.

So according to the misinformation thrown around by the self-proclaimed environmentalists, leaving the land to rot, they believe, is best for the environment; the forests are gone forever whenever they are harvested. I wonder if they think it was all a barren land up here until one Friday we got up and, lo and behold, there was a forest. Just like a bolt of lightning, it was there. When you get a haircut, is that head of hair gone forever? To some it might be. Who knows. But I don't think so. Currently, most of our national forests in Montana, and throughout the West, we face a 25-percent tree mortality in the next 15 years. We will lose 25 percent of our forests just to mortality, getting old and dying.

So I am saying land management, proper land management saves our forests. I can take you to one of the worst areas there is in the Forest Service—it happens to be up in northwest Montana—and even the foresters themselves will tell you that we are ashamed of the condition of this forest. But because of litigation, they are powerless to do anything about it. Fuel loads, beetle infestations, it is not a pretty sight.

It is not a pretty sight.

Healthy forests are usually the benefit of good management. Harvesting of timber is healthy, and it is all part of management. That is aside from the faces of the people who live in these forest communities. Two weeks ago, we shut down a mill in Darby, MT. We sold it at auction. Jobs are gone. A tax base is gone. The ability to build roads on private lands, to maintain services, and to build schools—all that revenue is gone.

The opponents of timber production would have you believe we still clearcut entire forests when we do not do that anymore. They would have you believe we have industrial lawn mowers big enough to mow down the great redwoods as we clear swaths from seed to seed, and we do not do that anymore. In fact, there are more trees in this country than during the time of Lewis and Clark. It is hard to believe, isn't it? But it is true.

When we put together this appropriation and this budget, there was balance. It brought balance of wildlife, balance of timber and new timber growth, balance of timber that we could harvest for the benefit of Americans, for those folks who build homes, and for those folks who work with timber.

If one looks across the Nation right now, not many commodities are making money—gas, oil, no farm commodities. If you look at all the litigation, timber is not making any money either. Anything that comes from mining is not making any money. Why should we do it? Where would those industries move? What other land on this globe will be devastated because we are not allowed to manage our renewable resources?

I can remember dirt under the fingernails and the ability to produce a crop every year was pretty honorable. Madam President, 1.5 million Americans provide all the food and fiber for the other 260 million. That is not bad. We do a pretty good job, and we do it under conditions that are getting more and more difficult all the time.

Modern forestry, of course, with some rules and regulations passed by Congress, is being regulated more and more every day. Environmental laws require foresters to take a look at the impact of what they are doing. It employs independent timber firms that know the land. They are harvesting. All of this costs money, and yet they will say below-cost-timber sales. If we lump all the rules and regulations, all the hoops we have to jump through for one timber sale on a forest, it probably could be called a below-cost-timber sale. Those are hoops we have to jump through. So we increased the budget. It costs more money to complete a timber sale.

We do not clearcut areas with disregard. We spend more time making sure everything we do is done in a responsible manner. Dispel the misinformation, get away from the inflammatory words of growing a commodity and harvesting a commodity. In Montana, the people who harvest timber are the same ones who come back to hunt and fish. They do it every weekend. They recreate all that same forest.

Contrary to the doomsayers, we want our land to be usable. We want healthy wildlife populations, we want clean water, and we want to make sure our native fish are healthy.

Let's talk about this wildlife habitat. Most of the wildlife habitat is found on public land in the summertime. When they have to make it through the winter, do you know where the deer, the elk, the moose winter? On private lands, in my neighbor's hay meadow. Did you know we have to board up our haystacks in the West or the elk and the deer will eat all the hay and leave us none for our own livestock? They do not winter on public lands because there is no water and there is no feed. It is covered up. They have to winter on private lands. So are we so bad? I do not think so. We would not have it any other way because we are all hunters and fishermen and we enjoy the sights

of big game. We want to maintain the habitat. We enjoy seeing those elk. We enjoy this season of the year when they start bugling. Go out and listen. That is what makes my State worth living in.

It costs more money and the timber sale budget offers us an opportunity to feed our Nation's need for raw materials while employing Montanans and making and protecting habitat. We are talking about balance. Someone is buying that lumber or we would not have the demand to harvest it.

Harvesting a crop is not a sin. To the contrary, it keeps this country moving forward. It provides the timber to build our homes, and it provides the paper that often gets shuffled back and forth in this town. Quite simply, a timber sale budget is essential to America for food and fiber by proud producers. That is what it is all about. They do not like to be lied to. They do not even require much support. They ask very little. They ask to grow, to plant, nurture, and harvest. That is what it is all about.

How did those people who work in natural resources and agriculture—and this is agriculture in its highest form—who are responsible for 22 or 23 percent of the Nation's GDP become bad folks? How did we get that way? Because we used the resources around us, and our definition of conservation is the wise use of a natural renewable resource. Think about that. Twenty-three percent of the GDP in this Nation is in the production and the feeding of this country. It is unbelievable how that can be overlooked.

I ask my colleagues to contemplate the alternative. Let's say we quit harvesting trees in America, and that is what some extremist groups want us to do, or they want to make it so expensive we cannot compete on the open market. Do you realize that I have mills in Montana that are hauling logs 500 miles, out of where? Canada. So is your demand for lumber so high that you want to so-called devastate the Canadian land? I do not think so.

Why do people like to visit States such as Montana? No. 1, we are kind of authentic. Because we have done a pretty good job of taking care of it. And it is true of our good neighbors to the west in Idaho. It makes us the friendliest and the nicest people you will ever meet. But our people are starting to get cranky because their livelihood is being taken away from them, their ability to take care of themselves, by the rest of the country in its desire for the food and fiber that it takes for us to subsist.

So if you want to see our forests die in front of us, if you want to see our wildlife choked out of its habitat, and if you want to see our rural communities die, and to see foreign corporate timber production unfettered, fueled by our need for fiber, then vote for the Bryan amendment. That is what it is all about.

But there is balance here. I urge my colleagues to vote to maintain that balance. We believe in the balance of our forest lands and good stewardship.

If you want to talk about stewardship, we have a stewardship plan that is getting started on a trial basis in Montana that is being participated in by a lot of people, including very small harvesters. So if you say you want a stewardship program, you have one. It is a good one. It is a dandy. It will work. But we cannot make it work unless we have funds to balance the needs of our forests.

I thank the Chair and my chairman and yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on or in relation to the pending amendment No. 1623 at 10 a.m., and the time between 9:30 and 10 a.m. on Tuesday be equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Chair.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I will take a very short while.

I think the details, the information of this issue have been well discussed. But I rise in strong opposition to what is being proposed based simply on the health of forests.

In Wyoming, of course, we have national forests, as they do in Pennsylvania and other places. These forests need to be managed. I just spent several days in August in Yelowstone National Park. We road for 2 days, and all of it was in burnt forests. I have to tell you, that burn was not even effective because the ground fuel is still there. The trees are dead, but the ground fuel is there.

So all I am saying is, you have to manage this resource. Something will happen to the trees. They will either die or they will be harvested or they will be diseased. So if we are to have healthy forests, certainly they need to be managed.

The proponents of the amendment have said the timber program is wasteful. It was never intended to operate as a commercial tree farm. We have some numbers as to the resources that are provided for communities and the Federal Government. They are substantial.

I am not inclined to take a great deal of time. The chief of the Forest Service has stated there are 40 million acres of national forests which are at risk, either through fire or infestation. This amendment would cripple the Forest Service's ability to use the timber harvest to promote health. The amendment will crush a program that provides significant economic contributions to both the Federal Government and the communities. This amendment is wrong. It is shortsighted. I question why the Congress would continue to ask the agency to manage this land and then take away their ability to do that.

So I will end by urging Members not to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the time.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. If there is no objection, I would like to amend my immediate past unanimous consent request. It was from 9:30 to 10 a.m. tomorrow morning equally divided. I ask unanimous consent to amend that to be from 9:30 until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania on this most important amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, it isn't often I rise to talk about these kinds of issues because, by and large, these issues generally affect the West, and we in Pennsylvania do not have much direct involvement. But in this case we are directly affected in Pennsylvania.

We have a national forest in Pennsylvania, the Allegheny National Forest. What has been going on in the Allegheny National Forest over the past several years has been a very troubling thing to thousands of residents in my State; it has had a dramatic negative impact on the quality of life for the residents in northwestern and north central Pennsylvania, as the amount of timber harvests have continued to decline.

What we have seen, as a result of that, is a real damaging of the economy. It is a very rural area. Most people think of Pennsylvania and think of big cities and factories, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. But Pennsylvania has the largest rural population of any State in the country. I repeat that. Pennsylvania has the largest rural population of any State in the country.

That rural population, by and large, survives on agriculture and off the natural resources, whether it is coal mining or whether it is quarrying or whether it is timber or whether it is what we consider traditional agriculture.

The Allegheny National Forest is vitally important for several of our smallest counties. We have 67 counties in Pennsylvania. Our smallest county in population, oddly enough, is called Forest County. Forest County has about 4,000 or 5,000 people who live there. The biggest part of it is the national forest, the Allegheny National Forest. But there are other counties surrounding it that have bits and pieces of the national forest in their county: Warren County, McKean County, and Elk County.

In Elk County, PA—aptly named—we have about 600 elk, big ones, that have

come back over the past years and are thriving in our forests, almost to the point of being domesticated in some respects and causing problems. But that is another issue for another day.

But those four counties get a lot of revenue because big chunks of them are national forest areas. They get a lot of revenues from the timber sales that principally support their school districts.

I spoke to students at the Forest County schools a couple of weeks ago. The No. 1 issue that the kids asked me about was, what are we going to do about timber sales? Because they potentially will have to close down one of their schools because of cuts in the Forest Service budget, as well as lawsuits because of the Indiana bat, which, I guess, stays up in the Allegheny National Forest for a couple days a year, so there are all sorts of lawsuits tying up the Allegheny National Forest in harvesting.

The Allegheny National Forest is the single largest area for the harvesting of black cherry timber. You look at your black cherry veneer and you will see a lot of it comes from the largest black cherry stand in the country, which is the Allegheny National Forest.

The Allegheny National Forest, by the way, is a profitable forest. They make a lot of money in their timber sales because of high value trades. So they are not losing any money to anybody. They are making a lot of money. In fact, the less we harvest, the worse off we are financially.

It has been very deleterious to those counties. I will look at the timber receipts for the past several years. Even last year, which was not particularly a great year, we had $1.6 million for Warren County; $1.5 million for McKean County; $1.3 million—$1.3 million for a county of 4,000 people is a lot of money.

All these other counties range in the area of 20-, 30,000 people; Elk County, 1.26. All of them, every one of those counties, will have their revenues cut by more than half this year, by more than half because of legal roadblocks and cutbacks in the amount of timber sales as a result of Federal legislation.

The problems we confront are not just financial in terms of tax revenue. They are financial, but they are also financial with respect to our economy. Logging is a very important aspect of the way of life. Wood products: Because of our high-value black cherry and other species, we have a lot of high-value processing of that wood, which is resulting in very high unemployment. Many of these areas, in this very strong economy, are experiencing double-digit unemployment, and have consistently for the past couple of years.

We also have another concern which, again, when you go up and talk to the folks who live around the forests, is almost frightening, the kind of misinformation that is out there about our forests and the management of the forests.

I remember going to Gray Towers, which is outside of Milford, PA. Gray Towers was the home of Gifford Pinchot, who was the Governor of Pennsylvania and was a conservationist. Gifford Pinchot went on to be the first head of the U.S. Forest Service around the turn of the century. The Yale School of Forestry was actually colocated in Milford, PA, at Gray Towers, which was the mansion the Pinchot family lived in. Now it is a museum dedicated to forestry. I was up there looking at old pictures of Pennsylvania. It is remarkable. In picture after picture after picture, Pennsylvania was completely clearcut—clearcut.

I stood on the front porch of Gray Towers and looked out and saw the expanse. You can see literally for miles. I looked at the picture on the portico of roughly 100 years ago. It literally was stumps of trees for as far as the eye could see. Of course, now it is green as far as the eye can see, full of trees.

Pennsylvania is just remarkable. I fly over it all the time in small planes. It is just literally covered with trees, almost all of which, if not all of which—because I have been told it was completely clearcut—were not there 100 years ago. So the regeneration happens. In fact, the Allegheny National Forest is a valuable forest today because it was clearcut and because a shade-resistant strain of black cherry couldn't grow in those old forests. In fact, there are areas that are now dedicated to old growth in the Allegheny National Forest that have a lot less diversity.

People are worried about the health of the forest, environmental diversity. You get to some of these old-growth forests. You take the combination of the old growth and the fact that you have less vegetation, which puts pressure on your deer and everything else—we have a lot of deer. They completely decimate old-growth forests, where it is a desert there because of these high trees. You don't have a lot of younger growth. Whatever does crop up, because there isn't much else around, the deer take it right out.

So we went, in this area called the heart of the forest, when they dedicated it to old growth, from 37 varieties of plants down to 4. I don't know about you, but I am not too sure that is protecting the environment or the health of the environment.

I am an easterner. I am not one of these guys who understands public lands and forests and all that stuff. I grew up around the city of Pittsburgh and didn't know too much about forests. But I remember hearing people say: We have to manage the forest. You say: Forests manage themselves pretty well. What do you mean? Well, yes, forests manage themselves pretty well, but they manage themselves not in a way that you and I would consider them. They manage it through, in a sense, a boom-and-bust cycle, growth and then destruction and then growth and then destruction. That is pretty much how forests grow if you leave them alone. That is OK, I guess. But it doesn't provide what is, I think, in the best interest of the animal life and the plant life and certainly the community for recreation. The economic resources that are derived from the forest are not maximized when you allow this kind of wild and unmanaged forest generation and regeneration to occur.

I trust the Forest Service. I don't always agree with them, but I trust the Forest Service will work to maintain forests and wisely manage them, using sound science to provide the best environment for stable growth of the forest as well as for the indigenous animal species that are there to feed. It is very serious—it is the No. 1 issue in about 5 or 6 counties in my State—that we allow the timber harvesting program to continue. It is the economic lifeblood of those counties.

I felt compelled to give a little different perspective, as someone who doesn't talk to these issues very much—and maybe it is best I don't—but who has a real sensitivity as to what sounds good. As I have told people about what sounds good in suburban Philadelphia, saying leave these trees alone, we love the trees, don't hurt the trees, a little knowledge is dangerous sometimes and no knowledge is downright lethal. And in the case of dealing with forest management, a lot of folks don't have a darn bit of knowledge. And it is killing people. It is killing their economy. It is killing their school districts. It is killing the forests.

That is not something we should allow to go unchallenged in Congress. Just because it makes a good TV commercial, just because it sounds as if you care more, you don't care more if you understand the facts involved in forest management.

I am an enthusiastic opponent of this amendment. I must tell you, when I first got to Congress, I was not. But the more I have learned about forest management and the impact of timber sales on not only the health of the forest but the health of the economy related to the forest, it is an absolute must for me to stand here and oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, in the few minutes remaining, I wish to add my voice to those in opposition to this amendment. We thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his sensitivity to these issues.

As he correctly said, this amendment could be devastating to the people and to the families who depend on their jobs in many counties across America. I think it is important that we understand this amendment in the context in which it is being proposed. Federal timber sales are in a steep and devastating decline. Since the early 1990s, the timber program has been reduced in America by over 70 percent. Already, more than 75 percent of the National

Forest System is off limits to timber harvests. The Federal timber supply has dropped from 12 billion board feet to the 3 billion board feet being harvested today.

Both the economic and the ecological context created by this reduction are not desirable. More than 80,000 jobs have been lost already, and of the 55,000 jobs that remain, they will be jeopardized by this amendment. That represents over $2 billion in employment income, mostly in rural parts of America. The families who depend on those jobs are counting on us to understand this issue and to vote correctly.

It is confounding also that these additional cuts are being considered at a time when the industry and those working men and women who depend on it have already been deeply hurt by the critical cuts in the timber program.

In my home State of Idaho, our rural communities continue to suffer devastating reductions in the 25 percent funds from timber sales. Schools are going without needed renovation, and county governments are going without needed support and jeopardizing their basic services because of these steep reductions.

This amendment is also counterintuitive from an environmental perspective. Active forest management, including thinning and other timber harvest, has widely acknowledged benefits. In fact, most timber sales are currently designed to attain other stewardship objectives, in addition to the sales themselves. Timber sales are the most economic and efficient and effective methods available for our managers to treat and control many insect epidemics.

Madam President, each year the National Forest System grows by 23 billion board feet; 6 billion board feet die naturally. Only 3 billion board feet are being harvested. Tree growth in our National Forest System exceeds harvest by 600 percent.

I stand firmly with those who have cast their opposition today against this amendment and encourage my colleagues to reject it.

DEPLORING THE GRANTING OF CLEMENCY—MOTION TO PROCEED—RESUMED

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I rise to express my strong opposition to the President's decision to commute the prison terms of 16 members of the FALN, a Puerto Rican terrorist group. I also strongly support S.J. Res. 33, which expresses the Senate's opposition to this misguided decision.

There is no question that the President has the Constitutional power to do what he did. The President receives thousands of requests per year for a pardon or clemency, and the Department of Justice has a standard procedure under which the Pardon Attorney reviews these requests each year. However, all indications are that the procedures were not followed in these cases, and that these cases were anything but routine.

News reports indicate that the Justice Department did not make a recommendation for or against clemency in these cases like it normally does. There is no excuse for the Department to stand neutral on very significant requests such as these. Also, the terrorists apparently did not personally take the proper steps to seek the relief, given that one of the conditions for clemency was that the prisoners had to sign statements requesting it.

Although the White House says the members were not convicted of committing murder or physical injury, it is clear that these criminals were actively involved in the militant group. Making bombs and transporting firearms designed to carry out the reign of terror, or committing armed robbery to finance the deeds, is not fundamentally different from personally harming innocent victims. They were conspirators in the FALN, a terrorist group, and they received stiff prison terms for good reasons.

News reports indicate that the law enforcement organizations that reviewed the issue, including the FBI and Federal Bureau of Prisons, recommended against it. Also, law enforcement organizations have expressed strong opposition.

The opposition is based on good reasons. America has long had a firm policy of intolerance regarding terrorism. Granting clemency to members of the FALN sends the wrong message about America's commitment to fighting terrorism. In fact, it sends the wrong message about America's commitment to fighting crime at home.

It is telling that the FALN terrorists did not immediately agree to the simple conditions that the President placed on his generous offer. It took them weeks to agree to renounce the use of violence and submit to standard conditions of parole. Indeed, some never did. Moreover, it does not appear that they have even expressed regret or remorse for their crimes. This is clear from one of the members' appearance on a Sunday news program, where he refused to express sorrow or regret for his crimes.

An obvious question we must ask is whether the President will continue to grant clemency in a way contrary to American interests. I sincerely hope the President will not pardon or commute the sentence of convicted Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard. I sent the President a letter last week asking him to clearly affirm that he will not do this.

I hope the Senate today will invoke cloture on the resolution and express our profound opposition and concern regarding this matter.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the Hispanic whose actions and fate I would like the Senate to focus on for action is Richard Paez. Richard Paez has never been convicted of a crime and is not associated with the FALN. He is not a petitioner seeking presidency clemency. Rather, he is a judicial nominee who has been awaiting consideration and confirmation by the Senate since January 1996—for over 3½ years.

The vacancy for which Judge Paez was nominated became a judicial emergency during the time his nomination has been pending without action by the Senate. His nomination was first received by the Senate almost 44 months ago. This nomination has now been held even longer than the unconscionable 41 months this Senate forced Judge William Fletcher to wait before confirming his nomination last October.

Judge Paez has twice been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee to the Senate for final action. He is again on the Senate calendar. He was delayed 25 months before finally being accorded a confirmation hearing in February 1998. After being reported by the Judiciary Committee in March 1998, his nomination was held on the Senate Executive Calendar without action for over 7 months, for the remainder of the last Congress.

Judge Paez was renominated by the President again this year and his nomination was stalled without action before the Judiciary Committee until late July, when we were able to have his nomination reported again. The Senate refused to consider the nomination before the August recess. I have repeatedly urged the Republican leadership to call this nomination up for consideration and a vote. If they can make time on the Senate floor for debate and consideration of a Senate resolution commenting on the clemency grant, which is a power the Constitution invested in the President without a congressional role, the Senate should find time to consider the nomination of this fine Hispanic judge.

Judge Paez has the strong support of both California Senators and a ''well-qualified'' rating from the American Bar Association. He has served as a municipal judge for 13 years and as a federal judge for four years.

In my view Judge Paez should be commended for the years he worked to provide legal services and access to our justice system for those without the financial resources otherwise to retain counsel. His work with the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, the Western Center on Law and Poverty and California Rural Legal Assistance for nine years should be a source of praise and pride.

Judge Paez has had the strong support of California judges familiar with his work, such as Justice H. Walter Crosky, and support from an impressive array of law enforcement officials, including Gil Garcetti, the Los Angeles District Attorney; the late Sherman Block, then Los Angeles County Sheriff; the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs' Association; and the Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs.

The Hispanic National Bar Association, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, and many, many others have been seeking a vote on this nomination for what now amounts to years.

I want to commend the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his steadfast support of this nominee and Senator BOXER and Senator FEINSTEIN of California for their efforts on his behalf.

Last year the words of the Chief Justice of the United States were ringing in our ears with respect to the delays in Senate consideration of judicial nomination. He had written: ''Some current nominees have been waiting a considerable time for a Senate Judiciary Committee vote or a final floor vote. . . . 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.'' Those words resonate with respect to the nomination of Judge Paez.

I trust the American people recognize who is playing politics with the issue of clemency. I disagreed with the President's decision, but it was his to make. He says that he granted clemency with conditions after study and based on a sense of proportion and justice. The calls for clemency in these cases came from Bishop Tutu, Coretta Scott King, other Nobel peace prize winners, a number of churches and religious groups. It has drawn praise in some circles and criticism in others.

I do not agree with the President, but I caution that the overreaching by Republican critics in the Congress on this is worrisome, as well. To contend that this shows a weakness of resolve against international terrorism is both wrong and may itself be creating a dangerous atmosphere.

We ought to be careful when anyone, let alone the Senate and Congress of the United States, start bandying about declarations that accuse the United States Government of making ''deplorable concessions to terrorists,'' ''undermining national security'' or ''emboldening domestic and international terrorists.''

Playing politics with this matter and accusing the President of ''undermining our national security'' or ''emboldening terrorists'' carries significant risks. Could a potential terrorist somewhere in the world believe this political rhetoric and be ''emboldened'' by it? This is risky business. I do not believe the short-term political gain to the other party is worth having the Senate endorse a resolution that might itself have precisely that effect.

The Senate cannot find time to vote on the nomination of Judge Richard Paez or that of Bill Lann Lee to head the Civil Rights Division of that of Justice Ronnie White to be a federal judge in Missouri or any of the scores of other nominees pending before it. The Senate has not completed work on 11 of the 13 appropriations bills that must be passed before October 1. The Republican Congress cannot find time to consider campaign finance reform or pass a real patients' bill of rights or consider raising the minimum wage or reforming Medicare or complete the juvenile crime bill conference, but there is plenty of time for floor debate and on the President's decision to exercise his clemency power. The Senate has had three hearings on judicial nominations all year and the Republican Congress will have that many hearings on the clemency decision this week.

In closing, I ask: If the Senate has the time to debate and vote on this resolution, why does it not have time to vote on the nomination of Judge Richard Paez to the Ninth Circuit?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to address Senate Joint Resolution 33, regarding the President's granting of conditional clemency to certain Puerto Rican prisoners.

Before addressing the merits of this resolution, I must note that I am troubled by the procedure which has been employed for its consideration. Almost two weeks ago, Senator COVERDELL announced that he would hold a hearing on President Clinton's decision in the Terrorism Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, this coming Wednesday, September 15. Last Wednesday, the Judiciary Committee also gave notice of a hearing on this subject for September 15. However, notwithstanding these planned hearings, the Republican leadership filed this resolution condemning the clemency and scheduled a vote related to it for today.

Holding a vote before the hearings is akin to having the verdict first, and then the trial.

Nevertheless, since we must vote, I will address the merits of the President's decision, based upon the information which is available to me before the hearings.

At the outset, let me say that serious, thoughtful people urged the President to offer this clemency. These people include former President Carter; eleven Nobel Peace Prize winners, including Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Coretta Scott King; and dozens of religious leaders and organizations. President Clinton's decision was not a frivolous one, nor did it appear from out of thin air.

However, that having been said, I believe strongly that the decision the President made was the wrong one.

In the post-Cold War era, terrorism presents perhaps the greatest threat to our national security. As Ranking Member of the Terrorism Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, I have done what I can to assist law enforcement in combating terrorism.

These prisoners were terrorists, and granting them leniency is exactly the wrong thing to do. We have tried in recent years to send a clear, unequivocal message to terrorists: if you plan or commit acts of terrorism against the United States, we will find you, hunt you down, and punish you severely. Until this point, President Clinton's administration carried this message forward forcefully, including, for example, apprehending and punishing the Oklahoma City bombers and taking retaliatory strikes against Osama bin laden. However, the President's decision last month undermines this message.

Some have described these prisoners as political prisoners. They were not. They were terrorists. Let me describe for a minute some of what they did.

These prisoners were members of the FALN, the Armed Forces for National Liberation, which seeks to make Puerto Rico and independent nation, through violent means. While some of them will not admit it, this was alleged and proven in the trials against them.

According to the FBI, and I quote, ''In the past, Puerto Rican terrorist groups struggling for Puerto Rico's independence from the United States have been responsible for the majority of terrorist incidents perpetrated by domestic terrorist groups within the United States.'' The FBI's Terrorist Research and Analytical Center reported in 1996 that the ''FALN has been linked to over 130 bombings which have resulted in over $3.5 million in damages, 5 deaths, and 84 injuries.''

The prisoners who received clemency were active participants in this campaign of terror. For instance, Alejandrina Torres, Edwin Cortes and Alberto Rodriguez were convicted of conspiring to, and I read now from the indictment against them, ''oppose by force the authority of the government of the United States by means of force, terror and violence, including the construction and planting of explosive and incendiary devices at banks, stores, office buildings and government buildings . . . It was a further part of the said conspiracy that the conspirators would claim credit in the name of the FALN for certain . . . bombings through either telephone calls or typed communiques.'' This is classic terrorist activity.

As part of this plot, Torres and Cortes stockpiled dynamite, weapons, blasting caps and bulletproof vests. Together with Rodriguez, they planned to bomb U.S. military facilities in the Chicago, cased the facilities, and reviewed a communique to be published in conjunction with the planned bombings. They built bombs containing 21 pounds of dynamite. They also planned to use explosives to free FALN leader Oscar Lopez (who also was offered clemency by the President) from prison, to rob a Chicago Transit Authority facility to fund FALN operations, and to harbor another FALN leader who had escaped from prison.

Four others who were offered clemency were convicted in connection with

the armed robbery of seven million dollars from a Wells Fargo depot, to fund a similar Puerto Rican revolutionary independence group, Los Macheteros. This is an organization that ambushed a Navy bus and killed two U.S. servicemen and launched a rocket attack at the federal courthouse in Hato Rey, Puerto Rico.

Madam President, building bombs and committing armed robberies on U.S. soil are not political acts. They are crimes, plain and simple, and these people were appropriately locked up for their offenses. It should make no difference that the prisoners had political motivations which some may share. Virtually all terrorists are politically motivated, and many justify their acts in the cause of ''national liberation.'' But terrorism is a cowardly and evil means to achieve such ends, which can never be justified, and which must be punished harshly.

It has been reported that the clemency petition was opposed by the FBI and the Bureau of Prisons. The Fraternal Order of Police has vehemently condemned this offer, calling it a ''horrendously bad idea.''

Clemency proponents have asserted that these prisoners harmed no one. A former Assistant U.S. Attorney who prosecuted some of these FALN members counters this assertion, noting: ''A few dedicated federal agents are the only people who stood in their way. The conspirators made every effort to murder and to maim. It is no small irony that they should be freed under the guise of humanitarianism.''

History has shown us that making concessions to terrorists spurs increased terrorism. The President made the wrong decision. I hope and pray that his decision will not have this effect, but I fear it will.

Despite the flawed procedure, I will vote to proceed to Senate Joint Resolution 33, and I will subsequently vote for its passage. Terrorism does not deserve leniency.

• Mr. HATCH. Madam President, the President's ill-considered offer of clemency has now been accepted by 12 of the 16 FALN members, many of whom are now back on the street.

These are people who have been convicted of very serious offenses involving sedition, firearms, explosives, and threats of violence. The FALN has claimed responsibility for past bombings that have killed and maimed American citizens. I pray that no one else gets hurt.

This is yet another example of this Administration sending the wrong message to criminals—be they foreign spies, gun offenders, or—in this case—terrorists.

In this case, it appears President Clinton put the interests of these convicted criminals ahead of the interests of victims, the law enforcement community, and the public.

I think we need to know: Did Attorney General Janet Reno do her job?

Media reports suggest that—notwithstanding the strong opposition of prosecutors, the FBI, the Bureau of Prisons, and the victims of crime, the Department of Justice and the Attorney General apparently did not take a formal position on the matter even though the Department's own rules require doing so.

Here we have another example of what people suspect: The Attorney General is asleep at the switch while the White House runs the Justice Department.

As Chairman of the Senate Committee with oversight of the Department of Justice, I have requested copies of all relevant documents, including the Department's memo to the White House. Even our colleague Senator SCHUMER believes we should have these documents. But, so far, the Department has refused to turn over anything.

The Department and the Attorney General are hiding behind their tired, old ploy of studying whether to assert executive privilege. If the President has confidence that his decision was a just one, then he ought to be willing to hold it up to public scrutiny.

I will hold a hearing on the matter next Wednesday, September 15, at which time we will hear from the law enforcement community and those negatively affected by this grant of clemency.

I believe, Madam President, that our entire nation is victimized by terrorism. A bomb at the World Trade Center, the Oklahoma City Federal Building, or a U.S. embassy abroad has an effect on all of us.

This clemency deal is an insult to every American citizen. This clemency deal is not humanitarian; it is not just.

Exactly what is this? A weak moment? Political favoritism? Another foreign policy miscalculation?

I'll tell you what it is—it is wrong.•

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 5 p.m. having arrived, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 33, a joint resolution deploring the actions of President Clinton regarding granting clemency to FALN terrorists:

Trent Lott, Conrad R. Burns, Ted Stevens, Peter Fitzgerald, Jim Bunning, Larry E. Craig, Michael D. Crapo, Chuck Hagel, Fred Thompson, Bill Frist, Michael B. Enzi, Judd Gregg, Craig Thomas, Jesse Helms, Pat Roberts, and Paul Coverdell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 33, a joint resolution deploring the actions of President Clinton regarding the granting of clemency to FALN terrorists, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 270 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Abraham	Edwards	Lugar
Akaka	Feingold	Mack
Allard	Feinstein	McCain
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Baucus	Frist	Mikulski
Bayh	Gorton	Moynihan
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Murray
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Boxer	Gregg	Reed
Breaux	Hagel	Reid
Brownback	Harkin	Robb
Bryan	Hollings	Roberts
Bunning	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Burns	Hutchison	Roth
Byrd	Inhofe	Santorum
Campbell	Inouye	Sarbanes
Chafee	Jeffords	Schumer
Cleland	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kerrey	Snowe
Conrad	Kerry	Specter
Coverdell	Kohl	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Leahy	Torricelli
Dodd	Levin	Voinovich
Domenici	Lieberman	Warner
Dorgan	Lincoln	Wellstone
Durbin	Lott	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Bennett	Hatch	Smith (OR)
Enzi	Helms	
Graham	Sessions	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). On this vote, the yeas are 93, the nays are 0. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 1603 to Calendar No. 210, H.R. 2466, the Interior appropriations bill.

Trent Lott, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Gordon Smith of OR, Thad Cochran,

Larry E. Craig, Bill Frist, Michael Crapo, Don Nickles, Craig Thomas, Chuck Hagel, Christopher Bond, Jon Kyl, Peter Fitzgerald, Pete V. Domenici, Phil Gramm, and Slade Gorton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, in view of the fact that seven of our Members are missing, I ask unanimous consent to move the cloture vote to tomorrow following the votes at 10:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. I object. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Under the previous order, there will now be 5 minutes of debate equally divided between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask if Senator HUTCHISON would like to go first?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I prefer to reserve my time and close.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, may we have order in the Chamber, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is well taken. Senators will take their conversations to the Cloakroom, please.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I have taken the Senate's time on this matter. Here is why: I simply care about the Senate too much to see it be a party to a deliberate scheme by just 5 percent of the oil companies to underpay their royalty payments to our constituents. The Hutchison amendment allows the situation to continue by stopping the Interior Department from fixing it.

How do we know taxpayers are being cheated? First, there are many whistleblowers, former oil executives, who say under oath they undervalued the oil from Federal lands in order to pay less.

Second, settlements are occurring all over the country whereby these oil companies are paying billions of dollars in back royalties to keep their cases out of court.

Senator HUTCHISON has said the Interior Department wants to raise taxes on the oil companies. Royalties are not taxes; they are legal agreements just as your mortgage or rent is. As USA Today says:

> Imagine if one day you decided to lower your rent by 10 percent. No individual could do that. And yet the oil companies are.

You may hear all we need is more time, but this is the fourth rider this Senate has passed, although we have never had a vote on it before. This is the first vote. We have already lost $88 million from the Department of the Interior because of it. These companies should do what 95 percent of them are already doing, base their royalty payments on fair market value.

Senator HUTCHISON has said the oil companies are suffering now and it is bad timing to fix this. I voted, and most of us did, for a bill to help the oil companies. That is fine. But royalty payments must be collected and because they are based on fair market value, they do go down when oil prices are depressed. That is a better deal than most Americans get on their mortgages or their rent.

You may hear about a court case in California that the oil companies won. But that had nothing to do with Federal oil royalties; it was about State royalties.

Finally, the Hutchison amendment is not in the House bill because this is an appropriations bill, and the Hutchison amendment will strip another $66 million out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We need those funds very much. Senator HUTCHISON says it is just $10 million. Interior and OMB say $66 million. Regardless, it is a bad rider. I hope you will not vote for cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. BREAUX.

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, I thank the Senator for yielding. In just 60 seconds, it is unfortunate we are voting with a number of Senators absent. I guess we will have to do that.

The question is, How do we value oil? The law says the companies owe the Federal Government, taxpayers, one-sixth to one-eighth of the value of the oil. The problem is, how do you determine the value? It is a very complicated rulemaking procedure that is ongoing to try to determine what are the legitimate deductions and transportation costs, in particular, determining what the fair market value of oil is. We can rush this thing through. It will result in years of litigation. Or we can pause for a few moments, which is what we are asking to be done, to try to negotiate out something to which both sides can agree. I think it makes more sense to pause for a few moments, get the groups together and work it out, rather than run the risk of years and years of litigation. We know what is going to happen then. Nobody is going to win. The American public is not going to win.

I urge we support the Hutchison amendment and get it done in a more realistic and fair fashion.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I rise in support of the Hutchison-Domenici amendment because the MMS's procedures are flawed. Department of the Interior employees involved in the writing of the regulations received $300,000 each from a group that had interests contrary to those of the oil and gas firms.

It is wrong on substance. I will just give one example showing it is flawed. A producer from one oil well producing one kind of oil would be forced to value his oil ten different ways under this MMS proposal.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I strongly support Senator HUTCHISON's amendment to keep the Department of Interior from spending additional money for one year to implement their flawed oil valuation regulation. I am a cosponsor of the amendment.

Our amendment does two things: First, it puts the Senate on record opposing a Value-added Tax proposed by the executive branch. Second, it prevents MMS from implementing a rule that is so corrupt the Interior Department's inspector general and the Department of Justice are currently investigating $700,000 in payoffs to federal employees involved in the rule.

The CBO scored the impact of this amendment at $11 million. This is the apparent cost of standing up for Congress' constitutional prerogative to raise revenues.

The domestic oil and gas industry is being driven from our shores. During the oil embargo in 1973, we imported 36 percent of our oil. Today, we import 56 percent of our oil. We will continue to burn oil—in fact, we burn a bit more now than we did in 1973. But our own industry is in a death spiral, caused in part by government actions like this. Over 50,000 American families have lost their jobs in the last two years as companies leave the U.S. for foreign shores—foreign shores where it's cheaper to drill and governments encourage domestic energy production.

Without adoption of the Hutchison amendment, we will be saying: ''Go ahead. Raise royalties and taxes. We, the U.S. Senate, yield our power to the Executive.'' This Senator cannot stand by and watch all power flow to the Executive.

''RENT-A-RULE''—POGO, ETC.

Neither can this Senator stand aside when there are serious allegations of payoffs to government employees involved in the rule.

In May of this year, the press began to report that two federal employees—one at the Department of Interior; the other, retired from the Department of energy—had taken $700,000 from a self-described ''public interest group'' as an ''award'' for their work in the federal government on the rule to raise royalty rates on domestic oil producers. This group, the project on Government Oversight, or POGO, has not been very effective in its membership drive—it has only about 200 subscribers—but it has been very successful attracting trial lawyers as board members. In fact, the trial lawyers on its board have spent years litigating the very cases on oil value that the proposed DOI rule would benefit if the Boxer Amendment is adopted.

The inspector general and the U.S. Department of Justice public Integrity Section are investigating these payments.

In two letters to the Secretary of Interior, Senators DOMENICI, NICKLES, and I have asked the Department to withdraw the proposed rule pending the outcome of the investigations into

whether the employees can take money for ''fixing'' a rule. The Department has declined to do so twice.

In answering our first letter, DOI said the two had nothing to do with the rule. Senators DOMENICI, NICKLES, and I wrote back, this time providing public documents proving their involvement, and asking them, based upon the evidence, to withdraw the rule.

The response to our second letter was to acknowledge that the two apparently did have some involvement in the rule, but the decision to change the rule was made prior to their official involvement.

The Department's argument is misleading. The two federal employees worked hand-in-glove with POGO to convince the Department to craft a rule to POGO's liking. According to POGO's Executive Director, POGO even arranged for the employees to be specifically requested to testify before a House subcommittee to put pressure on the Department to start a rulemaking.

All the facts suggest that these employees were influential, if not instrumental, in the decision to issue the rule and the content of the rule. After influencing the decision to issue the rule, the employees took part in the public comment phase of the rulemaking. In other words, they were up to their elbows in this issue from start to finish.

A skeptic could conclude that the employees, working with POGO and the trial attorneys who stood to gain from out-of-court settlements, earned their ''rewards.'' POGO, after all, admits they paid them $350,000 each. The Department's position appears to be that POGO paid the wrong bureaucrats.

The public integrity of the public rulemaking process is at stake, even if Secretary Babbitt fails to see it.

In our nation, federal employees are not paid to push rule changes which benefit one party in a lawsuit. This is a dangerous precedent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, we directed the MMS to simplify the oil royalty payments so that companies would know what their fair share is. This is what MMS has come forward with as a simplification.

Companies still do not know what they will owe. They want to pay their fair share. I want them to pay their fair share. Whether they have in the past is not an issue. We are trying to have a fair setting of taxes.

The question is: Who makes tax policy in this country? Is it Congress or is it unelected bureaucrats who are not accountable to the people? We are talking about a 1-year moratorium so that this can be worked out in a way that is acceptable to Congress.

The Senator from California says this only affects 5 percent of the producers. I have a letter from the California Independent Petroleum Association, representing 450 independent oil and gas producers, which says:

It is false to claim that this rulemaking only affects the top 5 percent of all oil producers. It affects every California producer on Federal land.

Madam President, I urge a vote for cloture so we can have a fair up-or-down vote on this amendment so that Congress will set the policy of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1603 to H.R. 2466, the Interior appropriations bill, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 271 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Allard	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Nickles
Bingaman	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grams	Roth
Breaux	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Shelby
Bunning	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Burns	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Hutchison	Snowe
Chafee	Inhofe	Specter
Cochran	Inouye	Stevens
Collins	Jeffords	Thomas
Coverdell	Kyl	Thompson
Craig	Landrieu	Thurmond
Crapo	Lincoln	Voinovich
DeWine	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—40

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Moynihan
Bayh	Harkin	Murray
Biden	Hollings	Reed
Boxer	Johnson	Reid
Bryan	Kennedy	Robb
Byrd	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerry	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kohl	Schumer
Daschle	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dodd	Leahy	Wellstone
Dorgan	Levin	Wyden
Durbin	Lieberman	
Edwards	Lott	

NOT VOTING—5

Bennett	Hatch	Sessions
Graham	Helms	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 55, the nays 40. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate failed to invoke cloture on the pending Hutchison amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I understand the Chair will now put the question on this nomination.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MARYANNE TRUMP BARRY, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 210, which the clerk will report.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I also indicate that we will be prepared to confirm two further judicial nominations by consent before we close business this evening. Therefore, there will be no further votes this evening, and the next vote will occur at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday in relation to the Bryan forestry amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the confirmation of Maryanne Trump Barry to the Third Circuit—and I predict that she will be confirmed—will bring to 15 the total number of federal judges considered by the Senate all year.

While I am appreciative of this opportunity to consider this nomination, I note that the Republican leadership has chosen to skip over the nominations of Marsha Berzon, Judge Richard Paez, and Ray Fisher to the Ninth Circuit. These nominations have all been on the Senate calender for as long or longer than that of Ms. Barry. The Republican leadership has, again, skipped over the nomination of Justice Ronnie White for the federal court in Missouri, as well.

All of these nominations could and should have been considered before the August recess. Indeed the nominations of Judge Paez and Justice White, should have been considered when they were first reported last year.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry to the United States Court of Appeals of the Third Circuit.

I commend Senator HATCH for moving forward with this nomination. We must ensure that the federal bench is at full strength so that our citizens will receive justice promptly and fairly. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee deserves thanks from all who believe that our court system is at the core of our precious democratic structure.

Judge Barry's reputation is well known and she has excellent credentials. In 1983, she was nominated to a federal district court judgeship by President Reagan, and since being confirmed for that post she has compiled an impressive record and become a nationally recognized expert on a wide range of criminal and civil law matters.

Her knowledge of criminal law led Chief Justice Rehnquist to appoint her to chair the Committee on Criminal Law of the Judicial Conference of the United States, a position she held from 1993–1996. Additionally, the Federal Judicial Center asked her to make an instructional videotape called ''How to Try a Complex Criminal Case'' and that tape is played for all new district court judges at their orientation seminar.

In the area of civil law, Judge Barry has issued many important rulings including a decision that Blue Cross was required to pay for a bone marrow transplant for a terminally ill young girl who would have died without the procedure.

New Jersey residents are particularly proud of her decision holding New York City responsible and in contempt for failing to obey a court order designed to prevent garbage and medical waste from New York's Fresh Kills Landfill from drifting onto New Jersey's shore. Not only do her judicial colleagues hold her in high regard, Judge Barry is also well-respected by the many attorneys who have appeared before her. They praise her command of the law, her professional demeanor, and her razor-sharp wit.

As a result of her tenure in the U.S. attorney's office, her 16 years of outstanding service at the district court level, and her legal expertise, Judge Barry is well-prepared for elevation to the circuit court. In fact, she has already sat on the Court of Appeals—by designation—and has written several opinions.

Mr. President, I highly recommend Judge Barry for elevation to the third circuit. As some of my colleagues may know, the third circuit is currently facing a judicial emergency, and the appointment of Judge Barry will help.

To further address this crisis, I hope that the Judiciary Committee will soon take up the nomination of another excellent candidate for the third circuit, Judge Julio Fuentes. I would also be remiss if I did not point out that the elevation of Judge Barry will create another vacancy on the District Court of New Jersey, and so it would be essential that the committee move forward with the nomination of Faith Hochberg to that court.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Judge Maryanne Trump Barry's confirmation to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have followed Judge Barry's nomination closely as it has moved through the confirmation process. During this time, I have been impressed by her candor, intelligence, and qualifications for the position. She has moved through the process quickly, and I believe the overwhelming support for her nomination is evidence of her ability to ultimately fulfill the obligations of serving on the Third Circuit.

Those who know Judge Barry, and have had the pleasure of working with her, have spoken openly of her integrity and thorough knowledge of the law. Some have highlighted her decency, while others have focused upon her razor-sharp wit. However, everyone has agreed on one point—Judge Barry has developed a reputation as a skilled jurist with a judgment and temperament that are highly respected by her peers. The other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee agreed with this assessment, and I was pleased that Judge Barry's nomination was passed out of the Committee by voice-vote on July 29th.

For those who are unfamiliar with Judge Barry's distinguished career, she has graduated with Master's and law degrees from Columbia and Hofstra Universities respectively. Judge Barry first worked for the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey and quickly rose through the ranks. She served as Chief of the Appeals Division, and then as a first assistant to the U.S. Attorney. At the time, Judge Barry was the highest-ranking female prosecutor in any major U.S. Attorney's Office in the country.

In 1983, Judge Barry was appointed to the U.S. District Court by President Reagan. For almost 16 years, she has served as a pragmatic and vocal presence on the bench in Newark, New Jersey. As a former President of the Association of the Federal Bar of the State of New Jersey, Judge Barry has had a tremendous impact on policy across the State. She currently serves on its advisory board, and continues to be highly regarded for her insights and opinions. Judge Barry has consistently impressed me as an extraordinary woman, and one who will continue to distinguish herself. I urge my colleagues to support her confirmation to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

The Senator from Washington.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, with respect to the Interior appropriations bill, there will be a vote on or in relation to the Bryan amendment and the second-degree Wyden amendment tomorrow morning at 10:30.

It may well be that that will be the last contested matter in connection with this appropriations bill other than the disposition of the Hutchison amendment. I am not entirely certain of that at this point. But we are close to having agreed-upon managers' amendments both with respect to legislative matters and with respect to money matters, with the exception of the motion to reconsider the invocation of cloture.

For that reason, this is a notice and a request to Members that if they have other matters they wish debated, or if they have other matters they wish brought to the managers' attention, they should do so very promptly. We will not in the managers' amendment dispose of all the amendments which were reserved, but I think we probably will be able to take care of all of those that look as if they would be otherwise brought up and voted on.

We are tantalizingly close to finishing. But, of course, we will not finish or go to third reading under the present circumstances at least until after disposition of the motion to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture, and that motion will certainly pass, and there will be at least one more vote on cloture itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, thank you very much.

I would just like to comment upon the vote the Senate has just taken on whether to shut down debate on the Hutchison amendment. I thank very much those colleagues who voted against that cloture motion. I think it is very important that the light and the truth be shone upon this matter. I think the way to do it is to have more discussion.

I just want to say to the Senate that when I made my 2½-minute presentation, it is always very difficult to say everything in your heart in 2½ minutes. But I said the reason I am doing this—there is no other reason in the world for me to be delaying a vote on an amendment—is that I love the Senate too much to see it be a party to such a scheme by just 5 percent of the oil companies to essentially rob this Treasury of millions and millions of dollars.

This is the fourth time that Senator Hutchison has attempted to pass this rider. It never had a Senate vote before. This is the first vote in any way about the Hutchison amendment.

By the way, I know that some people who voted aye on the cloture motion will vote with me on the substance. I am looking forward to that.

But the bottom line is, when we look at this closely, we see a number of things—that most of the oil companies are doing the right thing on their royalty payments. Ninety-five percent of

them are doing the right thing. They pay the appropriate royalty when they drill on Federal lands, onshore or offshore, and they send that check over to the taxpayers. You know where the funds go—right into the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Historic Preservation Fund to be used for environmental purposes for the upkeep of our parks and for the upkeep of our historical monuments. We all know from both sides of the aisle that we need to do more for our parks and open space.

As a matter of fact, there are bipartisan proposals to pass legislation to do that. Yet at the same time, too many people seem willing to shut their eyes to a raid on the Treasury that would lower the revenues to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

You have to ask yourself why the oil companies are so interested in this. I think the answer is in the Record. There have been several whistleblowers who have come forward who have stated in the most eloquent of terms that when they were working for the oil companies, the companies purposely undervalued the oil so that they could pay fewer dollars of royalty payments.

As USA Today says, what if we all woke up one day and said: You know, I don't think I am paying a fair amount of rent. Forget about the contract I signed with my landlord. I am just going to cut it back.

It wouldn't be too long before that tenant was out on the street, and rightly so. If he or she signed an agreement, they have to pay it.

What if one of us decided not to pay our mortgage and just say, let's take 10 or 20 percent off the top? The answer is, if we did that on a continual basis, the banker would take over our home, and rightly so, because we signed an agreement.

The oil companies have signed an agreement. They have signed an agreement with the Federal Government, and 95 percent of them are doing the right thing, but 5 percent of them are not.

The Interior Department wants to make sure that those 5 percent do the right thing by clarifying the rules that govern these royalty payments. The Hutchison amendment would stop the Interior Department in its tracks from trying to collect the fair royalties.

I have used another analogy in this debate before. If somebody came running through the Senate Chamber with a big sack of money that he had just stolen from the Treasury, every one of us on both sides of the aisle would stop that individual. Frankly, this is no different.

How do I know that?

The whistleblowers have told us so under penalty of perjury that they sat around and said: Let's undervalue this oil and ''wait for the day of judgment.'' That is what one of the whistleblowers actually said.

How else do we know there is cheating going on?

Look at all the settlements that the oil companies are agreeing to with the various States all throughout our country on this matter. They don't want to go to court. They are afraid they are going to lose because the whistleblowers will get out there—because the facts are there. So they are settling for millions of dollars.

Ironically, Mr. President, I think I even sent it to your office on Friday, two more big oil companies are settling this week for over $100 million rather than take their weak case to the court.

We know that the posted prices they are paying their royalty on are just made up and they are far less than the market price.

All Interior wants to do is fix the situation.

You will hear the argument: It is a bureaucracy run amok. Let me say this: You could say that about anything. But the facts belie that statement because the Interior Department has held many meetings. By the way, they have opened up their rule for further comment.

All I want to say to my colleagues by way of thanking them for this is that because of your standing with me against this cloture amendment, it means we are going to continue to have the American people focus in on this scam. When they do, they are going to want to know who stood with them or who stood with the vertically integrated oil companies that had been getting away with this robbery.

That is all I want. I don't gain anything out of this. There are lots of oil companies in my State. They are not thrilled. This is not something I do to be popular. But if in your heart you know you are right, and if in your heart you don't want to see the Senate associated with this kind of scam, then you have to stand up and be counted. Many of my colleagues, including Senator DURBIN, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator WELLSTONE, and Senator MURRAY, stood with me and entered statements in the RECORD or stood by my side on the floor of the Senate.

I say to my friend, Senator HUTCHISON, she was the one who wanted a vote on Monday originally. The vote was supposed to be held on Tuesday. I did not object to an earlier vote. A lot of people came back for the vote. Therefore, of course, I insisted we have a vote. We are going to have another vote. This could be from my perspective a very short-lived victory. It is true, they could come up with the 60 votes. But I feel good tonight. We have courage on this floor. This was not an easy vote.

Senator FEINGOLD has taken to the floor. He has shown the biggest contributions have come from oil companies. I understand the power of that. I understand that. It is hard to stand up when these 5 percent—and they are the big ones, the billion-dollar companies—call you on the phone and say: Come on, this is just a procedural matter, stick with us.

What will we have in the end? More delay and a $66 million loss to the Treasury on top of the $88 million we have already lost from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I think if the American people will focus on this, they will thank those colleagues who stood with me today. They are all consumers. They all understand this.

There has been a lot of talk on the floor that oil companies are suffering. I was very strongly in support of helping the oil companies and the steel companies that were in trouble. I am the first one to say we need to give them help. But don't allow 5 percent to cheat the taxpayers. That is a different issue. The interesting thing about royalty payments is they go down when there is a depression in all prices.

Wouldn't it be nice if our rent went down if there was a depression or we lost our job? Wouldn't it be wonderful if our mortgage automatically went down if there was a recession? That is what happens with these royalty payments. They are very fair. They are based on the fair market value of the oil. There is no set price because we want to be fair to the oil companies.

It is a privilege to drill on the people's land. It is a privilege, whether it is offshore or onshore. If it is Federal land, the taxpayers, the American people own that land. We want to make sure we work in a cooperative spirit with those who would like to exploit our resources. Make sure, at the same time, that they are good corporate citizens. What stuns me about this debate is that 95 percent of them are and 5 percent of the oil companies are not.

All the Department of the Interior is saying is: Please, let us straighten this mess out with these 5 percent. It is a lot of money to the Treasury, money that is necessary to keep our parks up, preserve our remaining open space, invest in our historical monuments that this great Nation so cherishes. It is a shame to see these 5 percent of the oil companies—and this is the fourth time this rider is before the Senate—walking off with millions of dollars that belong to the American taxpayers.

Senator HUTCHISON says the Office of Management and Budget is wrong when they say it is a $66 million loss. The Interior Department says it is a $66 million loss. The CBO tells Senator HUTCHISON it is about $11 million. I say it doesn't matter if it is $11 million or $66 million. Maybe it is somewhere in between. It is the principle here of millions of dollars that belong to the taxpayers not winding up in the Land and Water Conservation Fund to take care of our natural resources.

Whether this is a victory for those who believe in fairness and justice and truth, if it is a victory that lasts 24 hours, so be it. To me it is an important point. We have made our point. This is not a trivial debate. This is not a trivial argument. As a matter of fact, I think the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAIG, was on the floor and said it is a baseless debate. It is far from baseless.

We see that tonight with this vote, however it winds up. This is a divided Senate.

Again, I thank the people who stood for fairness, who stood with the taxpayers, who stood with the environment, who stood with those who say you have to be a good corporate citizen. That is all we are saying. We expect our citizens to be good. Boy, if they don't pay their taxes, we are after them. And don't have the lawyers that the oil companies have on their side to drag out these arguments in court, month after month—ordinary citizens don't have that. If they don't pay their taxes, they have to explain why. If they don't pay their rent, they better explain why. If they don't pay their mortgage, they better tell the bank why.

We shouldn't have a double standard just because an oil company is powerful, just because an oil company can give millions of dollars of contributions, just because an oil company is influential. This day we stood up for the average person. I hope we do it again. For me, it was all worth it.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I think it is very clear that the Senate has seen through all of the rhetoric, through all of the hyperbole, and they have made the right decision on this amendment. I am very proud tonight that if everyone had been here we would have had 60 votes for cloture. As it is, we had 55 votes. The clear will of the Senate is to do the right thing on this issue—not to be led down a path, bringing up issues that are unrelated in order to make a point that isn't relevant to what we are talking about today.

The Senate voted, overwhelmingly, to come to closure and take control of the tax policy of this country. After all, if the Senate doesn't make the tax policy along with our colleagues in the House, are we going to let unelected bureaucrats make decisions that will affect our economy, the jobs of thousands of people, possibly sending them overseas for foreign jobs instead of American jobs? Our Senate colleagues tonight said the Senate of the United States is going to speak on oil and gas tax policy. We spoke very clearly that we want a 1-year moratorium. We hope MMS will do the right thing in giving a simple and fair tax that will be paid by the oil companies for the right to drill on public lands. That is the issue here.

There has been a lot said tonight. First of all, the quote was made from a USA Today article saying that this would be like a lessee saying: I'm not going to pay $500 a month for this apartment; I'm going to pay $400 a month even though I agreed to pay $500 a month.

Actually, it is just the opposite. The oil companies have a contract with the Federal Government. They have met all the criteria that the Federal Government has put down in order to drill on Federal lands. What the Senator from California has asked that we do is to allow the Mineral Management Service to raise the rent on the apartment in the middle of the month. They are breaking a contract and saying: We are going to raise your taxes right in the middle of the contract.

If we allow that to happen, who will be next? Who is the next person who is going to have a contract and have the price increased in the middle of the contract? Contract rights are part of the basis of the rule of law in this country, and we seem to be blithely going over it as if, ''It's a big oil company; we can run over them.'' That is not the rule of law. We should not be raising taxes in the middle of a contract. It is not right and I hope in the end the Senate will prevail and we will make the tax policy for this country.

No. 2, the Senator from California keeps saying only 5 percent of the oil companies are going to be affected by the MMS-proposed rule. In fact, every company that drills on public lands is affected by this ruling. I want to put in the RECORD the letter that was received on September 13, 1999, by the California Independent Petroleum Association.

Dear Senator HUTCHISON:

The California Independent Petroleum Association represents 450 independent oil and gas producers, royalty owners, and service companies operating in California. We want to set the record straight. The MMS oil royalty rulemaking affects all California producers on federal land. It is false to claim that this rulemaking only affects the top 5 percent of oil producers.

How are California independents affected? The proposed rulemaking allows the government to second guess a wellhead sale. If rejected, a California producer is subjected to an ANS index that adjusts to the wellhead set by the government. Using a government formula instead of actual proceeds results in a new tax being imposed on all producers of federal oil.

I ask unanimous consent the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION,
Sacramento, CA, September 13, 1999.

Hon. KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

CIPA SUPPORTS YOUR AMENDMENT TO EXTEND ROYALTY RULEMAKING AN ADDITIONAL YEAR

DEAR SENATOR HUTCHISON: The California Independent Petroleum Association (CIPA) represents 450 independent oil and gas producers, royalty owners and service companies operating in California CIPA wants to set the record straight. The MMS oil royalty rulemaking affects all California producers on federal land. It is false to claim that this rulemaking only affects the top 5% of all producers.

How are California independents affected? The proposed rulemaking allows the government to second guess a wellhead sale. If rejected, a California producer is subjected to an ANS index that adjusts to the wellhead set by the government. Using a government formula instead of actual proceeds results in a new tax imposed on all producers of federal oil.

It doesn't end, if a California producer chooses to move its oil downstream of the well, the rulemaking will reject many of the costs associated with these activities. Again, to reject costs results in a new tax being levied on the producer.

Senator Hutchison, California producers support your amendment to extend the oil royalty rulemaking an additional year. We offer our support not on behalf of the largest producers in the world but instead on behalf of independent producers in the state of California. Your amendment will provide the needed impetus to craft a rule that truly does affect the small producer and creates a new rulemaking framework that is fair and equitable for all parties.

Again, thank you for offering this amendment. We cannot allow the government to unilaterally assess an additional tax on independent producers. After record low oil prices. California producers are barely beginning to travel down a lengthy road to recovery. To assess a new tax at this time could have a devastating effect on federal production and the amount of royalties paid to the government.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. KRAMER,
Executive Director.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD the very people who are affected are from the home State of the Senator from California, the small producers, the independents who do not have the luxury of big margins. They are very much affected and very concerned about this rule and what it would do to somebody who has a contract, who says: Pull your truck up and I will sell you 1000 barrels of oil. Here is the price, $12 a barrel.

And the Government says: No, we will not accept the $12 a barrel, even though they are picking it up right there.

That is exactly what the MMS rule does. So every independent is affected and it is the independents who are having to lay people off in this industry because the oil prices have been so low over the last year that they have not been able to stay in business.

Do you know what happens when somebody shuts down? Every family that is dependent on employment from that small producer no longer has a job, and they may live in a place where it is not easy to find another job. The big oil companies just chose to move overseas where they know what the regulatory environment is. They know it is stable. They do not want to create foreign jobs, but that is what they are forced to do because it is so hard to do business in the United States and especially when an unelected bureaucracy is able to change the taxes in the middle of a contract. That is just not the American way.

I am very proud the people of the Senate spoke clearly tonight, very clearly; 55 Members of the Senate voted to make the tax policy in this country.

Congress did hope we could simplify oil royalty rates. We asked the Mineral Management Service to come forward with a simplified system so everyone would know exactly what the price

would be to drill on Federal lands. Simply, they have failed so far in the proposed rule.

This is the diagram of what will happen if this rule goes into effect against the wishes of Congress that we simplify it so oil companies will know what they owe without question. By the time you go through all of this, how could anyone know for sure what they owed?

Furthermore, the MMS will not allow the ruling for one company on oil royalty rates and the basis for those rates to apply to any other person who is drilling, unlike the IRS, which will give you a ruling letter so you will know this is the precedent, this is the way the IRS will treat this particular fact situation so anyone else with the same fact situation can rely on the precedent and can give IRS that ruling document and know they will be treated the same. That is not the case. The MMS refuses to be bound by the precedents they set themselves, even if the facts happen to be the same. That is not sound policy. That is not fair treatment for the taxpayers and the people doing business and creating jobs in our country.

The Senate has clearly spoken. The question is, Will the Senator from California let the majority rule? Will the Senator from California say 55 Members on both sides of the aisle have voted for Congress to set tax policy and to require the oil companies to pay a fair price for drilling on public lands? That is the question.

The Senate has voted 55, with 5 Members missing—according to the votes that have been taken it will be 60 votes if everyone is here and voting. So we have the vast majority to invoke cloture, and the question is, Will the Senator from California do the honorable thing? She said earlier in this debate she wanted fair treatment of this amendment. Fair treatment means an up-or-down vote on the amendment. So the question is, in the face of the overwhelming majority of the Senate who want to do the right thing, who want fair taxation of our oil and gas industry, will she let the majority rule? She said, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 9:

> Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee for being so gracious in preserving my rights. My friend from Texas and I feel equally strongly on the point, just on different sides. I think each of us wants to have justice done on the amendment.

If the Senator from California will stick with her commitment that we would have justice done on the amendment, she will allow the majority to rule. The majority has heard the debate on this issue; they have seen through the rhetoric; they have seen that lawsuits are not a part of making a fair rule. They have seen it is the responsibility of Congress to set policy because we do have accountability. We are accountable to the people.

So if the Senator from California means to do justice by the amendment, as she stated on September 9 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, she will let us have an up-and-down vote on this amendment and let the majority rule in the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SITUATION IN EAST TIMOR

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues, I was pleased yesterday when President B.J. Habibie of Indonesia agreed to work with the United Nations to allow international peacekeepers to restore peace and stability to East Timor. The reprehensible wave of violence that engulfed East Timor in the week following the announcement of the August 30 referendum was inexcusable, and demands the harshest condemnation by the international community.

But, more importantly, the international community must now work to bring an immediate end to the violence in East Timor, protect refugees, safeguard humanitarian aid for displaced persons, and work with Indonesian troops already in East Timor to see to it that they fulfill their mission of protecting the East Timorese.

On August 30, close to 98 percent of the eligible voters of East Timor went to the polls for the United Nations sponsored vote on East Timor's autonomy. This vote was in keeping with the May 5 agreements between Indonesia, Portugal, and the United Nations regarding the future of East Timor.

On September 4, the Secretary General of the United Nations announced the outcome of the August 30 vote, and the results show that the people of East Timor have spoken with a clear voice: 78.5 percent rejected autonomy in favor of complete independence from Indonesia.

Under the May 5 agreements, if East Timor opted for independence, the Government of Indonesia committed itself to a process of peaceful and constitutional change, in which the United Nations would oversee the transition to independence for East Timor.

Unfortunately, following the Secretary General's announcement of the clear, overwhelming, and freely-expressed choice of the East Timor people, anti-independence militias, backed by the Indonesian military and police, began a systematic and organized campaign of terror, violence and intimidation in an effort to overturn the will of the people of East Timor.

The criminal action undertaken by the militias and their backers in the Indonesian military are reprehensible: mass looting, arson, systematic destruction of infrastructure, and most disturbing of all, murder.

According to the United Nations, hundreds, and possibly thousands, have been killed and more than 200,000 people have been forced to flee their homes. There are also reports of mass killings and a systematic campaign of political assassination.

The May 5 Agreements between the Governments of Indonesia and Portugal and the United Nations mandated the popular vote on the offer of autonomy and clearly delegated responsibility for peace and security before, during and after the ballot process to the Government of Indonesia. And the Government of Indonesia freely agreed to take on that responsibility.

Yet, in the face of widespread violence, the Indonesian army and police forces have stood aside and, worse, assisted the anti-independence militias. I, like many of my colleagues, was startled by the Government of Indonesia's unwillingness or inability to control its own military forces and police in East Timor.

Now that the Government of Indonesia has agreed to work with the United Nations to restore peace to East Timor, there is much work to be done.

First, I am heartened by the willingness of the Australian government to lead peacekeeping efforts to restore peace in security to East Timor, by the willingness of the states of ASEAN to participate in this peacekeeping mission, and by the efforts of the United Nations Security Council to engage the Government of Indonesia to address these issues. The United States, along with our partners in the United Nations and the international community, must be responsive to these efforts and provide appropriate assistance.

Second, I believe that it is essential that the international community condemns the acts of violence that have occurred in East Timor in the past week—as it has in Bosnia, Kosovo, Rwanda, and elsewhere—and urge a complete investigation into any criminal acts with those responsible being brought to justice.

Third, now that the Government of Indonesia has agreed to allow international peacekeepers into East Timor, I am hopeful that it will continue to work with the United Nations to implement the August 30th vote and safeguard East Timor's transition to independence. The United States and the international community must remain engaged and involved with this transition, and strongly encourage the Government of Indonesia to make those changes that the people of East Timor in the August 30 referendum overwhelmingly supported.

Lastly, I believe that President Clinton's decision to review U.S. international financial and military assistance to Indonesia in the context of the violence in East Timor was wholly appropriate, and that Jakarta must understand that as much as we value our relations with the people of Indonesia, future U.S. assistance will depend on

their continued cooperation with the international community in resolving this deplorable situation.

Mr. President, the people of East Timor have made their feelings clear. They want a peaceful transition to independence. The Government of Indonesia has made a commitment that they would grant the people of East Timor independence and oversee a peaceful transition. As the Government of Indonesia has belatedly recognized, it must live up to its commitments. The international community can play a crucial role in providing support and helping guarantee the security of the people of East Timor in this transition to independence. We must not let them down.

EFFECTIVE EXPORT CONTROLS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as Ranking Member of the Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, I wish to call attention to an important briefing given to Senate staff just prior to the August recess by Administration officials from the U.S. Customs Service and the U.S. Census Bureau on the new Automated Export System (AES).

The AES is a joint venture between the U.S. Customs Service and the Foreign Trade Division of the U.S. Census Bureau. AES provides for the electronic filing of the Shipper's Export Declaration (SED) and electronic filing of the outbound manifest. AES is an information gateway designed to ensure compliance with and enforcement of laws relating to exporting. It will improve the collection of trade statistics and improve customer service. Its goal is a paperless reporting of export information by the year 2002.

I believe the AES will become the centerpiece of efforts to improve the effectiveness of the United States' export control program.

Last June Senator THOMPSON, Chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, held very important hearings on the findings and recommendations of reports issued by the Inspectors General from six U.S. agencies involved in the export control process: namely, the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Energy, State, Treasury (U.S. Customs), and the Central Intelligence Agency. One of the critical recommendations made by several of the Inspectors General was that licensing officials should perform ''cumulative effect analysis'' of proposed export transactions. The primary tool for this analysis will be information gathered in the AES.

Furthermore, the recent report from the Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, chaired by former CIA Director John Deutch, entitled ''Combating Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction,'' also highlighted the AES program as a central tool for improving the overall performance of our export control program. The Deutch Report observed that the AES could be used as a tool to identify trends in shipments of otherwise nonstrategic items that might be used by rogue nations pursuing the development of weapons of mass destruction.

Based upon the Deutch Commission's recommendation, Senator SPECTER introduced a bill, S. 1372, entitled ''Proliferation Prevention Enhancement Act of 1999.'' This bill mandates that U.S. companies electronically files Shipper's Export Declarations (SEDs) through AES for exports of items that are on the U.S. Munitions List of the Commerce Control List. I commend my colleague for his efforts to improve the overall effectiveness of our export control program which is so essential to preserving our nation's security. I am a cosponsor of this legislation and urge its support. Our continued oversight of exports of dual-use and munitions list items will help ensure that exports do not go awry to rogue nations or individuals.

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 a treaty and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 56

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 Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein during the calendar year 1998. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 79–264; 22 U.S.C. 287b).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 13, 1999.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:54 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should not have granted clemency to terrorists.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2684. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2587) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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–5111. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Radioactive Contamination Control Guide'' (DOE G 441.1–9), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5112. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to conditional pesticide registrations for 1997 and 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5113. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar years 1996, 1997, and 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–5114. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to personal property furnished to non-Federal recipients; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–5115. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on direct spending or receipts legislation dated August 17, 1999; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–5116. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers'', received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5117. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Listing of Color Additives for Coloring Bone Cement; FD&C Blue No. 2-Aluminum Lake on Alumina'', received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5118. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers'', received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5119. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Application Period for Temporary Housing Assistance; 64 CFR 46852; 08/27/99'' (RIN3067–AC82), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5120. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the adequacy of the nation's marine transportation system; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5121. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Public Financing of Presidential Primary and General Election Campaigns'', received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–5122. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Chemical Weapons Convention, Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations; States Parties; Licensing Policy Clarification'' (RIN0694–AB67), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5123. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Transfers of Capital from Banks to Associations'' (RIN3052–AB80), received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5124. A communication from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Stamp Program: Food Stamp Provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997'' (RIN0584–AC63), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5125. A communication from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule: 1998-Crop Peanuts, National Poundage Quota, National Average Price Support Level for Quota and Additional Peanuts, and Minimum Commodity Credit Corporation Export Edible Sales Price for Additional Peanuts'' (RIN0560–AF81), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5126. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''High-Temperature Forced-Air Treatments for Citrus'' (Docket No. 96–069–4), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5127. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area'' (Docket No. 98–083–6), received September 2, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5128. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Milk in the Southwest Plains Marketing Area—Suspension'' (DA–99–06), received September 2, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5129. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Increased Assessment Rate'' (FV99–948–1 FR), received September 2, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5130. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Fiscal Period Change'' (FV99–955–1 IFR), received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5131. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Changes to Pack Requirements'' (FV99–906–3 IFR), received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–348. A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Latimer County, Oklahoma relative to the English language; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title.

S. 566. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to exempt agricultural commodities, livestock, and value-added products from unilateral economic sanctions, to prepare for future bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations affecting United States agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–157).

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 Mr. McCAIN:

S. 1577. A bill to assure timely, rational, and complete Federal Communications Commission resolution of all pending proceedings reexamining the current radio and television broadcast stations ownership rules; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 1578. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ferroniobium; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 1579. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to the provision of counseling and treatment for sexual trauma experienced by veterans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 1580. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to assist agricultural producers in managing risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 182. A resolution designating October, 1999, as ''National Stamp Collecting Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 1577. A bill to assure timely, rational, and complete Federal Communications Commission resolution of all pending proceedings reexamining the current radio and television broadcast stations ownership rules; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

BROADCAST OWNERSHIP REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will make federal radio and television ownership rules Y2K compatible.

When Congress passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996 almost four years ago, we recognized that the forty-year-old rules restricting broadcast station ownership were badly outdated and in need of change. They reflected a mass media industry made up of radio stations, TV stations, and newspapers—and that's all. None of the dominant new multichannel media like cable TV, satellite TV, or the Internet figured in, because they didn't exist.

But they exist now, and they have transformed the way Americans get their news, information, and entertainment. As more and more people turn to cable channels and the Internet as their preferred means of electronic

communications, the audience and revenues of the big TV networks have plummeted, and the number and circulation of daily newspapers have spiraled downward.

The days when Huntley, Brinkley and Cronkite on the air, and the *Times*, the *Post*, and the *Tribune* at the breakfast table dominated our perspectives on the issues are forever gone. In their place are CNN, CNBC, MSNBC, and the innumerable web sites available on the Internet.

Even more important, Americans today are no longer just passive recipients of the news and views doled out by a handful of powerful TV networks and daily newspapers. Today, thanks to the Internet, anyone on line can pose questions and exchange perspectives with anyone else on line.

In other words, the days when network news and big-city newspaper editors were the dominant opinionmakers are long over. But the restrictive ownership rules that were a product of that time aren't over. Like so many federal regulations, they live on, despite the fact that they're as out-of-date as Alice Kramden's ice box.

The proliferation of alternative sources of electronic news, information and entertainment hasn't just made the old ownership rules useless—it's actually made them harmful. Faced with daunting competition from these new media, broadcasters, and especially newspaper owners, must have the opportunity to realize the increased operating economy and efficiency that liberalized ownership rules make possible. If we do not allow this to happen, we place the future of these older media in even greater doubt in today's hypercompetitive market.

Congress recognized all this when it directed the FCC to review all its broadcast ownership rules every two years. Although the Commission recently overhauled some of these rules, it left two others intact—the national network ownership limit and the ban on owning a daily newspaper and a broadcast station in the same market.

That's not consistent with what Congress told the Commission to do, and it isn't fair. We told the Commission to reexamine all the rules precisely because all the rules, not just some of the rules, have been rendered counterproductive by the changes that have taken place in the electronic mass media marketplace. In fact, the rule that's arguably the most hopelessly anachronistic is the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership ban—yet the FCC shows no sign of budging on it.

Mr. President, this bill corrects this situation. With respect to the national TV ownership limits, it follows the approach Congress used in the 1996 Telecommunications Act by raising the national audience reach limitation from 35 to 50 percent, and allows the FCC to raise it further if the public interest warrants it. It eliminates the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership ban, but would allow the FCC to reimpose it if the Commission can do so by January 1, based on the extensive record that has been pending before them for over three years.

Mr. President, there are lots of policy cobwebs that have kept these rules in place despite the permanent and unmistakable changes the electronic media market has undergone. Some of them spring from the notion that broadcasting, as a free rider on the public's multibillion-dollar spectrum, can and should be subject to regulation over and above that of other media. Others are stubbornly ingrained notions of how powerful the TV networks and newspapers are. Still others—the least worthy—are scars left over from what particular newspapers have had to say on their editorial pages.

Nobody is less sympathetic than I am to the fact that broadcasters, unlike other users of the public's spectrum, pay nothing for the privilege. But subjecting them to anachronistic, even counterproductive, rules isn't a substitute for lost spectrum revenues. And remembrances of things past, whether they be the long-gone days of network TV hegemony or old stories in the local newspaper, are no way to deal with the problems of the present.

Uncle Miltie TV ownership rules don't work in a Chris rock media market. Let's face that fact, shed our outdated notions, and finish the job the FCC didn't

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. 1577

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 ''Broadcast Ownership Reform Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The contemporary electronic mass media market provides consumers with abundant alternative sources of news, information and entertainment, including radio and television broadcast stations, cable television systems, and the Internet.

(2) Due to the advent of digital technology, these alternative sources of electronic news, information and entertainment are converging as well as proliferating.

(3) The simultaneous proliferation and convergence of electronic mass media renders technology-specific regulation obsolete.

(4) The public interest demands that the Federal Communications Commission reexamine its technology-specific regulation of electronic mass media to assure that it retains its relevance in the face of the proliferation and convergence of electronic mass media.

(5) Section 202(h) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 recognized that there is a particular public interest need for the Federal Communications Commission to periodically and comprehensively reexamine its radio and television broadcast ownership rules, which predate the proliferation and convergence of alternative competing electronic sources of news, information and entertainment.

(6) Although the Commission has reexamined and revised its broadcast duopoly and one-to-a-market ownership rules, it has not completed long-pending reexaminations of its national television station ownership restrictions or the newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership prohibition.

(7) The Commission's failure to simultaneously resolve all its pending broadcast cross-ownership rules fails to recognize, as Congress did in enacting section 202(h), that the proliferation and convergence of alternative electronic media implicates the bases of the national television ownership rules and the newspaper broadcast cross-ownership rules no less than the bases of the local radio and television station ownership rules.

(8) The Commission's failure to simultaneously resolve all its broadcast cross-ownership rules will affect all potential buyers and sellers of radio and television stations in the interim, because the current restrictions will prevent networks and newspaper publishers from engaging in station transactions to the extent they otherwise might.

(9) The Commission's failure to simultaneously resolve its pending proceedings on the national television ownership and newspaper/broadcast crossownership restrictions is arbitrary and capricious, because it treats similarly-situated entities—those bound by ownership rules that predate the advent of increased competition from alternative electronic media—differently, without any consideration of, or reasoned analysis for, this disparate treatment.

(10) The increase in the national television audience reach limitation to 35 percent mandated by section 202(c)(1)(B) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 was not established as the maximum percentage compatible with the public interest. On the contrary, section 202(h) of that Act expressly directs the Commission to review biennially whether any of its broadcast ownership rules, including those adopted pursuant to section 202 of the Act, are necessary in the public interest as a result of competition.

(11) The 35-percent national television audience reach limitation is unduly restrictive in light of competition.

(12) The newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership restriction in unduly restrictive in light of competition.

(13) The Commission's failure to resolve its pending proceedings on the national television ownership and newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership restrictions simultaneously with its resolution of the proceedings on the duopoly and one-to-a-market rules does not serve the public interest.

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN NATIONAL TELEVISION AUDIENCE REACH LIMITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Communications Commission shall modify its rules for multiple ownership set forth in section 73.3555(e) of its regulations (47 C.F.R. 73.3555(e) by increasing the national audience reach limitation for television stations to 50 percent.

(b) FURTHER INCREASE.—The Commission may modify those rules to increase the limitation to a greater percentage than the 50 percent required by subsection (a) if it determines that the increase is in the public interest.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF NEWSPAPER/BROADCAST CROSS-OWNERSHIP RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule under section 73.3555(d) of the Federal Communication Commission's regulations (47 C.F.R. 73.3555(d)) shall cease to be in effect after December 31, 1999, unless it is reinstated by the Commission under subsection (b) before January 1, 2000.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 1579. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to the provision of counseling and treatment for sexual trauma experienced by veterans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

VETERANS SEXUAL TRAUMA TREATMENT ACT

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Veterans Sexual Trauma Treatment Act, legislation authorizing a program within the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) which will offer counseling and medical treatment to veterans who suffered from sexual abuse while serving in the armed forces.

I have nothing but the utmost respect for those who have served or are currently serving their country in uniform. Countless men and women, and their families, have served this country with courage, honor and distinction. Today, as they have throughout this proud nation's history, they stand ready to answer the call to duty, and they deserve, at the very least, to serve free from the threat of sexual abuse and harassment. And yet, an estimated 35 percent of all female veterans report at least one incident of sexual harassment during their military service. That it why I am introducing this legislation today.

The Veterans Sexual Trauma Treatment Act, which is similar to legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative GUTIERREZ, will enable former military personnel who were subjected to sexual harassment or abuse while in the military to receive proper medical and psychological care. The legislation does so by extending and improving the VA's abuse counseling initiatives.

The bill makes permanent a program to require the VA to provide counseling to veterans to overcome psychological trauma resulting from a physical assault or battery of a sexual nature, or from sexual harassment, which occurred during active military service. Under current law the program authorizing such counseling expires in 2001.

The bill authorizes the program to include appropriate treatment, and requires a VA mental health professional to determine when such counseling and treatment is necessary. Currently, the VA Secretary makes this determination.

The bill also calls for the dissemination of information concerning the availability of counseling services to veterans, through public service and other announcements. It also calls for a report on joint DOD/VA efforts to ensure that military personnel are informed upon their separation from service about available sexual trauma counseling and treatment programs.

Most importantly, the bill eases restrictions under the existing program. I find it very troubling, for example, that women with fewer than two years of service are not eligible for counseling, even if they separated from the military due specifically to incidents of harassment or abuse.

According to the DOD, over 5 percent of female active duty personnel have been sexually assaulted while in the service. And a recent survey conducted for the Pentagon found that between 1988 and 1995, the percentage of active duty women who reported that they had received uninvited or unwanted sexual attention stood at 55 percent, while the percentage for men stands at 14 percent.

The survey also reported that 78 percent of female respondents said they had experienced one or more specific types of unwanted behaviors from a range of specified inappropriate behaviors.

Eighty eight percent of females said the harassment occurred on a base; 74 percent said the harassment occurred at work; 77 percent said it occurred during duty hours; 44 percent said that military coworkers of equal rank were the perpetrators; and 43 percent said the perpetrator was of a higher rank.

These findings are very disturbing. The data illustrates just how widespread this problem is, and indicates the need for a program to treat victims upon separation from active duty service. I credit the DOD with working to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment in the military. However, as long as there is harassment and abuse in the military, it is vital that victims have access to counseling while on active duty and after separation from the service as well.

We expect active duty servicemen and women to make extraordinary sacrifices to safeguard the democracy we cherish. We should not expect them to accept abuse and harassment while they serve.

The legislation I am introducing today is aimed specifically at ensuring that veterans have access to abuse counseling after they leave the military. It has the backing of the VFW, Vietnam Veterans of America, the American Legion, and AMVETS.

I urge my colleagues to join me in a strong show of support for this legislation.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 1580. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to assist agricultural producers in managing risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

RISK MANAGEMENT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce on behalf of myself, Senator KERREY of Nebraska, and a bipartisan group of 17 of our colleagues—including a majority of the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the ''Risk Management for the 21st Century Act.''

This legislation represents a significant step in improving the risk management tools available to producers throughout the United States.

In early March, Senator KERREY and I joined to introduce S. 529, the ''Crop Insurance for the 21st Century Act.'' At the time, we stated that we did not necessarily believe it was ''the bill,'' but that we hoped it would serve as the starting point for a discussion that would lead to the introduction of a comprehensive piece of legislation to improve the risk management tools available to producers throughout the U.S. and which could be supported by a majority of our colleagues.

I believe this is that bill. Going back to last fall and through this spring and summer, we have been involved in literally hundreds of hours of discussions with producers, commodity and farm organizations, insuranceproviders, insurance agents, and Members of the House and Senate regarding what needs to be done to improve the risk management tools available to our farmers and ranchers.

The bill we introduce today is the product of these many discussions.

This bill includes many of the provisions included in the original Roberts/Kerrey legislation, but it also includes many new provisions recommended during our discussions with Members and agricultural organizations. These include:

An inverted subsidy structure.

An equal level of subsidy for revenue insurance products.

APH adjustments for producers suffering multiple years of crop losses.

APH adjustments for new and beginning farmers, those farming new land, and those rotating crops.

Instructions to undertake alternative rating methodologies for low risk producers and regions and crops with low participation percentages and to then implement this new rating system. This at the request of many of our southern colleagues.

Changes in prevented planting and incentives to encourage producers to take additional risk management measures. Similar to car insurance, if you take drivers education classes you get an additional discount on your premium. Under our legislation, producers who take additional risk management steps will also receive a bonus discount on their premiums.

Authority for several pilot programs, placing special emphasis on polices to explore coverage for livestock and to expand the quality and levels of coverage available to specialty crops.

Mr. President, in addition to the many changes mentioned above, our legislation also provides for major changes in the Risk Management Agency (RMA) and the regulatory process governing the crop insurance program.

We change the members of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's Board of Directors to include:

Four Farmers from geographic regions to be determined by the Secretary.

One member active in the crop insurance industry.

One member with reinsurance expertise.

The Undersecretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, the Undersecretary for Rural Development, and the USDA Chief Economist.

Make the FCIC the overseer of RMA.

Create an Office of Private Sector Partnership to serve as a liaison between private sector companies and the FCIC Board of Directors.

Allow companies to charge minimal fees to other companies selling their products, in order to allow the recovery of research and development costs.

Mr. President, our legislation also focuses on several areas that I want to place special emphasis on because they are areas that I know are of interest to many of my colleagues and which some often think those of us in the Midwest and Plains States tend to ignore.

The first deals with program compliance. We have heard complaints from some of our colleagues and specific commodity groups that fraud exists in several areas of the country. Let me make clear, Senator KERREY and I oppose any attempts to defraud the crop insurance program.

To prevent this fraud, the legislation calls for penalties of up to $10,000 for producers, agents, loss adjusters, and approved insurance providers that attempt to defraud the program. It also allows for USDA to remove producers from eligibility for all USDA programs if they have defrauded the program. Furthermore, agents, loss adjusters, and approved companies that do business in the program could be banned from participation for up to five years if they have committed fraud.

Mr. President, these provisions are strong and they are clear—those who attempt to defraud the program and taxpayers will be punished.

Mr. President, another concern that Senator KERREY and I have heard repeatedly is the lack of emphasis and prioritization for specialty crops and development of new crop insurance and risk management tools for these crops. We have included many provisions in our legislation to address these concerns.

These specialty crop provisions include:

Changes in the Noninsured Assistance Program that we believe will make it easier to obtain assistance and funding through changes in which commodities can be covered and by allowing payments in some instances irregardless of an area trigger occurring.

Several pilot projects geared specifically towards looking at the feasibility of Gross Revenue and Whole Farm Revenue polices that include coverage for specialty crops.

Requiring the newly created Office of Private Sector Partnership to include staff with specialty crop expertise.

Allow RMA to spend up to $20 million per year to create partnerships with Land Grant Universities, the Agricultural Research Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and other qualified entities to develop and implement new specialty crop risk management options.

Requires 50 percent of RMA's research and development funds to go to specialty crop products development. Additionally, 50 percent of these R&D funds must be contracted out to organizations and entities outside RMA.

Reaffirms the authority of the Specialty Crops Coordinator in RMA. The bill also allows the Specialty Crops Coordinator to make competitive grants for research and development of new products in the specialty crops area.

Contains provisions regarding sales closing dates and the issuance of new polices.

Orders the Specialty Crops coordinator and the FCIC to study the feasibility of offering cost-of production, Adjusted Gross Income (AGI), quality-based policies, and an intermediate coverage level (higher than current CAT coverage) for specialty crops.

Requires the Board to annually review and certify that speciality crops are adequately covered. If insufficient coverage is available for a commodity, the Board can require RMA to undertake R&D activities.

Provides mechanisms whereby the Secretary must take steps to improve participation in the program when total participation for a crop in an individual state falls below 75 percent of the national participation average.

Mr. President, these changes for specialty crops are significant and we believe they give important attention to a group of producers that has often felt neglected in U.S. agricultural policy. I hope that our colleagues will agree and that they will join us in supporting this legislation.

Mr. President, let me also state that I realize some will argue that specific provisions should have been included in this legislation that currently are not. I understand these concerns, but as we developed this bill, we had to determine the priorities of each agricultural region and commodity groups. There is something from this bill that all of us would like to see included, including Senator KERREY and myself, but as a whole it is I believe the best package available.

I also realize that some in this body claim that crop insurance is not necessary and that we do not need to act on this legislation this year. I could not disagree more.

Mr. President, every year our producers put the seed in the ground and believe that with a little faith and luck they will produce a crop. But, sometimes the creeks do rise and the multiple perils of drought, flood, fire, hail, blizzard, pests, and disease get the better or our producers. They must have the tools to manage these risks.

The agricultural and lending communities have spoken loudly, and they all have continually expressed the need to improve the risk management tools available to producers throughout the U.S. It is time for us to move towards action on this issue. The House Agriculture Committee approved legislation prior to the August recess. It is time for the Senate Agriculture Committee to do the same. A majority of the Committee has said as much by supporting our legislation.

Mr. President, we know there are many disagreements within members of the Senate in regards to specific agricultural policy. In fact, Senator KERREY and I have disagreements of our own on the underlying Farm Bill. However, we all agree that our producers today cannot be successful without access to new, improved, and adequate risk management tools. This legislation accomplishes these needs, and I urge my colleagues to join us in working towards an improved crop insurance program and risk management tools.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 37

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. 37, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the restriction on payment for certain hospital discharges to post-acute care imposed by section 4407 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 391, a bill to provide for payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to improve the National Writing Project.

S. 562

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 562, a bill to provide for a comprehensive, coordinated effort to combat methamphetamine abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill 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 for other purposes.

S. 690

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 690, a bill to provide for mass transportation in national parks and related public lands.

S. 693

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 693, a bill to assist in the enhancement of the security of Taiwan, and for other purposes.

S. 765

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to ensure the efficient allocation of telephone numbers.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide for the establishment and operation of asthma treatment services for children, and for other purposes.

S. 882

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 882, a bill to strengthen provisions in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 with respect to potential climate change.

S. 1023

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1023, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to carve out from payments to Medicare+Choice organizations amounts attributable to disproportionate share hospital payments and pay such amounts directly to those disproportionate share hospitals in which their enrollees receive care.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1025, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the proper payment of approved nursing and allied health education programs under the medicare program.

S. 1153

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1153, a bill to establish the Office of Rural Advocacy in the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 1268

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1268, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide support for the modernization and construction of biomedical and behavioral research facilities and laboratory instrumentation.

S. 1322

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services.

S. 1325

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1325, a bill to amend the Applachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to add Hickman, Lawrence, Lewis, Perry, and Wayne Counties, Tennessee, to the Appalachian region.

S. 1332

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Father Theodore M. Hesburg, in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to civil rights, higher education, the Catholic Church, the Nation, and the global community.

S. 1399

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1399, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that pay adjustments for nurses and certain other health-care professionals employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be made in the manner applicable to Federal employees generally and to revise the authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make further locality pay adjustments for those professionals.

S. 1463

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 1466

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1466, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for congressional review of rules establishing or increasing taxes.

S. 1473

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1473, a bill to amend section 2007 of the Social Security Act to provide grant funding for additional Empowerment Zones, Enterprise Communities, and Strategic Planning Communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1500, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an additional payment for services provided to certain high-cost individuals under the prospective payment system for skilled nursing facility services, and for other purposes.

S. 1528

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1528, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to clarify liability under that Act for certain recycling transactions.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 33

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 33, a joint resolution deploring the actions of President Clinton regarding granting clemency to FALN terrorists.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 53

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 53, a concurrent resolution condemning all prejudice against individuals of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry in the United States and supporting political and civic participation by such individuals throughout the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 92, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that funding for prostate cancer research should be increased substantially.

SENATE RESOLUTION 108

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

SNOWE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 108, a resolution designating the month of March each year as ''National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 133

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 133, a resolution supporting religious tolerance toward Muslims.

SENATE RESOLUTION 163

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 163, resolution to establish a special committee of the Senate to study the causes of firearms violence in America.

SENATE RESOLUTION 179

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 179, a resolution designating October 15, 1999, as ''National Mammography Day.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 182—DESIGNATING OCTOBER, 1999, AS ''NATIONAL STAMP COLLECTING MONTH''

Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 182

Whereas over 150 years ago, United States commemorative stamps began honoring the people, places, and events that have shaped our Nation's history;

Whereas in 1999, more than 22,000,000 Americans, including children, collect and learn about our Nation through stamps, making stamp collecting one of the most popular hobbies in our Nation and the world;

Whereas as we stand on the threshold of the 21st century, it is important that we pause to reflect on our Nation's history;

Whereas stamps honor statesmen and soldiers who fought for freedom and democracy, recognize our Nation's scientific and technological achievements, pay tribute to our Nation's artistic legacy, and celebrate the strength of our Nation's diversity;

Whereas starting October 1, 1999, ''National Stamp Collecting Month'' will transform more than 100,000 schools, libraries, and post offices into learning centers where our Nation's young people can honor the past and celebrate the future through stamps;

Whereas the founders and participants of ''National Stamp Collecting Month'' include millions of adult and youth collectors, thousands of teachers and schools, the American Philatelic Society, and the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the people, places, and events shaping America today will be United States commemorative stamps tomorrow;

Whereas ''National Stamp Collecting Month'' will help empower our Nation's children and future generations to study and learn from our Nation's history; and

Whereas as our Nation's children learn the lessons of the past, the children will be better prepared to guide our Nation in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates October, 1999, as ''National Stamp Collecting Month''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

BRYAN (AND WYDEN) AMENDMENT NO. 1623

Mr. BRYAN (for himself, and Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1588 proposed by Mr. BRYAN to the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, line 3, strike ''$1,216,351,000'' and all that follows through ''management'' on page 2, line 4, and insert ''$1,225,351,000 (which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 in accordance with section 4(i) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–6a(i))), to remain available until expended, of which $33,697,000 shall be available for wildlife habitat management, $22,132,000 shall be available for inland fish habitat management, $24,314,000 shall be available for anadromous fish habitat management, $28,548,000 shall be available for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species habitat management, $196,885,000 shall be available for timber sales management, and $10,000,000 shall be available for survey and manage requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan Record of Decision, for which the draft supplemental environmental impact statement is to be completed by November 15, 1999, and the final environmental impact statement is to be published by February 14, 2000''.

On page 2, line 6, strike ''$371,795,000'' and insert ''$365,795,000''.

On page 2, line 11, strike ''$122,484,000'' and insert ''$116,484,000''.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, PRODUCTION AND REGULATION

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on past and present worker safety issues in DOE facilities at the Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Paducah, Kentucky.

The hearing will take place on Monday, September 20, 1999 from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Paducah Community College Fine Arts Auditorium in Paducah, Kentucky.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC, 20510–6150.

For further information, please call Kristin Phillips, Staff Assistant, or Colleen Deegan, Counsel, at (202) 224–8115.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power.

The purpose of the hearing is to conduct oversight on the practices of the Bureau of Reclamation regarding operations and maintenance costs and contract renewals.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, September 29, 1999 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC, 20510–6150.

For further information, please call Kristin Phillips, Staff Assistant, or Colleen Deegan, Counsel, at (202) 224–8115.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary requests unanimous consent to conduct a hearing on Monday, September 13, 1999, beginning at 9:15 a.m. in the Ceremonial Court Room of the Federal Court Building, Philadelphia, PA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CLIFF GULLICKSON

• Mrs. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Cliff Gullickson family and a group of North-Central Montana farmers that pulled together

in true Montana tradition this harvest season.

Cliff Gullickson was killed in a farm accident when the grain truck he was driving to Big Sandy rolled on August 8. Neighbors rallied together the way only agricultural folks can to harvest the Gullickson's grain.

Some of the combines came from 50 miles away for the harvest and all started the day with a prayer for their safety and for Cliff Gullickson. In four hours the remaining 170 acres were harvested.

Don Jenkins, who lives on the northeast border of the Gullickson's farm said, ''This is what you do when there's a tragedy. This is their bread and butter. This is their livelihood sitting out in this field.'' That statement summarizes the attitude and depth of feeling prevalent in farming and ranching.

I extend my deepest sympathies to the Gullickson family for the loss of a fine person who dedicated his life to agriculture and also commend them for their hard work and dedication to the agricultural community.

Additionally, I commend each and every neighbor who lent a helping hand this harvest season in the face of a tragedy.●

NATIONAL ASSISTED LIVING WEEK

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to draw the Senate's attention to National Assisted Living Week. The National Center for Assisted Living is sponsoring National Assisted Living Week this week to highlight the significance and the hope that this type of service can provide seniors.

Assisted living is a long term care alternative for seniors who need more assistance than is available in retirement communities, but do not require the heavy medical and nursing care provided by nursing facilities. Approximately one million of our nation's seniors have chosen the option of assisted living in this country. This demonstrates a tremendous desire by seniors and their families to have the kind of assistance that they need in bathing, taking medications or other activities of daily living in a setting that truly becomes their home.

This year's theme of National Assisted Living Week is ''A Community of Families'' and I think that is appropriate because assisted living encourages the involvement of families in the lives of the residents of assisted living facilities, and because this option can mean so much for seniors and their families.

Oregon has led our nation in pioneering the concept of assisted living and the state spends more state health dollars to provide assisted living services than any other state in our nation. Assisted living has taken different directions in different states and I believe providing these choices for consumers is important to provide security, dignity and independence for seniors.

Assisted living will become even more important as an option of seniors and their families as our nation experiences the tsunami of aging baby boomers. It is important for us to continue to support options that allow seniors and their families a choice of settings in order to assure that they get the level of care that they need.●

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL PAYROLL WEEK 1999

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of National Payroll Week 1999, which has been designated as September 13–17.

National Payroll Week was founded by the American Payroll Association in 1996 to honor the men and women whose tax contributions support the American Dream and the payroll professionals who are dedicated to processing those contributions.

In particular, the Susquehanna Valley Chapter of the American Payroll Association represents 200,000 residents and 25 businesses in Pennsylvania. These taxpayers contribute millions of dollars to the federal and state treasuries through payroll taxes each year. These taxes help pay for important civic projects including roads, schools, crime prevention, and national defense. In addition, taxpayers and payroll professionals are partners in maintaining the Social Security and Medicare systems.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending the taxpayers and payroll professionals who, through the payment, collection, and reporting of payroll taxes, have helped make our nation great.●

CONGRATULATING DR. SUPACHAI PANITCHPAKDI

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I congratulate Dr. Supachai Panitchpakdi of Thailand on his selection to serve as Director General of the World Trade Organization. Dr. Supachai, Thailand's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Commerce, has been an unfailing advocate for the principles of free trade and is an excellent choice to lead this organization. I am very pleased that our faithful friend and ally, the Royal Kingdom of Thailand, will have one of their citizens guiding an international organization.

The agreement reached will split the next term between Dr. Supachai and Michael Moore, the former Prime Minster of New Zealand. As many of my colleagues know, the process for selecting a new Director General was at a standstill for months. Renato Ruggerio of Italy, the first and very successful Director General, finished his term and stepped down at the end of April. Despite the fact that his departure was known well in advance, no consensus on a successor was formed and the post remained vacant at a critical time—the Seattle round of trade talks being on the immediate horizon. Most of the countries of Europe and Asia have been united in their support of Dr. Supachai while the administration has supported Mr. Moore. The agreement reached by the member nations will permit Mr. Moore to serve a three year term to be followed by a three year term for Dr. Supachai.

For those of you unfamiliar with Dr. Supachai's work, as Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Commerce, his most pressing responsibility has been developing policy to guide his country through their current economic challenges. This included taking a significant role in shepherding important banking and regulatory reforms through the Thai Parliament that are important to the sound economic foundation of his country. The IMF has reported good news for Thailand on the economic front. After experiencing an economic contraction of 8% in 1997, their economy is expected to grow this year by 2–3% with an expected growth rate of 5% in 2000. Their currency, the baht, has stabilized and the government has rebuilt reserves to higher than pre-crisis levels. This is very good news and a positive sign for an economic recovery for all of Asia.

Dr. Supachai was also one of the architects of the economic policies that led his country to merge as a dynamic economic engine in Asia and experience several years of phenomenal economic growth. As Minister of Commerce he has been active in opening the business sector to foreign participation and improving transparency. He helped create the country's Export-Import Bank and has worked very closely with the countries of Southeast Asia in creating the ASEAN free trade zone. In Thailand, he was a strong voice in forging public acceptance of the Uruguay round of trade talks and guiding ratification of the treaty through the Parliament. Throughout the economic crisis, Dr. Supachai's support for free trade has not waivered. His credentials on the issues important to leadership at the WTO speak volumes.

I believe it is important that an individual representing Asia and a developing economy has an important role in a prominent international organization, as Dr. Supachai will have. There are over 400 million people living in Southeast Asia alone, this region will soon be the second largest market for our exports. This region and all of Asia are growing in importance to our economy and security. A strong voice representing the Asian economies is overdue.

The economic collapse in Asia, Russia and other nations did not simply stifle growth of U.S. exports, it put millions of people out of work in these countries, exacerbated the poverty level and in some cases led to social upheaval. Unfortunately, it caused policy makers in many foreign nations to question the pace of globalization and in some cases question the wisdom of globalization. Many countries believe that they have little to gain through

expanding trade and everything to lose and that their stake in trade negotiations is limited. I do not agree. Increasing fair trade has contributed greatly to improving the standard of living of Americans and sustaining the growth of our economy and it holds the same potential for our trading partners.

While this is an unfortunate development, it is not one without a solution. The solution is working with individuals like Dr. Supachai who believe in expanding trade and working to improve the role and the economies of developing nations. Rather than being an after thought, we must begin to work with more nations if more are to believe that they have a role in globalization. For the global trading structure to succeed and prosper, all countries must have faith in the trading system and faith that trade deals are being reached to the benefit of all member nations rather than just the most powerful. Dr. Supachai is uniquely suited to facilitate such change and his increased role in the international stage is a very positive development for the World Trade Organization.

Finally, I believe the people of Thailand could have been treated better by the United States in this process. They are our good friends and faithful allies. We on the other hand were slow in selecting a candidate and did not do a good job in forging a compromise. Despite Dr. Supachai's strong advocacy of the principles of free trade, we actively worked against him. Fortunately, groups such as the US-ASEAN Business Council and companies like Boeing were outspoken on Dr. Supachai's strong record on trade issues. This lack of leadership does not enhance the credibility of the WTO and needlessly strains relationships with our friends. But I am confident that the new leadership, Mr. Moore and Dr. Supachai, can overcome these obstacles and look forward to working with them on these issues.

So once again, I congratulate Dr. Supachai on his appointment. He is very strong on promoting expanded trade and I am confident that a leadership role for a representative of a Southeast Asian nation is a positive development for the World Trade Organization. I would like to commend the people of Thailand for their persistence and not backing down in their support of their candidate. I would also like to congratulate Mr. Moore and wish him the best; he is taking control of the organization at a critically important time. I look forward to working with both of these gentleman on the issues that are important to advancing free and fair trade around the world.●

THE ARAB AMERICAN CULTURAL AND COMMUNITY CENTER, HOUSTON, TEXAS.

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to express my sincere congratulations to the Arab American Cultural and Community Center in Houston, Texas. The Center will be hosting its Fourth Annual Gala ''Unity of Friendship'' in Houston on October 16, 1999, and it is worthy of recognition.

Mr. President, I commend those who have strived so hard to build this Center and make it a vibrant part of the community in Texas. This is an important effort which has advanced and demonstrated the continuing positive contributions of Arab-Americans. This Center has served as a cultural resource center for all nationalities in Houston, but is a special place where Arab-American culture, art, and language can be preserved and carried on for generations to come. It has assisted the children in the Arab American community by teaching them about their ancestors' impressive history and heritage.

I am pleased to recognize the efforts of those involved in this year's banquet and to note that they are generously donating a portion of the proceeds to help very worthwhile humanitarian projects. They are to be commended for their efforts and foresight, and I am pleased to acknowledge them in the United States Senate.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO WHP–AM 580

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate WHP–AM 580 in Harrisburg, PA as they celebrate their 75th anniversary as a prominent news leader in Central Pennsylvania.

For 75 years, WHP has covered the biggest news stories of the day, including the holocaust, Pearl Harbor, the Korean War, Vietnam, Watergate and the fall of the Berlin Wall.

As the owner of the radio news franchise in the Capitol region, WHMP reaches more than 100,000 people a week. The unique talent at WHP along with their exceptional news coverage and distinct personalities, have contributed to the station's listener loyalty and enthusiasm.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in congratulating WHP on their 75th anniversary and on their commitment to excellence in their news coverage to Pennsylvania and the Capital region.●

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, September 10, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,652,191,549,114.70 (Five trillion, six hundred fifty-two billion, one hundred ninety-one million, five hundred forty-nine thousand, one hundred fourteen dollars and seventy cents).

One year ago, September 10, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $5,545,658,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred forty-five billion, six hundred fifty-eight million).

Fifteen years ago, September 10, 1984, the Federal debt stood at $1,572,266,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred seventy-two billion, two hundred sixty-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, September 10, 1974, the Federal debt stood at $479,580,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-nine billion, five hundred eighty million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,172,611,549,114.70 (Five trillion, one hundred seventy-two billion, six hundred eleven million, five hundred forty-nine thousand, one hundred fourteen dollars and seventy cents) during the past 25 years.●

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Executive Calendar Nos. 211 and 212. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, 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:

THE JUDICIARY

David N. Hurd, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

Naomi Reice Buchwald, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

MODIFICATION OF LIST OF CONFEREES—H.R. 2670

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of conferees for the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill be modified to add Senator LEAHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 106–9

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following convention transmitted to the Senate on September 13, 1999, by the President of the United States: Tax Convention with Slovenia, Treaty Document No. 106–9.

I further ask unanimous consent that the convention be considered as having been read the first time, that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the

President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for Senate advice and consent to ratification the Convention Between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Ljubljana on June 21, 1999. Also transmitted is the report of the Department of State concerning the Convention.

This Convention, which is similar to tax treaties between the United States and OECD nations, provides maximum rates of tax to be applied to various types of income and protection from double taxation of income. This Convention also provides for resolution of disputes and sets forth rules making its benefits unavailable to residents who are engaged in treaty-shopping or with respect to certain abusive transactions.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this Convention and that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 13, 1999.*

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1999

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, September 14. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume debate on the Bryan second-degree amendment No. 1623 to H.R. 2466, the Interior appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the Bryan second-degree amendment regarding the forest system budget at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday. By previous consent, a vote on the pending Bryan amendment will occur at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow. Further amendments to the Interior appropriations bill are expected throughout tomorrow's session. Therefore, Senators can expect votes throughout the day in anticipation of completing action on the bill.

In light of today's cloture vote on S.J. Res. 33, the Senate will have limited debate on the resolution with a vote on final passage during tomorrow's session at a time to be determined by the two leaders.

For the remainder of the week, the Senate is expected to begin consideration of the transportation appropriations bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:52 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 14, 1999, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 13, 1999:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN F. POTTER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 1, 2005, VICE T. BURTON SMITH, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

ROGER WALTON FERGUSON, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ALICE M. RIVLIN, RESIGNED.

ROGER WALTON FERGUSON, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2000. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WILLIAM B. BADER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS). (NEW POSITION)

SIM FARAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF OF THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 188:

To be lieutenant commander

KURT A. SEBASTIAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271:

To be captain

ERNEST J. FINK, 0000
ALAN L. PEEK, 0000
JAMES S. ANGERT, 0000
GERALD R. WHEATLEY, 0000
MARK P. THOMAS, 0000
MICHAEL B. KARR, 0000
JOHN J. O'BRIEN, 0000
KEITH D. CAMERON, 0000
BARRY A. HARNER, 0000
ROBERT C. LORIGAN, 0000
PATRICK A. HARRIS, 0000
JONATHAN D. SARUBBI, 0000
DONALD B. THOMPSON, 0000
BENJAMIN A. WATSON, 0000
WILLIAM M. MOORE, 0000
JOSEPH J. COCCIA, 0000
KEVIN B. SMITH, 0000
RAYMOND J. MILLER, 0000
KENNETH G. THYSELL, 0000
JOSEPH J. SABOE, 0000
JACK R. SMITH, 0000
MARK J. KERSKI, 0000
TEDRIC R. LINDSTROM, 0000
RONALD T. HEWITT, 0000
ROBERT W. DURFEY, 0000
DOUGLAS C. CONNOR, 0000
JEFFREY A. KAYSER, 0000
WILLIAM G. DAVIDSON, 0000
CURTIS B. ODOM, 0000
RICHARD B. CUSSON, 0000
MARK J. SIKORSKI, 0000
MARK H. LANDRY, 0000
PETER J. DINICOLA, 0000
KEVIN P. CARPENTIER, 0000
MASON K. BROWN, 0000
MARK L. MILLER, 0000
CLINTON S. GORDON, 0000
WAYNE N. COLLINS, 0000
JAMES A. WATSON, 0000
BRIAN J. O'KEEFE, 0000
WILLIAM P. LAYNE, 0000
WILLIAM J. WAGNER, 0000

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

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES H. COOLIDGE, JR., 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 9333(B):

To be colonel

THOMAS G. BOWIE, JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be colonel

JAMES W. BOST, 0000
JEAN C. COMEAU, 0000
LOREN M. JOHNSON, 0000
RICHARD L. STAHLMAN, 0000
JAMES K. WRIGHT, 0000

To be lieutenent colonel

PETER A. BAUER, 0000
EVA T. BERRO, 0000
CATHERINE E. BIERSACK, 0000
MARK W. BOWYER, 0000
WILLIAM M. CAMPBELL, 0000
GEORGE W. CHRISTOPHER, 0000
GARY D. CROUCH, 0000
DAVID L. DAWSON, 0000
STEPHEN E. GARNER, 0000
DAN R. HANSEN, 0000
JAMES H. HERIOT, 0000
ROBERT R. IRELAND, 0000
MOON Y. JEU, 0000
PHILIP T. KLAZYNSKI, 0000
JAMES R. KNOWLES, 0000
JAMES R. LITTLE, 0000
ABUBAKR A. MARZOUK, 0000
JAMES S. MOELLER, 0000
SUSAN W. MONGEAU, 0000
RANDALL J. MOORE, 0000
EMMANUEL D. NAVAL, 0000
PAUL A. PHILLIPS, 0000
ODES B. ROBERTSON, JR., 0000
MARC S. ROBINS, 0000
JOSE E. RODRIGUEZVAZQUEZ, 0000
WILLIAM M. ROGERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER SARTORI, 0000
ROBERT E. SMITH, II, 0000
LAWRENCE W. STEINKRAUS, JR., 0000
KATHLEEN S. TAJIRI, 0000
JEFFREY M. THOMPSON, 0000
JAY A. WINZENRIED, 0000
GROVER K. YAMANE, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSON FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT A. VIGERSKY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203 AND 1552:

To be colonel

MICHAEL V. KOSTIW, 0000
DAVID T. ULMER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS (MC) AND MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS (MS) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT S. ADAMS, 0000 MC

To be major

JEFFREY P. STOLROW, 0000 MS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS AND CHAPLAINS AND FOR REGULAR (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) APPOINTMENT UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, 624, 628, AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JON A. HINMAN, 0000 MC

To be major

MARTIN P. CURRY, 0000 MC
LISA M. L. PARKER, 0000 MC
*GLENN R. SCHEIB, 0000 CH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JAMES E. COBB, 0000
AUGUSTUS L. COLLINS, 0000
JOHN E. DAVOREN, 0000
ALBERT E. FRANKE, III, 0000
DANIEL J. MCCORMACK, 0000
RANDALL W. MOON, 0000
MICHAEL E. NUNLEY, 0000
ERROL R. SCHWARTZ, 0000
JOSEPH A. WANNEMACHER, 0000
CURTIS G. WHITEFORD, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

HERBERT J. ANDRADE, 0000
SUSAN M. CHESHIER, 0000
THOMAS C. COBURN, 0000
MICHAEL FITZPATRICK, 0000
JIMMY R. GOMEZ, 0000
RICHARD E. HENS, 0000
THOMAS R. LAMONT, 0000
KEVIN J. LORDS, 0000
JOSEPH G. MATERIA, 0000
OLGA C. RODRIGUEZ-RAMIREZ, 0000
JAMES M. STEWART, 0000
KRISTIAN J. STOLTENBERG, 0000
NATHAN A.K. WONG, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

RICHARD P. ANDERSON, 0000
LARRY D. BARTTELBORT, 0000
HERBERT W. BEAM, 0000
MICHAEL L. BOYD, 0000
CHARLES A. CHAMBERS, IV, 0000
RICHARD D. FINDLAY, 0000
ROBERT LEROY FINN, 0000
JORGE B. GONZALEZ, 0000
JOHN A. GOODALE, 0000
JOHN L. GRONSKI, 0000
KATHLEEN A. MORRISSEY, 0000
DAVID M. PARQUETTE, 0000
WILLIAM H. PETTY, 0000
THOMAS H. REDFERN, 0000
JAMES M. ROBINSON, 0000
SHERWOOD J. SMITH, 0000
ROBERTA P. STANDISH, 0000
ROBERT H. TOWER, 0000
HORACE S. TUCKER, JR., 0000
WILLARD G. VARIAN, 0000
PEDRO G. VILLARREAL, 0000
GARY F. WAINWRIGHT, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE MEDICAL CORPS (MC) AND DENTAL CORPS (DE) (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

*RODNEY H. ALLEN, 0000
EDWARD D. ARRINGTON, 0000
*THOMAS P. BAKER, 0000
*JOHN M. BALAS, JR., 0000
*ITALO M. BASTIANELLI, 0000
*JOHN J. BAUER, 0000
*AMY E. BENSON, 0000
*ELIZABETH A. BLAIR, 0000
*JODIE L. BOLT, 0000
*STEPHEN L. BOLT, 0000
*OTTO F. BONETA, 0000
*SHERI Y. BOYD, 0000
*GEORGE T. BRANDT, 0000
THOMAS D. BRESLEY, 0000
*GEORGE BROUGHTON II, 0000
*MICHAEL E. BROWN, 0000
*WILLIAM T. BURNS, 0000
JOHN CAMPBELL, 0000
ANTHONY J. CANFIELD, 0000
*MARY L. CANNON, 0000
*JOHN N. CAREY, 0000
*BRIAN E. CAVALLARO, 0000
*PAUL S. CHANG, 0000
*DARREN C. CHAPMAN, 0000
*GREGORY E. CHOW, 0000
*LARRY D. CHRISTOPHER, 0000
*LAWRENCE E. CLAPP, 0000
GARY W. CLARK, 0000
*JOSEPH Y. CLARK, 0000
HEIDI L. CLOSE, 0000
*JOSE J. CONDE, 0000
*NORVELL V. COOTS, 0000
*BRIAN E. COTHERN, 0000
*TALLEY F. CULCLASURE, JR., 0000
JAMES A. DAHL, 0000
*ALEXANDER K. DEITCH, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER A. DILLON, 0000
* THEODORE A. DORSAY, 0000
*KENNETH N. DUNN, 0000
ANNETTE DUSSEAU, 0000
*JOHN R. EKSTRAND, 0000
SUSAN EMANUEL, 0000
*JOHN W. ETZENBACH, 0000
LILIA A.FANNIN, 0000
GERALD L.FARBER, 0000
*JEFFREY A. FAULKNER, 0000
LOIS A. FIALA, 0000
*DAVID K. FIASCHETTI, 0000
*ROGER S. FIEDLER, 0000
*STEPHEN F. FLAHERTY, 0000
*DAVID T. FLOYD, 0000
THOMAS B. FRANCIS, 0000
*BARTON K. GEORGE, 0000
*SEAN D. GHIDELLA, 0000
*BENJAMIN N. GILBERT, 0000
*BRUCE E. GOECKERITZ, 0000
*MONICA B. GORBANDT, 0000
*PAUL E. GOTT, 0000
WAYNE E. HACHEY, 0000
NELSON A. HAGER, 0000
*STEVEN W. HAMMOND, 0000
*JACKIE A. HAYES, 0000
JON A. HINMAN, 0000
*WILLIAM K. HIROTA, 0000
DAVID P. HOCHSCHILD, 0000
*ROBERT L. HOLMES, 0000
*DUANE R. HOSPENTHAL, 0000
*WILLIAM T. HUMPHREY, JR., 0000
RAYMOND G. HYNSON, 0000
*JEFFREY L. JACKSON, 0000
JAMES R. JEZIOR, 0000
KAREN B. JOHANSEN, 0000
LUTHER B. JOHANSEN, 0000
BARBARA JOSLOW, 0000
*BYRON D. JOYNER, 0000
*LISA W. KEEP, 0000
*KENNETH R. KEMP, 0000
KEVIN L. KENWORTHY, 0000
*JOHN S. KITZMILLER, 0000
*ERIK J. KOBYLARZ, 0000
JOSEPH R. KOLB, III, 0000
*MARK G. KORTEPETER, 0000
DAVID A. KRISTO, 0000
*KEVIN M. KUMKE, 0000
WILMA I. LARSEN, 0000
JEFFREY A. LAWSON, 0000
*LAWRENCE S. LEPLER, 0000
*THOMAS E. LEVOYER, 0000
*ANGELA D. LEVY, 0000
EDWARD B. LUCCI, 0000
JEFFREY S. MACINTIRE, 0000
ANDREW J. MACLELLAN, 0000
*FRANCIS J. MALONE, 0000
*JOHN R. MAYER, 0000
DONALD R. MCCLELLAN, 0000
*SHANNON S. MCGEE, 0000
*JAMES W. MCLANE, 0000
WILLIS A. MCVAY, 0000
*COLIN K. MILLER, 0000
*JERRY J. MILLER, 0000
*RICKEY C. MYHAND, 0000
*SRIDHAR NATARAJAN, 0000
ROBERT J. OGLESBY, 0000
*COLIN K. OHRT, 0000
FREDERICK V. PALMQUIST, 0000
*MARY F. PARKER, 0000
*ANTHONY J. PARKER, 0000
*GEORGE D. PATRIN, 0000
*GEORGE E. PEOPLES, JR., 0000
GREGORY W. PETERMANN, 0000
*RONALD J. PLACE, 0000
ALBERT V. PORAMBO, 0000
MARY E. PORISCH, 0000
*STEVEN J. POSNICK, 0000
LAURA L. PRATT, 0000
*BRADLEY P. PRESNAL, 0000
KELLY D. PRIDGEN, 0000
*WILLARD F. QUIRK, 0000
*KENDALL L. RAY, 0000
*JAY A. RIDDLE, 0000
RANDAL D. ROBINSON, 0000
*JEFFREYE. RODZAK, 0000
WALTER F. RONGEY, 0000
*BRADLEY J. ROTH, 0000
*MICHAEL J. ROY, 0000
*STEVEN P. RUBCZAK, 0000
*MICHAEL B. RUSSO, 0000
GLENN D. SANDBERG, 0000
*DARRELL K. SCALES, 0000
*CRAIG K. SETO, 0000
JOHN M. SHEPHERD, 0000
*NEAL I. SHPARAGO, 0000
BORIS J. SIDOW, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER K. SINHA, 0000
*CURTIS M. SORENSEN, 0000
*DAVID B. SPROAT, 0000
*JOHN J. STASINOS, 0000
*KEITH D. STEWART, 0000
*ALEXANDER STOJADINOVIC, 0000
*THOMAS R. TEMPEL, JR, 0000
*HEIDI P. TERRIO, 0000
*JAMES D. TERRIO, 0000
*SONJA M. THOMPSON, 0000
*GLEN E. TOMKINS, 0000
*BRIAN K. UNWIN, 0000
*DAVID A. VINCENT, 0000
*BRAD E. WADDELL, 0000
*PAUL J. WARDEN, 0000
*ROBERT A. WASCHER, 0000
*PETER J. WEINA, 0000
*GARY A. WHEELER, 0000
*SCOTT C. WILLIAMS, 0000
*MARK R. WITHERS, 0000
*GLENN W. WORTMANN, 0000
*JOHN S. XENOS, 0000
*CLIFTON E. YU, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

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 major

MICHAEL J. DELLAMICO, 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

CHARLES S. DUNSTON, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be Lieutenant Commander

ANIBAL L. ACEVEDO, 0000
JOHN J. ADAMETZ, 0000
BRIAN K. ADAMS, 0000
DAWN E. ADAMS, 0000
KEITH N. ADAMS, 0000
LAURA M. ADAMS, 0000
LYNNE B. AHN, 0000
JOHN C. ALBERGHINI, 0000
CARLA M. ALBRITTON, 0000
THOMAS C. ALEWINE, 0000
CATHERINE R. ALLEN, 0000
CONNIE J. ALLEN, 0000
JANE D. ALLEN, 0000
TONY L. AMMONS, JR, 0000
TERESA A. ANDERSEN, 0000
DONALD W. ANDERSON, JR, 0000
MICHAEL L. ANDERSON, 0000
YVONNE ANDERSON, 0000
MICHAEL J. ANGERINOS, 0000
JEFFREY G. ANT, 0000
PAUL T. ANTONY, 0000
DANAE M. APLAS, 0000
LORIMEL F. ARABE, 0000
MONICA J. ARELLANO, 0000
ANTHONY A. ARITA, 0000
ADAM W. ARMSTRONG, 0000
THOMAS S. ARMSTRONG, 0000
VERONICA G. ARMSTRONG, 0000
ELIZABETH A. G. ASHBY, 0000
CHRIS ATKINS, 0000
HOWARD A. AUPKE, JR, 0000
CHARLES R. BAILEY, 0000
JONATHAN G. BAKER, 0000
JOEL L. BALDWIN, 0000
SUSAN BARNES, 0000
CARL R. BARR, 0000
JAMES R. BARRON, 0000
BRADLEY E. BARTH, 0000
JAMES BASS, 0000
BARRY J. BAUGHMAN, 0000
CATHERINE A. BAYNE, 0000
PAUL E. BEDSOLE, 0000
BRIAN E. BEHARRY, 0000
CARMEL M. BELANGER, 0000
AMY M. BELFORD, 0000
ANGELA BELL, 0000
DEDRA A. BELL, 0000
BRODERICK C. BELLO, 0000
MARK BENTON, 0000
LAMONT S. BERG, 0000
ERIK W. BERGMAN, 0000
RICHARD D. BERGTHOLD, 0000
STEPHANIE A. BERNARD, 0000
GARTH B. BERNINGHAUS, 0000
BRIAN BERRYMAN, 0000
GEOFFREY B. BETSINGER, 0000
VALERIE J. BEUTEL, 0000
DAVID T. BEVERLY IV, 0000
RAYMOND W. BICHARD, 0000
MICHAEL A. BIDUS, 0000
BRITTON K. BISHOP, 0000
CHARLES S. BLACKADAR, 0000
ANA L. BLACKMON, 0000
BRYAN P. BLAIR, 0000
STEVEN J. BLIVIN, 0000
DAVID C. BLOOM, 0000
TAMMY L.K. BLOOM, 0000
PRODROMOS G. BORBOROGLU, 0000
ALEXANDER J. BORZYCH, 0000
PIA S. BOSTON, 0000
PAUL J. BOURGEOIS, 0000
BRUCE H. BOYLE, 0000
GERALD BOYLE, 0000
KEVIN R. BRADSHAW, 0000
RUSTY C. BRAND, 0000
KAREN M. BRANSONBERRY, 0000
JAMES M. BRIAN, 0000
NEAL A. BRICKHOUSE, 0000
LYNN S. BRINKER, 0000
MARC E. BRODSKY, 0000
MYLES E. BROOKS, JR., 0000
MATTHEW J. BROTT, 0000
ELIZABETH BROUWER, 0000
DANIEL A. BROWN, 0000
DONALD C. BROWN, 0000
MARGO H. BROWN, 0000
MARY M. BROWN, 0000
RYAN A. BROWN, 0000
HAROLD M. BRUCE, 0000
KEVIN J. BUCHLI, 0000
KAREN J. BUENGER, 0000
EDDY R. BUENO, 0000
PAUL R.A. BUENVENIDA, 0000
JOHN R. BUFFINGTON, 0000
BRANCH BULLARD, 0000
DOUGLAS BUNTING, 0000
RONALD B. BURBANK, 0000
LLOYD G. BURGESS, 0000
TIMOTHY H. BURGESS, 0000
MICHAEL S. BURKE, 0000
ROBERT E. BURKE, 0000
PATRICIA M. BURNS, 0000
CHARLES C. BURROUGHS, 0000
GREGORY W. BURT, 0000
EDWARD G. BUTLER, 0000
HEIDI M. BYERS, 0000
JAMES D. BYRNE, 0000
LORI R. CAHILL, 0000
EUGENE C. CARLSON, 0000
KENNETH D. CARNEIRO, 0000
CAROL A. CAROTHERS, 0000
CYNTHIA L. CARPENTER, 0000
CHERYL L. CARSON, 0000
WILLIAM R. CARTER, 0000
LISA D. CASTLEMAN, 0000
JERRY R. CASTRO, 0000
JEFFREY J. CAVENDISH, 0000
DANIEL C. CELESKI, 0000
THERESE S. CERMAK, 0000
JOSE CERVANTES, 0000
WALTER M. CHANNELL, 0000
NORMAN F.J. CHARBONEAU, 0000
JAMES T. CHEEK, 0000
JAMES G. CHRISTENSON, 0000
MARLIN L. CHRISTIANSON, 0000
CHARLES E. CHURCHWARD, 0000
ALFRED J. CIUZIO, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. CLAPP, 0000
WILBURN A. CLARKE, 0000
JEFFREY C. CLEARY, 0000
BRIAN D. CLEMENT, 0000
DAVID T. CLONTZ, 0000
PATRICK W. CLYDE, 0000
GEORGE W. COLE, JR., 0000
PETER C. COLELLA, 0000
JOELLE M. COLETTA, 0000
MICHAEL A. COLSON, 0000
CANDACE L. COLSTON, 0000
LUNDY W. COLVERT, 0000
FERNANDO T. CONDE, 0000
AVAMARIE S. CONLIN, 0000
BYRON F. CONNER, 0000
MARK J. CONRAD, 0000
LEONARD W.W. COOKE, 0000
RONALD A. COOLEY, 0000
KEVIN J. COOLONG, 0000
JAMES F. COONEY, 0000
KIM CORLEY, 0000
PATRICIA CORLEY, 0000
MICHAEL E. CORSEY, 0000
ANTHONY A. CORSINI, 0000
ALLISON J. COSTE, 0000
SCOTT A. COTA, 0000
KENNETH D. COUNTS, 0000
RICHARD COWAN, JR., 0000
BENJAMIN M. CRANDALL, 0000
JOHN L. CRAPO, 0000
GERALD L. CREECH, 0000
SAMUEL D. CRITIDES, JR., 0000
GILBERT M. CSUJA, 0000
THOMAS B. CULLEN, 0000
ROBERT CUNARD, 0000
MARY F. DALESSANDRO, 0000
ELIZABETH V. DANG, 0000
CHRIS J. DARRUP, 0000
SURJYA P. DAS, 0000
RAYMOND B.J. DAUGHERTY, 0000
STEPHEN S. DAVIS, 0000
STEVEN W. DAVIS, 0000
PATRICIA K. DAY, 0000
ROBERT P. DAY, JR., 0000
TONY F. DEALICANTE, 0000
HONEY L. DEARMOND, 0000
SCOTT M. DEEDS, 0000
DIRK R. DEHAAS, 0000
MICHAEL W. DELANEY, 0000
NANCY R. DELANEY, 0000
DANIEL J. DELAURENTIS, 0000
EFRAIN DELEON, 0000
JOHN P. DEMCHAK, 0000
PAUL J. DEMIERI, 0000
JAMES T. DENLEY, 0000
DANE A. DENMAN, 0000
DAWN DENNIS, 0000
JAMES S. DEROSA, 0000
ROBERT P. DEVINE, 0000
JUAN J. DEZENGOTITA, 0000
FLORENCIO A. DICTADO, 0000
DARIN L. DINELLI, 0000
STACY K. DIPMAN, 0000
JOSEPH DIVINO, 0000
DEMETRIO L. DOMINGO, 0000
GERALD F. DONOVAN, 0000
WADE E. DOSCH, 0000
BRAD H. DOUGLAS, 0000
BRADLEY K. DRAPER, 0000
BRIAN J. DREW, 0000
BARBARA J. DROBINA, 0000
THOMAS M. DUGGAN, 0000
DEBRA L. DUNCAN, 0000
MARGARET T. DUPREE, 0000
GREGORY D. EBERHART, 0000
MARK K. EDELSON, 0000
JOEL E. EDGEMAN, 0000
MASOUD EGHTEDARI, 0000
MARK S. EICH, 0000
KURT R. EICHENMULLER, 0000
DENISE J. EICHER, 0000
REBEKAH J. EID, 0000
CARL C. EIERLE, 0000
SAMY M. ELHALAWANI, 0000
CHAD R. ELLER, 0000
THOMAS M. ELLIOTT, 0000
ROBERT P. ENGLERT, 0000
KENNETH W. EPPS, 0000
ANDREW C. ESCRIVA, 0000
JOSEPH B. ESSEX, 0000
ROBERT M. FAIRBANKS, 0000
DEANN J. FARR, 0000
MARC J. FARRAYE, 0000
TRISHA L. FARRELL, 0000
MAURICE F. FAULK, JR., 0000
JOHN F. FERGUSON, 0000
KRISTIN M.H. FIELDING, 0000
MARTIN F. FIELDS, JR., 0000
ASHLEY W. FISH, 0000
DAN E. FISHER, 0000
BRIAN T. FITZGERALD, 0000
EILEEN M. FITZGERALD, 0000
GEOFFREY M. FITZGERALD, 0000
DEREK R. FLEITZ, 0000
EUGENE H. FLETCHER, 0000
TIFFANY A. FLORES, 0000
ROBIN E. FONTENOT, 0000
DONNA J. FORBES, 0000
LEE A. FORDYCE, 0000
KIM M. FORMAN, 0000
ROBERT T. FRANKS, 0000
ILIANA FREDMIRANDA, 0000
ADRIENNE M. FRENCH, 0000
ELIZABETH J. FRENCH, 0000
WILLIAM C. FREUDENTHAL, 0000
JOHN J. FROIO, 0000
EDDIE G. GALLION, 0000
DIONISIO S. GAMBOA, 0000
WALTER G. GARNER, 0000
ADOLPH C. GARZA, 0000
KIRK P. GASPER, 0000
JENNIFER M. GEDDES, 0000
ERIC M. GESSLER, 0000
VINCENT F. GIARDINO, JR., 0000
MATTHEW J. GIBBONS, 0000
ROBIN D. GIBBS, 0000
CYNTHIA L. GIBSON, 0000
GUSTAVO GIERBER, 0000
MARCIA L. GILL, 0000
ELIZABETH K. GILLARD, 0000
GREGG D. GILLETTE, 0000
LAURA G. GILLIS, 0000
REGINA M. GODBOUT, 0000
CARLOS D. GODINEZ, 0000
MARK R. GOHL, 0000
MICHAEL D. GOLIGHTLY, 0000
THOMAS J. GORMAN, JR., 0000
JAMES C. GOUDREAU, 0000
ROBERT A. GRAMZINSKI, 0000
JAMES A. GRAPES, 0000
MICHAEL R. GREEN, 0000
MICHAEL L. GREENWALT, 0000
ROBIN C. GREGORY, 0000
HERBERT L. GRIFFIN, JR., 0000
ROWDY C. GRIFFIN, 0000
JEFFREY T. GRILL, 0000
JONATHAN C. GROH, 0000
IAN R. GROVER, 0000
JAMES M. GRUESKIN, 0000
ANNA M. GRUETZMACHER, 0000
CARLOS GUEVARRA, 0000
PEDRO G. GUZMAN, 0000
DONNA M. HAASE, 0000
CLYDE A. HAIG, 0000
ANNE R. HALEY, 0000
ERIC R. HALL, 0000
SANDRA M. HALTERMAN, 0000
FRANCES K. HAMMAN, 0000
ROBERT J. HAMMOND, 0000
WILLIAM C. HANCOCK, 0000
BRYAN HANFTWURZEL, 0000
ALAN M. HANSEN, 0000
ERIC L. HANSON, 0000
JULIE C. HANSON, 0000
GREGORY P. HARBACH, 0000
CHRISTINA A. HARDAWAY, 0000
JOHN V. HARDAWAY, 0000
NADJMEH M. HARIRI, 0000
DALE R. HARMAN, 0000
TIMOTHY J. HARRINGTON, 0000
JAMES HARRIS, 0000
MARK K. HARRIS, 0000
BARRY L. HARRISON, 0000
BRADLEY J. HARTGERINK, 0000
ROSANNE I. HARTLEY, 0000
LEE P. HARTNER, 0000
JEFFREY J. HAWKER, 0000
GENE A. HAWKS, 0000
RICHARD D. HAYDEN, 0000
RUSSELL B. HAYS, JR., 0000
J.P. HEDGES, JR., 0000
JOHN W. HEDRICK, 0000
RICHARD D. HEINZ, 0000

JOE H. HEMENWAY, 0000
ROY L. HENDERSON, 0000
MARK R. HENDRICKS, 0000
TODD B. HENRICKS, 0000
CARL R. HERRON, 0000
BRIAN M. HERSHEY, 0000
KATHLEEN E. HEWITT, 0000
JEFFREY D. HICKS, 0000
LAWRENCE D. HILL, JR., 0000
VINCENT T. HILL, 0000
EDWARD J. HILYARD, 0000
MICHAEL C. HOLIFIELD, 0000
KEITH G. HOLLEY, 0000
KARINE M. HOLLISPERRY, 0000
KATRINA M. HOOD, 0000
MATTHEW T. HORVATH, 0000
LINDA J.A. HOUDE, 0000
BRUCE A. HOUGESEN, 0000
KURT J. HOUSER, 0000
JOHN P. HOWARD, 0000
STUART D. HUBBARD, 0000
STEVEN J. HUDSON, 0000
BARBARA L. HUFF, 0000
KAREN A. HULBERT, 0000
THOMAS R. HUNT, JR., 0000
HEIDI K. HUPP, 0000
THOMAS L. HUSTED, 0000
CHRIS B. HYUN, 0000
BARBARA R. IDONE, 0000
ARISTIDES ILIAKIS, 0000
ROBERT D. JACKSON, 0000
MARGARET A. JACOBSEN, 0000
ALAN D. JACOVICH, 0000
RICHARD H. JADICK, 0000
GLADYS L. JAFFARI, 0000
JAMES JAWORSKI, 0000
STEVEN M. JEFFS, 0000
TRACY A. JENKINS, 0000
DENISE JOHNSON, 0000
ERIC JOHNSON, 0000
JAMES M. JOHNSON, 0000
KENNETH B. JOHNSON, 0000
ROBERT JOHNSON, 0000
ROBERT F. JOHNSON, 0000
JOHN W. JOHNSTON, 0000
ATHANASE J. JONES, JR., 0000
DAVID E. JONES, 0000
KARON V. JONES, 0000
KEVIN M. JONES, 0000
JOSEPH P. JORDAN, 0000
SUSAN A. JORDAN, 0000
ETHAN B. JOSIAH, 0000
MICHAEL JURGENS, 0000
PETER M. KADILE, 0000
DAVID H. KAO, 0000
GLORIA S. KASCAK, 0000
ERIC J. KASOWSKI, 0000
MICHAEL D. KAZEL, 0000
JANET R. KEAIS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. KELLY, 0000
SEAN R. KELLY, 0000
LISA A. KELTY, 0000
DAVID M. KENEE, 0000
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, 0000
TERRI KEPPINGER, 0000
MARK L. KIEFER, 0000
ROBERT J. KILLIUS, 0000
MARY J. KINSELLA, 0000
STANLEY A. KLOSS, 0000
STEVEN T. KNAUER, 0000
TAMMY L. KOCH, 0000
NEVANNA I. KOICHEFF, 0000
CHRISTINA M. KOONCE, 0000
MARK KOSTIC, 0000
CARMEN KRETZMER, 0000
KRISTIN L. KRUSE, 0000
ALLEN R. KUSS, 0000
RICKY A. KUSTURIN, 0000
MICHELLE C. LADUCA, 0000
ALBERT LAFERTY, 0000
GARY E. LAMB, 0000
JOHN A. LAMBERTON, 0000
ROBERT B. LANCIA, 0000
TAMERA L. LANE, 0000
LENORA C. LANGLAIS, 0000
GRAINGER S. LANNEAU, JR., 0000
BRIAN C. LANSING, 0000
MARCUS S. LARKIN, 0000
JONATHAN LARSEN, 0000
MARK A. LARUSSO, 0000
CLYDA L. LAURENT, 0000
ROBERT S. LAWRENCE, 0000
SCOTT P. LAWRY, 0000
CATHERINE L. LAWSON, 0000
LORI J. LEARNEDBURTON, 0000
CARLOS I. LEBRON, 0000
REES L. LEE, 0000
RONNELL R. LEFTWICH, 0000
KAREN M. LEHEW, 0000
JOSE R. LEMA, 0000
LINDA L. LEMASTER, 0000
STEVEN R. LENGA, 0000
DAVID S. LESSER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. LEWIS, 0000
TINA T. LIEBIG, 0000
DAVID A. LIFSET, 0000
JAMES LILLY, 0000
MATTHEW L. LIM, 0000
ARTHUR H. LOGAN, 0000
FRANK J. LORENTZEN, 0000
JOHN W. LOVE, 0000
SCOTT W. LOWE, 0000
JAMES M. LOWTHER, 0000
GREGORY D. LUNSFORD, 0000
SCOTT A. LUZI, 0000
MICHAEL P. LYNN, 0000
SYLVIA A. LYON, 0000
ANN E. MACKE, 0000
MICHAEL J. MAGUIRE, 0000
MARIA MAHMOODI, 0000
GARY M. MAJOR, 0000
RICHARD E. MAKARSKI, 0000
JOHN MALLOY, 0000
GEORGE C. MANSFIELD, 0000
DAVID A. MARCH, 0000
LOUIS J. MARCHIORI II, 0000
TIMOTHY R. MARKLE, 0000
KATHLEEN A. MARKS, 0000
THOMAS R. MARSZALEK, 0000
RONALD R. MARTEL, 0000
BETH A. MARTIN, 0000
JOEL E. MARTIN, 0000
PAUL E. MARTIN, 0000
JULIE MAURER, 0000
CHERYL L. MAUZY, 0000
SHIRLEY A. MAXWELL, 0000
TODD J. MAY, 0000
KEITH L. MAYBERRY, 0000
JOHN P. MAYE, 0000
MICHAEL T. MAZUREK, 0000
JEROME F. MC CABE, 0000
BRIAN L. MC CANN, 0000
PATRICK J. MCCLANAHAN, 0000
TROY M. MCCLELLAND, 0000
CATHY M. MCCRARY, 0000
DENISE K. MCELDOWNEY, 0000
SEAN K. MCELHANEY, 0000
ROBERT K. MCGAHA, 0000
KEVIN A. MCKENNEY, 0000
KENNETH W. MCKINLEY, 0000
DANIEL J. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
LAURA J. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
DAVID B. MCLEAN, 0000
MARY A. MCMACKIN, 0000
BRIAN T. MCNAMARA, 0000
BRYON K. MCNEIL, 0000
DWAYNE R. MEEKER, 0000
JAMES E. MEEKINS, 0000
JAMES W. MELONE, 0000
JILL S. MEONI, 0000
ROSARIO P. MERRELL, 0000
THOMAS V. MESSE, 0000
DREW C. MESSER, 0000
WENDELL Q. MEW, 0000
STERLING A. MEZA, 0000
CONNIE S. MICEK, 0000
JOSEPH B. MICHAEL, 0000
MARTHA J. MICHAELSON, 0000
AMY C. MICHALSKI, 0000
ADAM S. MICHELS, 0000
WILLIAM D. MILAM, 0000
DEANA J. MILLER, 0000
JONATHAN A. MILLER, 0000
RONALD P. MILLER, 0000
ROLAND A. MINA, 0000
KRAIG A. MITCHELL, 0000
WILLIAM D. MITCHELL, 0000
EDWARD T. MOLDENHAUER, 0000
JOSEPH M. MOLNAR, 0000
NANCY L. MONTAGOT, 0000
JOHN P. MOON, 0000
DANIEL H. MOORE, 0000
JULIE C. MOORE, 0000
RODNEY M. MOORE, 0000
CYNTHIA E. MOOREFIELD, 0000
ELIZABETH A. MORAN, 0000
KENNETH F. MORE, 0000
SANDRA M. MORFORD, 0000
SCOTT J. MOSES, 0000
DONALD R. MOSS, 0000
MEDGAR M. MOYA, 0000
MICHAEL G. MUELLER, 0000
SUSAN K. MUELLER, 0000
JEFFREY P. MUENCH, 0000
DAVID D. MULLARKEY, 0000
JAMES J. MURRAY, 0000
BENFORD O. NANCE, 0000
KEVIN T. NAPIER, 0000
BRUCE C. NEVEL, 0000
CUONG T. NGUYEN, 0000
KHANH K. NGUYEN, 0000
MARK M. NGUYEN, 0000
THOMAS T. NGUYEN, 0000
DANIEL J. NOLL, 0000
MICHAEL K. NORBECK, 0000
MARY J. P. NORDMANN, 0000
BARBARA E. NOSEK, 0000
LORRAINE E. NUDD, 0000
ROBERT E. O'BRECHT, 0000
REBECCA M. O'BRIEN, 0000
DENNIS M. O'DELL, 0000
PAUL J. ODENTHAL, 0000
DIANNE M. OKONSKY, 0000
MARK V. OLCOTT, 0000
GREGORY J. O'LEARY, 0000
EDWARD OMRON, 0000
KEVIN R. O'NEIL, 0000
BENJAMIN L. ORCHARD, 0000
CARLOS B. ORTIZ, 0000
PETER D. PANAGOS, 0000
CHRISTINA G. PARDUE, 0000
PETER J. PARK, 0000
LORI A. PARKER, 0000
ROBIN J. PARKER, 0000
ALBERT W. PARULIS, JR., 0000
STEVEN R. PATTON, 0000
MARK D. PENNINGTON, 0000
LUIS M. PEREZ, 0000
SHELLEY K. PERKINS, 0000
KYLE PETERSEN, 0000
PATRICIA L. PETITT, 0000
BRADLEY B. PHILLIPS, 0000
HOMER C. PHILLIPS, 0000
JOHNNY L. PHILLIPS, 0000
MICHAEL E. PICIO, 0000
JOSEPH J. PICKEL, 0000
MARK R. PIMPO, 0000
DREW S. PINILLA, 0000
MATTHEW M. POGGI, 0000
WILLIAM F. POLITO, 0000
MICHAEL J. POLIZZOTTO, 0000
TANYA M. PONDER, 0000
MAY B. PORCIUNCULA, 0000
GARY J. POWE, 0000
CRAIG S. PRATHER, 0000
DAVID E. PRATT, 0000
ANDREA M. PRINCE, 0000
JACQUELINE PRUITT, 0000
TEJASHRI S. PUROHITSHETH, 0000
ARMAND T. QUATTLEBAUM, 0000
GARY E. RAFFEL, 0000
MICHAEL D. RAMOS, 0000
JOE F. RAY, 0000
SANDRA H. RAY, 0000
WILLIAM S. REAMER, 0000
KAY R. REEB, 0000
CHRISTOPHER H. REED, 0000
JENNIFER L. REED, 0000
JESSICA D. REED, 0000
PAUL L. REED, 0000
EDWARD REEDY, 0000
KEVIN J. REGAN, 0000
LAURA G. REILLY, 0000
FRANK M. RENDON, 0000
MICHAEL L. RENEGAR, 0000
CHARLES R. REUNING, 0000
STEPHEN K. REVELAS, 0000
ORLANDO RICCI, 0000
MICHAEL D. RICHARD, 0000
ANDREA M. RIES, 0000
TRACY V. RIKER, 0000
MARCIA A. RIPLEY, 0000
PAUL B. ROACH, 0000
RONALD R. ROBERSON, 0000
LOVETTE T. ROBINSON, 0000
MIRTA C. ROE, 0000
CORAZON D. ROGERS, 0000
LORI M. ROGERS, 0000
DALE M. ROHRBACH, 0000
KIMBERLY W. ROMAN, 0000
JAMES E. ROMINE, 0000
LOUIS ROSA, 0000
PATRICK ROSATO, 0000
DEBORAH E. ROY, 0000
KEVIN L. ROYE, 0000
MARK A. RUCH, 0000
MICHAEL J. RUNDELL, 0000
ANDREW A. RUSNAK, 0000
GLORIA A. RUSSELL, 0000
GREGORY G. RUSSELL, 0000
MICHAEL B. RUSSO, 0000
HERMAN M. SACKS, 0000
DEIDRE I. SALL, 0000
ROSE M. SALUKE, 0000
JOSE E. SANCHEZ, 0000
DAVID D. SANDERS, 0000
FLOYD I. SANDLIN, III, 0000
JEFFREY N. SAVILLE, 0000
MCHUGH L.A. SAVOIA, 0000
KELLY K. SAWYER, 0000
JON D. SCHAAB, 0000
JAMES W. SCHAFFER, 0000
THOMAS R. SCHLUETER, 0000
MARK A. SCHMIDHEISER, 0000
KATHRYN SCHMIDT, 0000
MICHELLE M. SCHMODE, 0000
DYLAN D. SCHMORROW, 0000
GEORGE B. SCHOELER, 0000
WILLIAM G. SCHORGL, 0000
RICHARD SCHUSTER, 0000
ANN T. SCHWARTZ, 0000
ERIK J. SCHWEITZER, 0000
BRENT W. SCOTT, 0000
KIRBY J. SCOTT, 0000
DANIEL P. SEEP, 0000
CRAIG S. SELF, 0000
GREGORY J. SENGSTOCK, 0000
JEOSALINA N. SERBAS, 0000
ERIC M. SERGIENKO, 0000
DAVID SHAPIRO, 0000
AMIT SHARMA, 0000
RANDY L. SHARP, 0000
DAVID A. SHEALY, 0000
MARIA T. SHELDRAKE, 0000
GLENN A. SHEPHARD, 0000
CRAIG D. SHEPPS, 0000
WILLIAM T. SHIMEALL, 0000
ALFRED F. SHWAYHAT, 0000
LESLIE K. SIAS, 0000
CYNTHIA S. SIKORSKI, 0000
DORANEA L. SILVA, 0000
RACHEL M. SILVER, 0000
DANIEL S. SIMPSON, 0000
STEVEN L. SIMS, 0000
PETER SINGSON, 0000
GLENDA D. SINK, 0000
PATRICK L. SINOPOLE, 0000
ROBERT F. SKJONSBY, 0000
ALMAZ A. SMITH, 0000
CLIFFORD L. SMITH, 0000
GREGORY J. SMITH, 0000
JONATHAN M. SMITH, 0000
RICHARD Q. SMITH, 0000
RICHARD S. SMITH, 0000
STUART D. SMITH, 0000
CAROL SOLOMON, 0000
DANIEL J. SOLOMON, 0000
JOHN D. SORACCO, 0000
KAREN A. SORIA, 0000
BRETT V. SORTOR, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. SOSA, 0000
DEBRA R. SOYK, 0000
JONATHAN M. STAHL, 0000
ALESSANDRO I. STAMEGNA, 0000
AARON K. STANLEY, 0000
SUSAN A. STEINER, 0000
LAURA M. STERLING, 0000
MICHAEL L. STITELY, 0000
KAREN A. STOVER, 0000
BRIAN H. SULLIVAN, 0000
SEAN D. SULLIVAN, 0000
TERRY M. SURDYKE, 0000
GEORGE N. SUTHER, 0000
JOANNE M. SUTTON, 0000
TIMOTHY M. SWAN, 0000
TRACY B. SWANSON, 0000
FREDERIC R. SYLVIA, JR., 0000
AMY M. TARBAY, 0000
GARY A. TAVE, 0000
ERIC R. TAYLOR, 0000
RICHARD C. TAYLOR, 0000
FRANLILS C. TENGASANTOS, 0000
ELIZABETH A. H. TEWELL, 0000
DEANNA L. THOMAS, 0000
KEVIN C. THOMAS, 0000
CHARLOTTE A. THOMPSON, 0000
JOHN C. THOMPSON, 0000
JANET E. THORLEY, 0000
ERIK THREET, 0000
MARY A. TILLOTSON, 0000
MARK A. TITTLE, 0000
WILLIAM D. TITUS, 0000
ERIC R. TOGNOZZI, 0000
PETER P. TOLAND, JR., 0000
WENDY J. TOOLE, 0000
DEVORAH A. TORIAN, 0000
JOSUE TORO, 0000
MEHUL TRIVEDI, 0000
JEFFREY C. TROWBRIDGE, 0000
DAVID A. TUBLEY, 0000
BARBARA D. TUCKER, 0000
DEAN A. TUFTS, 0000
DERRIC T. TURNER, 0000
DALE H. TYSOR, 0000
LINDA C. ULRICH, 0000
KEN H. UYESUGI, 0000
HAROLD W. VALENTINE, 0000
ANASTASIA F. VALENZUELA, 0000
PAUL J. VANDENBERG, 0000
STRATEN M. R. VANDER, 0000
ANDREW F. VAUGHN, 0000
KEITH K. VAUX, 0000
ALCHRISTIAN C. VILLARUZ, 0000
CAMERON L. WAGGONER, 0000
DAWN M. WAGNER, 0000
GREGORY S. WAGNER, 0000
LORI A. WAGNER, 0000
TODD L. WAGNER, 0000
LORINDA C. WAHTO, 0000
GARY J. WALKER, 0000
PETER D. WALL, 0000
THOMAS J. WALSH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. WALTON, 0000
JULIA R. WARD, 0000
ROBYN C. WARD, 0000
KARIN E. WARNER, 0000
CHARLES R. WARREN, 0000
TERESA M. WATSON, 0000
JAMES E. WATTS, 0000
DAVID K. WEBER, 0000
TIMOTHY H. WEBER, 0000
MICHAEL B. WEIGNER, 0000
STEVEN WEINSTEIN, 0000
NEIL WEISMAN, 0000
KARIN C. WELLS, 0000
KENNETH WELLS, 0000
JEFFREY G. WEYENETH, 0000
DEREK S. WHEELER, 0000
MARK S. WHEELER, 0000
THOMAS C. WHIPPEN, 0000
JOHN D. WHITE, 0000
CATHERINE E. WIDMER, 0000
BARRY E. WILCOX, II, 0000
CYNTHIA A. WILKES, 0000
ROBERT A. WILLIAMS, 0000
CHARLES E. WILSON, 0000
JEFFREY WINEBRENNER, 0000
DIANA B. WISEMAN, 0000
COLLEEN R. WITHERELL, 0000
PETER J. WITUCKI, 0000
POLLY S. WOLF, 0000
CAROL J. WOMACK, 0000
JENNIFER L. WOMELDORPH, 0000
DONALD P. WOODMANSEE, JR., 0000
ROWLAND WU, 0000
ADORADO B. YABUT, 0000
NOBORU YAMAKI, 0000
JOSHUA S. YAMAMOTO, 0000
MIL A. YI, 0000
DOUGLAS YIM, 0000
LINDA D. YOUBERG, 0000
EDWARD L. ZAWISLAK, 0000
TARA J. ZIEBER, 0000
STEVEN T. ZIMMERMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DANIEL A. ABRAMS, 0000
KEVIN H. ADAMS, 0000
PAUL M. AGUILAR, 0000
JULIE C. ALBANUS, 0000
BRIAN N. ALBRO, 0000
JOSEPH A. ALCORN, 0000
NATHAN J. ALLEN, 0000
THOMAS H. ALLEN, 0000
WILLIAM B. ALLEN, 0000
DAVID R. ALLISON, 0000
ANTHONY L. ALLOU III, 0000
RICHARD B. ALSOP, 0000
JILL C. ALSTON, 0000
TINA M. ALTON, 0000
JEFFREY M. ALVES, 0000
MICHAEL D. AMROZOWICZ, 0000
SAUNDRA L. AMSDEN, 0000
TROY A. AMUNDSON, 0000
ERIC L. ANDALIS, 0000
EDWARD L. ANDERSON, 0000
EMORY A. ANDERSON III, 0000
GREGORY L. ANDERSON, 0000
RANDALL G. ANDERSON, 0000
JOSEPH C. ANDREATTI, 0000
ANTHONY J. ANGLIN, 0000
JASON L. ANSLEY, 0000
MICHAEL R. ARMSTRONG, 0000
THOMAS W. ARMSTRONG, 0000
LOUIS W. ARNY IV, 0000
JAMES F. ARRIGHI, 0000
DAVID A. ARTETA, 0000
LAWRENCE J. ARTMAN, 0000
MONTY G. ASHLIMAN, JR., 0000
CRAIG R. BACON, 0000
MICHAEL G. BADORF, 0000
MARK O. BAILEY, 0000
JOHN M. BAILLIO, 0000
KIM W. BALDWIN, 0000
WALTER L. BANKS, 0000
DANIEL J. BARBER, 0000
TIMOTHY C. BARKDOLL, 0000
ERIC S. BARKER, 0000
HERBERT C. BARKER, 0000
KENNETH L. BARKER, 0000
JEFFREY T. BARNABY, 0000
DANELLE M. BARRETT, 0000
TERRY S. BARRETT, 0000
JAMES A. BARTELLONI, 0000
AARON C. BARTLETT, 0000
SUZANNE I. BASALLA, 0000
DONALD A. BASDEN, 0000
KENNETH D. BATES, 0000
ARTHUR J. BAYER, 0000
JAMES B. BEARD, 0000
ROBERT E. BEAUCHAMP, 0000
DOUGLAS B. BECKER, JR., 0000
KENNETH R. BECKER, 0000
VANCE A. BECKLUND, 0000
PHILIP J. BECKMAN, 0000
RICHARD S. BEGGS, 0000
MARK D. BEHNING, 0000
ALICE E. BELLAFIORE, 0000
LAURA L. BELLOS, 0000
BASILIO D. BENA, 0000
PAUL T. BENNETT, 0000
KATHLEEN A. BENSE, 0000
SHAWN M. BENTLEY, 0000
PETER D. BERARDI, 0000
HARALD BERGE, 0000
LEIF E. BERGEY, 0000
BRODERICK V. BERKHOUT, 0000
JOHN G. BERNARD, 0000
JOSE M. BERNARDO, 0000
BRENDAN D. BERRY, 0000
WILLIAM J. BILLINGSLEY, 0000
VICTOR P. BINDI III, 0000
DWAYNE V. BLACK, 0000
WILLIAM D. BLACKBURN, 0000
BRADFORD A. BLACKWELDER, 0000
ROCK E. BLAIS, 0000
CRAIG R. BLAKELY, 0000
JOHN H. BLALOCK, JR., 0000
JEFFREY E. BLANKENSHIP, 0000
LARRY D. BLAYLOCK, II, 0000
TIMOTHY A. BOCHARD, 0000
TODD S. BOCKWOLDT, 0000
ROBERT W. BODVAKE, 0000
BOBBY C. BOLT, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C. BONE, 0000
RICK D. BONEAU, 0000
BARTEL J. BOOGERD, III, 0000
BRIAN W. BOOKER, 0000
JOSEPH D. BORGIA, 0000
MICHAEL D. BOSLEY, 0000
JAMES E. BOSWELL, 0000
DENNIS R. BOYER, 0000
STEVEN J. BRACKETT, 0000
CHARLES J. BRADY, III, 0000
JON N. BRADY, 0000
MICHAEL G. BRADY, 0000
REGINALD T. BRAGGS, 0000
JAMES M. BRANDT, 0000
KEITH A. BRANNER, 0000
GUNTER I. BRAUN, 0000
RALPH R. BRAUND, III, 0000
DONALD J. BREEN, 0000
SCOTT E. BREES, 0000
BRENT M. BREINING, 0000
BENJAMIN H. BRESLIN, 0000
MARK O. BRINKERHOFF, 0000
STEPHEN J. BROKENS, 0000
CHAD D. BROWN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER H. BROWN, 0000
LINWOOD L. BROWN, III, 0000
WILLIAM A. BROWN, 0000
WOODS R. BROWN, II, 0000
PUTNAM H. BROWNE, 0000
MARK C. BRUINGTON, 0000
ANTHONY C. BRUNER, 0000
DANIEL J. BRUNK, 0000
DANIEL W. BRYAN, II, 0000
MICHEAL L. BRYANT, 0000
EDWARD A. BUERO, 0000
FRANK V. BULGES, 0000
WILLIAM A. BULIS, 0000
PAUL R. BUNNELL, 0000
ANDREW D. BURDEN, 0000
DAVID J. BURDICK, 0000
MARK A. BURGESS, 0000
BARBARA M. BURGETT, 0000
JOHN N. BURK, 0000
CARL A. BURKINS, 0000
EDWIN J. BURNS, 0000
MICHAEL P. BURNS, 0000
JASON B. BURROWS, 0000
ANGELO D. BURSTION, 0000
DERRICK J. BUSSE, 0000
ARTHUR D. BUSSIERE, 0000
EDWARD L. BUTTS, 0000
RICHARD P. BYRNES, JR., 0000
AARON M. CADENA, 0000
THOMAS M. CALLENDER, 0000
ARLENE L. CAMP, 0000
JANE E. CAMPBELL, 0000
MATTHEW G. CAMPBELL, 0000
MICHAEL S. CAMPBELL, 0000
NICOLO R. CANDELA, 0000
EUGENE C. CANFIELD, 0000
ERIC S. CARL, 0000
ROBERT B. CARLSON, 0000
DANIEL P. CARRIGG, 0000
JAMES A. CARROLL, 0000
DAVID B. CARSON, 0000
DAVID M. CARSTEN, 0000
GUY N. CARUSO, 0000
LOUIS A. CARVALHO, 0000
ALDEN E. CARVER, 0000
MATTHEW O. CASE, 0000
FRANCIS X.I. CASTELLANO, 0000
ROLAND M. CASTRO, 0000
KENNETH C. CAVES, 0000
THOMAS G. CAWLEY, 0000
FRANK K. CERNEY, 0000
THOMAS CHABY, 0000

ANNE L. CHAPMAN, 0000
WILLIAM E. CHASE, III, 0000
ERIC D. CHENEY, 0000
WILLIAM C. CHINWORTH, 0000
DANIEL J. CHISHOLM, 0000
HEEDONG CHOI, 0000
JOHN J. CHOI, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. CHRISLIP, 0000
STEVEN J. CHRISTIAN, 0000
JAMES L. CHRISTIE, 0000
CYNTHIA L. CHURBUCK, 0000
CYNTHIA C. CLARK, 0000
ROBERT J. CLARK, 0000
CARLTON T. CLEVENGER, 0000
MICHAEL CLIFFORD, 0000
MARY F. CLOE, 0000
RICHARD F. CLOUGH, 0000
DOUGLAS A. COCHRAN, 0000
ROBERT B. COCO, 0000
JAMES W. COFFMAN, 0000
HEATHER E. COLE, 0000
VERNON C. COLE, 0000
ROBERT J. COLES, JR., 0000
KEVIN P. COLLING, 0000
CHRISTOPHER N. COLLINS, 0000
TIMOTHY R. COLLINS, 0000
DANIEL M. COLMAN, 0000
WILLIAM M. COMBES, 0000
MICHAEL D. CONKEL, 0000
MICHAEL A. CONNER, 0000
JOHN P. CONSIDINE, 0000
JAMES M. CONWAY, 0000
WILLIAM K. COOKE, 0000
MICHAEL G. COONAN, 0000
WALTER A. COPPEANS, II, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. CORGNATI, 0000
RENEE R. CORNETT, 0000
ALBERT R. COSTA, 0000
BRETT M. COTTRELL, 0000
MICHAEL R. COUGHLIN, 0000
GREGORY E. COUPE, 0000
PETER T. COURTNEY, 0000
STEVEN P. COUTE, 0000
NEIL B. COVINGTON, 0000
DAVID M. COX, JR., 0000
JOHN COYNE, 0000
STEVEN E. CRABB, 0000
ROBERT W. CRAIG, JR., 0000
MARK A. CREASEY, 0000
DENNIS R. CREWS, 0000
GARY W. CRIGLOW, 0000
SPENCER J. CRISPELL, 0000
DAVID C. CRISSMAN, 0000
PATRICIA A. CRONIN, 0000
WAYNE A. CROSS, 0000
DAVID R. CROWE, 0000
TIMOTHY M. CULLEN, 0000
MARCUS CULVER, 0000
JOANNE T. CUNNINGHAM, 0000
ROGER L. CURRY, JR., 0000
MICHAEL R. CURTIS, 0000
DONALD E. J. CZARAPATA, 0000
JEFFREY J. CZEREWKO, 0000
WILLIAM A. DAHL, 0000
JENNIFER A. DANIELS, 0000
MICHAEL R. DARGEL, 0000
JOSEPH R. DARLAK, 0000
RACHEL E. DARR, 0000
KEITH B. DAVIDS, 0000
LANCE G. DAVIDSON, 0000
SCOTT D. DAVIES, 0000
CARL P. DAVIS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. DAVIS, 0000
DERRICK M. DAVIS, 0000
RICHARD W. DAVIS, 0000
TRACY S. DAY, 0000
ALAN D. DEAN, 0000
JAMES P. DEAN, 0000
JOSEPH C. DEGRANDI, 0000
RUSSELL J. DELANEY, 0000
RAYMOND R. DELGADO, III, 0000
MARK F. DEMERS, 0000
DAVID A. DEMOULPIED, 0000
THOMAS W. DENT, JR., 0000
ROBERT J. DENTON, 0000
TIMOTHY A. DERNBACH, 0000
BRUCE L. DESHOTEL, 0000
DAVID W. DEUTERMANN, 0000
MICHAEL K. DEVAUX, 0000
EDWARD W. DEVINNEY, II, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. DEWEY, 0000
ROBERT A. DEWS, JR., 0000
BRUCE A. DICKEY, 0000
NICHOLAS J. DIENNA, 0000
KAMRAN A. DIL, 0000
DAVID L. DILLENSNYDER, 0000
JERRY B. DISMUKE, 0000
JOHN A. DISSINGER, 0000
THOMAS C. DISY, 0000
DAVID J. DITALLO, 0000
DANNY J. DOBBINS, 0000
WILLIAM A. DODGE, JR., 0000
MICHAEL J. DODICK, 0000
LEONARD C. DOLLAGA, 0000
JOHN H. DONEY, IV, 0000
WILLIAM P. DONNELLY, JR., 0000
ALAN D. DORRBECKER, 0000
MICHAEL E. DOUGLASS, 0000
THOMAS R. DOWDLE, 0000
JOHN S. DOWNEY, 0000
EUGENE J. DOYLE, 0000
RICHARD M. DOYLE, 0000
STEVEN E. DRADZYNSKI, 0000
PATRICK J. DRAUDE, 0000
TIMOTHY D. DREW, 0000
JEFFREY B. DRINKARD, 0000
RICHARD J. DROMERHAUSER, 0000
TIMOTHY E. DRY, 0000
BEAU V. DUARTE, 0000
DOUGLAS R. DUCHARME, 0000
JAMES A. DUFFORD, 0000
JAY R. DUHADWAY, 0000
CHARLES H. DUNAVANT, JR., 0000
GRADY D. DUNN, 0000
PHILIP D. DUQUETTE, 0000
KENNETH E. DURBIN, 0000
JOHN A. DUVALL, III, 0000
STEPHEN DVORNICK, 0000
ROBERT P. DYE, 0000
ANTHONY G. DYER, 0000
JAMES C. DYKEMA, 0000
DAVID B. EDWARDS, 0000
MARK A. EDWARDS, 0000
TANYA M. EDWARDS, 0000
PAUL F. EICH, 0000
RONALD W. EICKHOFF, 0000
DONALD E. ELAM, 0000
DANIEL P. ELEUTERIO, 0000
JOHN D. ELLIOT, 0000
ERNEST ELLIOTT, 0000
MICHAEL E. ELMSTROM, 0000
JAIME W. ENGDAHL, 0000
ROBERT J. ENGELHARDT, 0000
JOHN E. ERICKSON, JR., 0000
TIMOTHY J. ERICSEN, 0000
THOMAS M. ERTEL, 0000
PAUL A. ESQUIBEL, 0000
JAMES M. ESQUIVEL, 0000
HILARIO A. ESTRADA, 0000
ERIK O. ETZ, 0000
MICHAEL P. EURELL, 0000
SCOTT A. EVANS, 0000
STEVEN T. EVERARD, 0000
RICK C. EYMAN, 0000
DAVID C. FADLER, 0000
SEAN P. FAGAN, 0000
ANDREW R. FALKENBERG, 0000
GARRETT J. FARMAN, 0000
JOHN M. FARWELL, 0000
ANDREW I. FATA, 0000
GERARD R. FEAGLES, 0000
HANS J. FELDMANN, 0000
JAMES A. FELTY, 0000
MICHAEL W. FENDLEY, 0000
HORACIO FERNANDEZ, 0000
JUAN G. FERNANDEZ, II, 0000
RODOLFO FERNANDEZ, 0000
SCOTT P. FIELDS, 0000
JACQUELINE R. FINCH, 0000
NANCY J. FINK, 0000
STEVEN J. FINNEY, 0000
ERIK R. FINO, 0000
EDWARD J. FIORENTINO, 0000
MICHAEL R. FISHER, 0000
MATTHEW G. FLEMING, 0000
DENNIS E. FLORENCE, 0000
MICHAEL O. FLORENCE, 0000
DAVID M. FLOWERS, 0000
MARK A. FONDREN, 0000
KEVIN S. FORD, 0000
DAVID L. FORSTER, 0000
MARK J. FORSTER, 0000
SUSAN A. FORTNEY, 0000
MAUREEN FOX, 0000
DEREK L. FRANKLIN, 0000
GEORGE F. FRANZ, 0000
BRYAN P. FRATELLO, 0000
BRETT D. FRAZIER, 0000
FREDERICK P. FREELAND, JR., 0000
RONALD W. FREITAS, 0000
MARGARET R. FRIERY, 0000
DEREK K. FRY, 0000
PIERRE A. FULLER, 0000
JOHN V. FUNN, 0000
WALLACE J. GABER, JR., 0000
GEOFFREY S. GAGE, 0000
ANGELITO R. GALICINAO, 0000
JANET A. GALLAGHER, 0000
TYSON J. GALLANDER, 0000
PETER G. GALLUCH, 0000
EDWARD M. GALVIN, 0000
TIMOTHY L. GAMACHE, 0000
LAWRENCE M. GARCIA, 0000
JOSEPH L. GARDINER, III, 0000
ROBERT T. GARRETSON, 0000
BRIAN M. GARRISON, 0000
WILLIAM P. GARRITY, JR., 0000
JOSEPH T. GARRY, 0000
MELVIN C. GATES, 0000
DOMINIC C. GAUDIN, 0000
JASON L. GEIGER, 0000
KENDALL GENNICK, 0000
BRENT K. GEORGE, 0000
BRIAN E. GEORGE, 0000
REBECA M. GIACOMAN, 0000
ARTHUR GIBB, III, 0000
ALAN E. GIBSON, 0000
ROBERT J. GIBSON, JR., 0000
MARK S. GILBERT, 0000
MICHAEL W. GILES, 0000
DONALD H. GILL, III, 0000
HOWARD J. GILLESPIE, 0000
CHARLES R. GILLUM, JR., 0000
DAVID T. GLENISTER, 0000
WALTER H. GLENN, JR., 0000
DOUGLAS K. GLESSNER, 0000
JEFFREY L. GOERGES, 0000
CHARLES P. GOOD, 0000
RICHARD A. GOODWIN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. GORDON, 0000
DANA R. GORDON, 0000
ROBERT M. GORDON, 0000
JOHN R. GORMAN, 0000
RONALD P. GORMAN, JR., 0000
WILLIAM E. GOSSETT, 0000
BRIAN J. GOSZKOWICZ, 0000
RICHARD S. GOURLEY, 0000
RAYMOND D. GOYET, JR., 0000
GLEN D. GRAEBNER, 0000
DAVID E. GRAEFEN, 0000
SCOTT A. GRAHAM, 0000
BRIAN S. GRAY, 0000
EDWARD J. GRAY, 0000
JEFFREY J. GRAY, 0000
JEFFREY W. GRAY, 0000
ROBERT J. GRAY, 0000
RICHARD A. GREEN, 0000
ROBERT A. GREEN, 0000
CONSTANCE M. GREENE, 0000
JAMES M. GREENE, 0000
GEORGE D. GREENWAY, JR., 0000
DAVID S. GRENNEK, 0000
JEFFREY M. GRIMES, 0000
GEOFFREY M. GRINDELAND, 0000
CHRISTOPHER E. GRONBECH, 0000
TIMOTHY T. GRUNDEN, 0000
WILLIAM J. GUARINI, JR., 0000
CORNELIUS M. GUINAN, 0000
ANDREW J. GWYER, 0000
RICHARD J. J. HABERLIN, 0000
GARY L. HACKADAY, 0000
MICHAEL W. HADER, JR., 0000
JOHN A. HAGA, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. HAGEN, 0000
JAMES E. HAIGH, 0000
HENRY J. HAIGLER, 0000
WILLIAM B. HALE, 0000
MICHAEL J. HALL, 0000
JOHN H. HALTOM, 0000
HARRIS B. HALVERSON, II, 0000
JEFFREY HALVORSON, 0000
JACKIE D. HAMILTON, 0000
MARK D. HAMILTON, 0000
KRIS B. HANCOCK, 0000
MICHAEL J. HANNAN, 0000
ANTHONY P. HANSEN, 0000
BENJAMIN B. HANSEN, 0000
CRAIG M. HANSON, 0000
DAVID K. HARDEN, 0000
WILLIAM T. HARDER, 0000
RHONDA K. HARDERS, 0000
WALTER O. HARDIN, 0000
REBECCA L. HARPER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. HARRIS, 0000
DANIEL A. HARRIS, 0000
DAVID J. HARRIS, 0000
ROY HARRISON, 0000
ANGELA K. HART, 0000
JOSEPH M. HART, 0000
MICHAEL T. HART, 0000
STEPHEN J. HARTUNG, 0000
PAUL HARVEY, 0000
HERBERT S. HASELL, 0000
JAMES E. HASSETT, JR., 0000
DENNIS L. HASSMAN, 0000
DAVID A. HAWKINS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. HEBERT, 0000
DAVID D. HEBERT, 0000
JONATHAN D. HECKER, 0000
CHRISTINE Y. HEISER, 0000
KURT A. HELGERSON, 0000
JOSEPH B. HENDERSON, 0000
STEVEN R. HENDRICKS, 0000
PAUL A. HERBERT, 0000
GERALD R. HERMANN, 0000
REBECCA S. HERRINGTON, 0000
JEFFREY W. HICKOX, 0000
GEOFFREY T. HICKS, 0000
GREGORY L. HICKS, 0000
JOEL T. HICKS, 0000
EDWARD F. HILER, 0000
ROBERT R. HILL, JR., 0000
KARL E. HINES, 0000
LYLE E. HOAG, 0000
ROBERT I. HOAR, JR., 0000
SCOTT P. HOARD, 0000
DAVID W. HODGES, 0000
JAMES E. HODGES, 0000
CHRISTOPHER F. HOFFER, 0000
BRIAN M. HOFFMANN, 0000
PATRICK J. HOGAN, 0000
SHAUN D. HOLLENBAUGH, 0000
ANN E. HOLLENBECK, 0000
FRANK O. HOLLEY, 0000
CRAIG A. HOLTSLANDER, 0000
WILLIAM F. HOMAN, 0000
JOHN G. HONER, 0000
GLENN M. HOPSON, 0000
DARYL S. HORNE, 0000
JENNIFER P. HORNE, 0000
STEVEN L. HORRELL, 0000
KEITH W. HOSKINS, 0000
DAVID M. HOUFF, 0000
MICHAEL D. HOUSTON, 0000
HUGH W. HOWARD III, 0000
BRIAN A. HOYT, 0000
ROBERT F. HUBBARD, 0000
JAY C. HUCK, 0000
DAVID S. HUDSON, 0000
DAVID C. HUGHES, 0000
ADAM L. HUNT, 0000
DAVID S. HUNT, 0000
MARK M. HUNT, 0000
GEORGE K. HUNTER, 0000
MICHAEL A. HURNI, 0000
GREGORY A. HUSMANN, 0000
MARIA T. ILLINGWORTH, 0000
ERIK K. ISAACSON, 0000
MARK D. JACKSON, 0000
TROY S. JACKSON, 0000
BRIAN K. JACOBS, 0000
DARRYN C. JAMES, 0000
ROBERT B. JAMES, 0000
JAMES W. JENKS, 0000
KARL E. JENSEN, 0000
MICHAEL L. JENSEN, 0000
MICHAEL H. JOHANSSON, 0000
BRENT L. JOHNSON, 0000
ERIK O. JOHNSON, 0000
KEVIN B. JOHNSON, 0000
MARK H. JOHNSON, 0000
MICHAEL C. JOHNSON, 0000
MICHAEL D. JOHNSON, 0000
GEORGE S. JOHNSTONE, 0000
MARK A. JOINES, 0000
DOREEN M. JONES, 0000
EDWARD D. JONES, 0000
ERIC R. JONES, 0000
JOHN M. JONES, 0000
STANLEY C. JONES, 0000
LARRY L. JORDAN, 0000
JEFFREY L. JOYNT, 0000
LETITIA D. JUBERT, 0000
BRIAN D. JULIAN, 0000
MICHAEL JUNGE, 0000
FREDERICK W. KACHER, 0000
EDWIN D. KAISER, 0000
JOSEPH Y. C. KAN, 0000
KYLE G. KARSTENS, 0000
DAVID L. KAYEA, 0000
FRANTZ E. KEBREAU, 0000
JOHN J. KEEGAN, 0000
JOHN A. KEETON, 0000
STANLEY O. KEEVE, JR., 0000
SEAN P. KELLY, 0000
THOMAS M. KEMPER, 0000
HERBERT L. KENNEDY, III, 0000
DAVID A. KENNETT, 0000
MARK C. KESTER, 0000
ROBERT E. KETTLE, 0000
MUHAMMAD M. F. KHAN, 0000
QUINTEN M. KING, 0000
RICHARD T. KING, 0000
JEFFREY R. KINSMAN, 0000
JAMES A. KIRK, 0000
GARY W. KIRKPATRICK, 0000
LISA A. KIRKPATRICK, 0000
RICHARD L. KIRMIS, 0000
LESA J. KIRSCH, 0000
DONALD E. KLEIN, 0000
BRYAN J. KLIR, 0000
MARY J. B. KLUG, 0000
GRANT W. KLUZAK, 0000
KENN M. KNITTEL, 0000
KEITH A. KNUTSEN, 0000
RAYMOND E. KOCHEY, 0000
STEVEN F. KOENIG, 0000
DAVID K. KOHNKE, 0000
ALAN L. KOLACKOVSKY, 0000
NILS C. KONIKSON, 0000
ERIK A. KOONCE, 0000
BRETT J. KORADE, 0000
MATTHEW A. KOSNAR, 0000
MICHAEL A. KOSTIUK, 0000
WILLIAM P. KRONEN, 0000
DEBORAH S. KRONGARD, 0000
WILLIAM R. KRONZER, 0000
JEFFREY R. KRUSLING, 0000
BRIAN W. KUDRNA, 0000
BRIAN S. KULLEY, 0000
JOHN G. KURTZ, 0000
MICHAEL A. KUYPERS, 0000
DARRELL D. LACK, 0000
NANCY S. LACORE, 0000
DAVID A. LADERER, 0000
PATRICK B. LAFONTANT, 0000
ANDREW S. LAMBLEY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER F. LAMOUREAUX, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. LANDIS, 0000
DOUGLAS M. LANGLOIS, 0000
JULIE M. LAPOINT, 0000
RUSSELL C. LARRATT, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. LATHEM, 0000
JEROME P. LAVELY, JR., 0000
THOMAS A. LAVERGHETTA, 0000
CARLTON L. LAVINDER, 0000
FREDERICK B. LAWRENCE, 0000
CRAIG P. LAWS, 0000
MORGAN D. LEAKE, 0000
JAMES H. LEE, 0000
JAMES S. LEE, 0000
KWAN LEE, 0000
MICHAEL J. LEHMAN, 0000
JEFFREY B. LEHNERTZ, 0000
MICHAEL W. LEIGH, 0000
CURTIS C. LENDERMAN, 0000
DEREK J. LENEY, 0000
DARRYL J. LENHARDT, 0000
KEVIN P. LENOX, 0000
TIMOTHY G. LEONARD, 0000
BRADLEY J. LEONHARDT, 0000
ROGER J. LERCH, JR., 0000
MICHAEL LESCHINSKY, 0000
GLEN S. LEVERETTE, 0000
MARY E. LEWELLYN, 0000
ERIC M. LEWIS, 0000
JONATHAN A. LEWIS, 0000
LLEWELLYN D. LEWIS, 0000
MICHAEL D. LEWIS, 0000
RONALD T. LEWIS, 0000
THERESA A. LEWIS, 0000
TODD A. LEWIS, 0000
WARREN N. LIPSCOMB, III, 0000
JOSEPH A. LISTOPAD, 0000
MATTHEW J. LITTLETON, 0000
KEVIN F. LIVOLSI, 0000
ADAM C. LOCHMANN, 0000
JANET E. LOMAX, 0000
KENNETH S. LONG, 0000
RUSSELL G. LONGLEY, 0000
BARBARA L. LOPEZ, 0000
ERNESTO LOZANO, 0000
EDGAR LUCAS, 0000
TIMOTHY C. LUND, 0000
JOHN A. MACDONALD, 0000
ALVAH B. MACDOUGALL, JR, 0000
CORAL L. MACINTOSH, 0000
TERRENCE MACK, 0000
RANDY N. MACTAL, 0000
PAUL J. MAGOON, 0000
JANET K. MAHN, 0000
RICHARD D. MAHONE, JR, 0000
FERNANDO MALDONADO, 0000
CHARLES W. MALONE, 0000
SHAWN P. MALONE, 0000
MICHAEL J. MANGIAPANE, 0000
JEFFREY S. MANNING, 0000
PETER M. MANTZ, 0000
STEVEN J. MARINELLO, 0000
MATTHEW J. MARONE, 0000
DAVID J. MARTAK, 0000
EUGENE T. MARTIN, III, 0000
MICHIKO J. MARTIN, 0000
STEPHEN D. MARTIN, 0000
MARK M. MARTY, 0000
CATHERINE M. MASAR, 0000
MARK D. MASKIELL, 0000
KENT R. MATHES, 0000
ALAN L. MATHIS, 0000
GARY L. MATHIS, 0000
KEVIN M. MATULEWICZ, 0000
THOMAS E. MAURER, 0000
DAVID M. MAXWELL, 0000
DONALD G. MAY, 0000
SEAN C. MAYBEE, 0000
TODD A. MAYFIELD, 0000
RAYMOND C. MCBROOM, 0000
JOHN P. MCCALLEN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. MCCARTHY, 0000
MICHAEL A. MCCARTNEY, 0000
JEFFREY W. MCCAULEY, 0000
ROBERT A. MCCORD, 0000
RICHARD C. MCCORMACK, 0000
RUSSELL S. MCCORMACK, 0000
ALLEN H. MCCOY, 0000
ANTOINETTE MCCRACKEN, 0000
MARY J. O. MCCREA, 0000
DENNIS W. MCFADDEN, 0000
KEVIN C. MCGOFF, 0000
JAMES T. MCGOVERN, 0000
KEVIN MCGOWAN, 0000
JAMES P. MCGRATH, III, 0000
JOHN P. MCGRATH, 0000
WILLIAM C. MCKINNEY, 0000
VAN P. MCLAWHORN, 0000
RICHARD A. MCLEAN, 0000
MARK W. MCMANUS, 0000
MICHAEL M. MCMILLAN, JR., 0000
PAUL R. MCMULLEN, 0000
THOMAS E. MCNERNEY, III, 0000
SCOTT G. MCWETHY, 0000
TYLER L. MEADOR, 0000
DAVID A. MEECHAN, 0000
ROBERT L. MEEKER, JR., 0000
DAVID G. MELONSON, 0000
PORFIRIO MENDOZA, JR., 0000
JOHN V. MENONI, 0000
GREGORY C. MERK, 0000
KURT C. MERKLING, JR, 0000
KEVIN D. MEYERS, 0000
KYLE T. MICHAEL, 0000
PATRICK M. MIDDLETON, 0000
WADE R. MIKULLA, 0000
JIMMIE L. MILLER, 0000
ROBERT C. MILLER, 0000
WILLIAM G. MILLER, 0000
WILLIAM K. MIMS, 0000
DALE R. MINICH, 0000
ALLEN R. MINICK, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C. MISNER, 0000
ABRAHAM K. MITCHELL, 0000
CLELAN R. MOFFITT, 0000
JOHN C. MOHN, JR., 0000
MICHAEL F. MONAGLE, 0000
DEBORA R. MONROE, 0000
GEORGE T. MOODY, 0000
RONALD F. MOODY, 0000
KEITH G. MOORE, 0000
MICHAEL R. MOORE, 0000
SCOTT D. MORAN, 0000
KIMBERLY S. MOREIRA, 0000
WILLIAM K. MORENO, 0000
REECE D. MORGAN, 0000
DAVID N. MORIN, 0000
KEVIN R. MORRISON, 0000
SHENAE Y. MORROW, 0000
DARREN V. MORTON, 0000
JON T. MOSTYN, 0000
BRIAN C. MOUM, 0000
ALBERT G. MOUSSEAU, JR., 0000
JOSEPH A. MOYER, 0000
PATRICK T. MOYNIHAN, 0000
PATRICK R. MUELLER, 0000
EDWARD D. MURDOCK, 0000
JOHN S. MURGATROYD, 0000
GERALD D. MURPHY, 0000
JOHN B. MUSTIN, 0000
SERDAR M. MUTLU, 0000
BARBARA J. MYTYCH, 0000
KENNETH E. NAFRADA, 0000
JOSEPH P. NAMAN, 0000
MICHAEL D. NASH, 0000
ANDREW W. NEAL, 0000
JEFFREY W. NEGUS, 0000
JOHN D. NELL, 0000
RICHARD M. NELMS, JR., 0000
DAVID A. NELSEN, 0000
JAMES R. NELSON, 0000
KARLA J. NEMEC, 0000
CLINTON A. NEUMAN, 0000
PAUL V. NEUZIL, 0000
JOHN P. NEWCOMER, 0000
RICHARD P. NEWTON, 0000
KENNETH A. NIEDERBERGER, 0000
DAN A. NIGHTINGALE, 0000
MICHAEL A. NIKOLICH, 0000
DAVID H. NORMAN, 0000
MICHAEL K. NORTIER, 0000
STEVEN D. NORTON, 0000
YVONNE D. NORTON, 0000
DEVON C. NUGENT, 0000
TODD M. NUNNO, 0000
HAROLD O. OAKLEY, 0000

JOHN M. O'BRIEN, 0000
SEAN P. O'BRIEN, 0000
STEPHEN F. O'BRYAN, JR., 0000
RICHARD F. O'CONNELL, 0000
JAMES S. OGAWA, 0000
ANTHONY L. OHL, 0000
KLAS W. OHMAN, 0000
MICHAEL J. O'KEEFE, 0000
HAL S. OKEY, 0000
JOHN A. OKON, 0000
PETER S. OLEP, 0000
EDWARD OLEYKOWSKI, 0000
CHRISTOPHER V. OLSON, 0000
JON R. OLSON, 0000
MICHAEL N. OLUVIC, 0000
JULIE O'ROURKE, 0000
PEDRO J. ORTIZ, 0000
MICHAEL J. OSBORN, 0000
RAYMOND B. OTT, 0000
JAMIE R. OTTO, 0000
JOHN F. OUELLETTE, 0000
CLARK J. OVERBAUGH, 0000
JOE V. OVERSTREET, 0000
CHARLES L. OWENS, 0000
PATRICK M. OWENS, 0000
HOWARD PACE, 0000
DAVID M. PADULA, 0000
DONALD F. PAGLIARO, 0000
MELODIE S. PALMER, 0000
ROBERT D. PALMER, 0000
STEPHEN E. PALMER, 0000
JOHN S. PAMER, 0000
JAMES M. PARISH, 0000
JAMES P. PARISIEN, 0000
JOHN J. PARK, 0000
GREGORY J. PARKER, 0000
MARCUS L. PARKER, 0000
SCOTT A. PARVIN, 0000
LAURENCE M. PATRICK, 0000
MICHAEL D. PATTERSON, 0000
WAYNE M. PAULETTE, 0000
LAURA J. PEARSON, 0000
DAREN R. PELKIE, 0000
MARK E. PELTON, 0000
WILLIAM P. PENNINGTON, 0000
MICHAEL J. PERRY, 0000
STEFAN PERRY, 0000
JOHN A. PESTOVIC, JR., 0000
AARON S. PETERS, 0000
RANDALL V. PETERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. PETERSON, 0000
MICHAEL C. PETERSON, 0000
TRAVIS A. PETERSON, 0000
TIMOTHY H. PFANNENSTEIN, 0000
JESSICA PFEFFERKORN, 0000
DANIEL M. PFEIFF, 0000
TUAN N. PHAM, 0000
TUNG X. PHAM, 0000
MICHAEL W. PHARES, 0000
CLIFTON T. PHILLIPS, 0000
CURTIS K.M. PHILLIPS, 0000
PETER C. PHILLIPS, 0000
ERIC R. PHIPPS, 0000
THOMAS C. PICKETT, JR., 0000
MICHAEL R. PIERCE, 0000
DAVID A. PIERSON, 0000
MICHAEL E. PIETRYKA, 0000
NOEL A. PITONIAK, 0000
DARREN R. PLATH, 0000
MICHAEL A. POLIDORO, 0000
PHILLIP W. POLIQUIN, 0000
BRYAN P. PONCE, 0000
WILLIAM R. POPPERT, 0000
MALCOLM H. POTTS, 0000
DOUGLAS A. POWERS, 0000
MICHAEL S. PRATHER, 0000
CHARLES A. PRATT, 0000
MATTHEW S. PREGMON, 0000
PERRY D. PREUETT, 0000
MICHAEL J. PREWITT, 0000
ERIC K. PRIME, 0000
MARK A. PROKOPIUS, 0000
KEVIN J. PROTZMAN, 0000
ROBERT S. PRYCEJONES, 0000
JOHN A. PUCCIARELLI, 0000
ROBERT J. PUDLO, 0000
JOSEPH P. PUGH, 0000
GERARD F. QUINLAN, 0000
PAUL D. QUINN, 0000
CHARLES E. QUINTAS, 0000
DAVID A. QUIRK, 0000
JOSEPH V. QUIRK, 0000
HERBERT R. RACE, JR., 0000
NICK C. RADNEY, 0000
SALVATORE P. RAFANELLO, 0000
JAMES R. RAIMONDO, 0000
DAVID C. RAINE, 0000
THOMAS A. RAINVILLE, 0000
TIM RAINWATER, 0000
BRUCE C. RASCHE, 0000
JAMES J. RASMUSSEN, JR., 0000
EUGENE R. RATHGEBER, 0000
JAMES D. RAULSTEN, 0000
DEAN T. RAWLS, 0000
JOSEPH P. REASON, JR., 0000
KENNETH L. REBER, 0000
DOUGLAS E. RECKAMP, 0000
CHARLES V. RED, JR., 0000
CARL S. REED, 0000
LEONARD E. REED, 0000
ROBERT M. REEVES, 0000
ANGUS P. REGIER, 0000
PHILIP N. REGIER, 0000
MICHAEL R. REIN, 0000
DENNIS W. REINHARDT, 0000
BARON V. REINHOLD, 0000
MARK W. RENAUD, 0000
CURT A. RENSHAW, 0000
GREGORY A. REPPAR, 0000
JAY S. RICHARDS, 0000
TIMOTHY P. RICHARDT, 0000
TIMOTHY E. RIEGLE, 0000
DALE C. RIELAGE, 0000
KIM H. RIGAZZI, 0000
DENNIS B. RITCHEY, 0000
WILLIAM M. ROARK, 0000
DION A. ROBB, 0000
DONALD A. ROBERTSON, 0000
JOHN D. ROBINSON, 0000
JOSEPH R. ROBSON, JR., 0000
MICHAEL R. ROCHELEAU, 0000
CINDY M. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
HECTOR L. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
JOSEPH A. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
BRENDAN P. ROGERS, 0000
NESTOR E. ROMERO, 0000
BRIAN K. ROSGEN, 0000
MARK E. RUSNAK, 0000
RONALD W. RUSSELL, 0000
TED M. RUSSELL, 0000
MICHAEL D. RUSSO, 0000
MICHAEL L. RUSSO, 0000
DAVID M. RUTH, 0000
STEVEN M. RUTHERFORD, 0000
MICHAEL S. RYAN, 0000
RICHARD J. RYAN, 0000
JOHN A. SAGER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. SAINDON, 0000
ANTHONY W. SAMER, 0000
SCOTT A. SAMPLES, 0000
DOUGLAS A. SAMPSON, 0000
BENNIE SANCHEZ, 0000
THOMAS E. SANCHEZ, 0000
MATTHEW R. SANDBERG, 0000
DAVID P. SANDERS, 0000
JOHN R. SANDERSON, IV, 0000
MALACHY D. SANDIE, 0000
GREGORY M. SANDWAY, 0000
JOHN P. SANFORD, 0000
ANTONIO P. SANJOSE, JR., 0000
EUGENE A. SANTIAGO, 0000
DAVID D. SANTOS, 0000
CARLOS A. SARDIELLO, 0000
STEPHEN K. SAULS, 0000
CHARLES SAUTER, 0000
MICHAEL A. SCHACHTER, 0000
KEITH E. SCHAFFLER, 0000
LOUIS J. SCHAGER, JR., 0000
PHILIP M. SCHEIPE, 0000
FRANK M. SCHENK, JR., 0000
GREGORY J. SCHMEISER, 0000
KENT R. SCHRADER, 0000
CHARLES W. SCHREIBER, 0000
KARAN A. SCHRIVER, 0000
THOMAS S. SCHUMACHER, 0000
MARK C. SCOTT, 0000
SHARI L. SCOTT, 0000
STEPHEN D. SCOTTY, 0000
KARLA W. SCROGGINS, 0000
SCOTT R. SENAY, 0000
ROBERT N. SEVERINGHAUS, 0000
SEAN T. SEXTON, 0000
BRYAN P. SHEEHAN, 0000
THAD M. SHELTON, 0000
STEVEN B. SHEPARD, 0000
MICHAEL E. SHERWIN, 0000
LEONARD M. SHETLER, 0000
RANDALL B. SHOCKEY, 0000
DENNIS A. SHOOK, 0000
KIRSTINA D. SHORE, 0000
JOHN J. SHRIVER, 0000
MICHAEL L. SHUMBERGER, 0000
DENNIS W. SICKEL, 0000
TODD M. SIDDALL, 0000
EDWARD A. SIMILA, 0000
DONALD B. SIMMONS, II, 0000
KEVIN S. SIMOES, 0000
DAVID C. SIMS, 0000
GREGORY J. SINGERLE, JR., 0000
MICHAEL J. SINGLETON, 0000
JOHN P. SIPES, JR., 0000
JAMES G. SIRES, 0000
DAVID M. SLIGER, 0000
JAMES F. SLOAN, III, 0000
WAYNE F. SLOCUM, 0000
TIMOTHY B. SMEETON, 0000
JEFFREY E. SMITH, 0000
MARY E. SMITH, 0000
TOMMIE C. SMITH, 0000
WESLEY A. SMITH, 0000
WESLEY S. SMITH, 0000
JOHN J. SNIEGOWSKI, 0000
ERIN G. SNOW, 0000
TAMARA L. SNYDER, 0000
MARK W. SORTINO, 0000
MICHAEL J. SOWA, 0000
ROBERT J. SPANE, II, 0000
CHARLES C SPARKS, II, 0000
PAUL C. SPEDERO, JR., 0000
JOHN M. SPEREDELOZZI, 0000
TIMOTHY W. SPITSER, 0000
PAUL B. SPOHN, 0000
TIMOTHY W. STAATS, 0000
RICHARD M. STACPOOLE, 0000
BRETTON C. STAFFORD, 0000
DORA U.L. STAGGS, 0000
DAVID J. STAMM, 0000
DOUGLAS H. STANFORD, 0000
ROBERT W. STANLEY, 0000
WILLIAM F. STARR, 0000
RICHARD B. STEELE, 0000
KIRK A. STEFFENSEN, 0000
LEIF E. STEINBAUGH, 0000
EHRICH W. STEINMETZ, 0000
JOSEPH S. STENAKA, 0000
LEE C. STEPHENS, 0000
MARC A. STERN, 0000
BENJAMIN J. STEVENS, 0000
MICHAEL J. STEVENS, 0000
WILLIAM C. STEWART, 0000
CHRISTOPHER STEYN, 0000
RONALD J. STINSON, 0000
EDWARD J. STOCKTON, 0000
JAMES G. STONEMAN, 0000
MARK R. STOOPS, 0000
KIRK A. STORK, 0000
HAROLD W. STOUT, 0000
SHELBY STRATTON, 0000
DAVID A. STREIGHT, 0000
LAWRENCE J. STROBEL, 0000
MICHAEL O. STUART, 0000
LYLE D. STUFFLE, 0000
WILLIAM C. SUGGS, 0000
JERRY L. SULLIVAN, 0000
DAVID P. SUPPLE, 0000
JOSEPH A. SURETTE, 0000
PARKER W. SWAN, 0000
SCOTT H. SWORDS, 0000
ROBERT M. SYMULESKI, 0000
JAMES S. TALBERT, 0000
JAMES B. TANNAHILL, 0000
CHRIS E. TAYLOR, 0000
GUY A. TAYLOR, 0000
JAMES E. TAYLOR, 0000
DEREK L. TEACHOUT, 0000
MICHAEL W. TEMME, 0000
THOMAS R. TENNANT, 0000
HENRY J.M. THAXTON, 0000
RICHARD A. THIEL, JR., 0000
JOHN J. THOMPSON, 0000
KENT F. THOMPSON, 0000
PAUL A. THOMPSON, 0000
RICHARD W. THOMPSON, 0000
MARK E. THORNELL, 0000
MICHAEL L. THRALL, 0000
DARCEY J. THURESON, 0000
MARIE A. THURMAN, 0000
BRADLEY S. TIDWELL, 0000
KEITH G. TIERNAN, 0000
KATHRYN E. TIERNEY, 0000
RODNEY P. TISHNER, 0000
JAMES T. TOBIN, 0000
EDWIN TOBON, 0000
WILLIAM E. TOEPPE, 0000
CHARLES J. TOLEDO, 0000
ERIC T. TOOKE, 0000
RAYMOND M. TORTORELLI, 0000
THOMAS A. TRAPP, 0000
TARA K. TRAYNOR, 0000
THOMAS J. TREACY, 0000
BRETT H. TREESE, 0000
GEORGE F. TRICE, JR., 0000
DAVID M. TRZECIAKIEWICZ, 0000
JAMES M. TURECEK, 0000
PHILLIP H. TURNER, 0000
TROY J. TWOREK, 0000
ROGER R. ULLMAN, II, 0000
MONTE L. ULMER, 0000
CHRISTINA L. ULSES, 0000
BART J. UMENTUM, 0000
LOUIS T. UNREIN, 0000
RAJAN VAIDYANATHAN, 0000
JOHN L. VALADEZ, 0000
SALLY A. VANHORN, 0000
JEFFREY T. VANLOBENSELS, 0000
ANDREW B. VARNER, 0000
MICHAEL S. VARNEY, 0000
PETER G. VASELY, 0000
JOSEPH A. VASILE, 0000
RONALD E. VAUGHT, 0000
MICHAEL VERNAZZA, 0000
GENE B. VETTER, 0000
CHARLES H. VICKERS, 0000
CLARO W. VILLAREAL, 0000
TRACY A. VINCENT, 0000
BRADLEY E. C. VOLDEN, 0000
PAUL E. VOLLE, 0000
SUZANNE H. VONLUHRTE, 0000
JOHN F. WADE, 0000
WILLIAM E. WALDIN, 0000
WILLIAM C. WALKE, II, 0000
DOUGLAS H. WALKER, 0000
JEFFREY J. WALKER, 0000
JOEL R. WALKER, 0000
PATRICK J. WALKER, 0000
JEROME WALLACE, JR., 0000
RICKEY D. WALLEY, 0000
MICHAEL E. WALLIS, 0000
JOSEPH E. WALTER, JR., 0000
JON D. WALTERS, 0000
DAVID E. WARD, 0000
JOHN M. WARD, 0000
MARGARET M. WARD, 0000
ROBERT J. WARE, 0000
DENNIS J. WARREN, 0000
DAVID H. WATERMAN, 0000
TODD M. WATKINS, 0000
JILL C. WATSON, 0000
STEVEN H. WATSON, 0000
STEVEN D. WEBER, 0000
TIMOTHY R. WEBER, 0000
ROY T. WEDGEWOOD, 0000
WILLIAM A. WEEDON, 0000
KENNETH L. WEEKS, III, 0000
ANDREW J. WEGNAN, 0000
EVAN W. WEINTRAUB, 0000
MARK W. WEISGERBER, 0000
STEVEN G. WELDON, 0000
RICHARD T. WELHAM, 0000
DANIEL A. WELLS, 0000
DEAN E. WENCE, 0000
PAUL G. WERRING, JR., 0000
THOMAS L. WESTER, 0000
EDWARD J. WETZEL, 0000
CRAIG M. WEVLEY, 0000
CHARLES R. WHEELER, 0000
JEFFREY P. WHETMAN, 0000
MICHELLE K. WHISENHANT, 0000
DAVID A. WHITE, 0000
ERASMUS D. WHITE, 0000
WILLIAM S. WHITE, 0000
SCOTT E. WHITMORE, 0000
MICHAEL V. WIECZOREK, 0000
ERIC S. WIESE, 0000
JAMES W. WIGGS, 0000
GEORGE M. WIKOFF, 0000
DEAN R. WILL, 0000
PAT L. WILLIAMS, 0000
RACQUEL M. WILLIAMS, 0000
ROBERT A. WILLIAMS, 0000
SUSAN M. WILLY, 0000
ANHTUAN N. WILSON, 0000
DEAN A. WILSON, 0000
HAROLD M. WILSON, 0000
DAVID G. WIRTH, 0000
ANDREW V. WITHERSPOON, 0000
THOMAS A. WOLFE, 0000
CYNTHIA M. WOMBLE, 0000
WILLIAM P. WOOD, 0000
HAROLD T. WORKMAN, 0000
DANIEL C. WORRA, 0000
JOSEPH W. WORTHINGTON, 0000
BRYAN R. WRIGHT, 0000
KEITH B. YAUGER, 0000
STEPHEN C. YEAGER, 0000
DONNA M. YOUNG, 0000
FORREST YOUNG, 0000
MARK V. ZABOLOTNY, 0000
CHRISTIAN W. ZAUNER, 0000
MICHEAL L. ZIEGLER, 0000
KEVIN D. ZIOMEK, 0000
JOHN M. ZUZICH, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5582:

To be lieutenant commander

MARC E. ARENA, 0000
SCOTT A. CURTICE, 0000
KENNETH C. EARHART, 0000
JOHN G. ESAREY, 0000
PRESTON S. GABLE, 0000
TAMARA J. HOOVER, 0000
CYNTHIA R. JOYNER, 0000
RACHEL L. KATZ, 0000
STEVEN A. KLOCK, 0000
THOMAS K. LEAK, 0000
ALISON C. LEFEBVRE, 0000
SCHALK J. LEONARD, 0000
IVAN K. LESNIK, 0000
EDWIN T. LONG, 0000
ANTHONY C. MILLER, 0000
EILEEN SCANLAN, 0000
PGAYLE D. SHAFFER, 0000

To be lieutenant

SETH D. ABBOTT, 0000
JAMES R. ACKERMAN II, 0000
CHRISTINE N. ACTON, 0000
PAUL R. ALLEN, 0000
ROBERT W. ANDERSON, 0000
VANESSA D. ANJARD, 0000
CARLOS A. ARANDA, 0000
JOSEPH J. ARNOLD, 0000
MARTIN F. ARRIOLA, 0000
ELIZABETH A. ASHBY, 0000
BRANTLEY F. BAIN, 0000
ANDREW B. BAKER, 0000
JONATHAN G. BAKER, 0000
JOHN M. BARRETT, 0000
GREGORY R. BART, 0000
DONNA M. BARTEE, 0000
WILLIAM H. BAXTER, 0000
JUANITA B. BELISO, 0000
JEFFREY S. BERGER, 0000
AIDA S. BERNAL, 0000
JEFFREY J. BERNASCONI, 0000
VALERIE J. BEUTEL, 0000
KRISTEN M. BIRDSONG, 0000
KAREN H. BISOGNO, 0000
WALTER D. BRAFFORD, 0000
AARON G. BRODSKY, 0000
REGINALD C. BROWN, 0000
BRADLEY D. BUCHANAN, 0000
KAREN J. BUENGER, 0000
JASON A. BURNS, 0000
BRENT A. BUSHEY, 0000
VIRGINIA L. BUTLER, 0000
RONNIE M. CANDILORO, 0000
ANN M. CASE, 0000
MATTHEW CASE, 0000
JEROME J. CHRISTENSEN, 0000
JEFFREY CLARK, 0000
LORI J. CLAYTON, 0000
SCOTT O. CLOYD, 0000
TIMOTHY A. COAKLEY, 0000
MICHAEL L. COE, 0000
LAURA K. COMSTOCK, 0000
GREGORY W. COOK, 0000
CHERYL J. COSTA, 0000
ANDREW B. CRIGLER, 0000
ROBERT J. CROW, 0000
JOHN M. DANIELS, 0000
CASSANDRA DARDENBARNES, 0000
BRADLEY S. DAVIS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D. DECLERCQ, 0000
KRISTA J. DELLAPINA, 0000
FARIA DIAZ, 0000
THOMAS L. DORWIN, 0000
BARBARA J. DROBINA, 0000
JOEL D. DULAIGH, 0000
GARETT E. EDMONDS, 0000
KAREN L. EGGLESTON, 0000
JOHN W. EJNIK, 0000
DANIEL E. ELDREDGE, 0000
LORRAINE A. ENGLISH, 0000
TODD M. EVANS, 0000
BRADLEY A. FAGAN, 0000
KRISTIN M. FERER, 0000
GERRY M. FERNANDEZ, JR., 0000
GLENN S. FISCHER, 0000
BARBARA H. FLETCHER, 0000
JOSEPH P. FLOTT, 0000
DAVID R. FOSTER, 0000
SHELLY V. FRANK, 0000
THERESA L. FRITH, 0000
ORLANDO J. FUGARO, 0000
IVAN R. GARCIA, 0000
EUGENE K. GARLAND, 0000
JOSEPH R. GARNER, 0000
BARTON J. GARRISON, 0000
MARY B. GERASCH, 0000
DAVID G. GIBBONS, 0000
ROBERT W. GNEITING, 0000
MARY F. GREER, 0000
DARRELL S. GREGG, 0000
DANIEL W. GRIPPO, 0000
DEBORAH D. HALVORSEN, 0000
LAURA E. HAMILTON, 0000
SHANNON K. HAMILTON, 0000
BARBARA T. HANNA, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. HANSEN, 0000
JONATHAN M. HARTIENS, 0000
JOSEPH M. HENRIQUEZ, 0000
WILLIAM E. HENRY, JR., 0000
MARIO P. HERRERA, 0000
LARRY W. HERTER, 0000
KATHLEEN E. HEWITT, 0000
SHEILA HEWITT, 0000
STEPHEN F. HIGUERA, 0000
LAURA J. M. HOBBS, 0000
DENISE L. HOFFMAN, 0000
EMILIE R. HOOK, 0000
DEREK O. HOOKS, 0000
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, IV, 0000
JULIE A. HUNT, 0000
CHARLES E. HURST, 0000
LEON R. JABLOW, IV, 0000
RONNY L. JACKSON, 0000
JEFFREY J. JAKUBOSKI, 0000
CHRISTINA A. JAMIESON, 0000
ALBERT S. JANIN, IV, 0000
KARON V. JONES, 0000
ULETHA M. JONES, 0000
PAUL C. KAPFER, 0000
STEPHANIE A. KAPFER, 0000
FRANK T. KATZ, 0000
DUANE M. KEMP, 0000
SHARI D. KENNEDY, 0000
YOLANDA KERN, 0000
ANDREW S. KIM, 0000
KEVIN E. KING, 0000
TROY L. KING, 0000
REBECCA A. KISER, 0000
MARK F. KLEIN, 0000
MARCI C. LABOSSIERE, 0000
SUSAN D. LABOY, 0000
WILLIAM S. LARAGY, 0000
CINDY L. LASWELL, 0000
VERONICA A. LAW, 0000
KATRINA M. LEEK, 0000
DENISE M. LEVELING, 0000
ANDREW D. LEVITZ, 0000
MICHAEL LIBERATORE, 0000
BRIAN R. LOMAX, 0000
KEVIN T. LONG, 0000
TRACY L. LOPEZ, 0000
EVA M. LOSER, 0000
PETER M. LUDWIG, 0000
JOHN S. LUGO, 0000
MICHAEL P. LYNN, 0000
JENNIFER J. MACBAIN, 0000
DENNIS B. MACDOUGALL, 0000
IAN A. MACKINNON, 0000
CARL H. MANEMEIT, 0000
PAUL A. MANNER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. MANNION, 0000
DAVID M. MARTIN, 0000
DWAYNE B. MARYOTT, 0000
MICHAEL R. MAULE, 0000
CAREN L. MC CURDY, 0000
ERIC J. MC DONALD, 0000
STUART R. MCKENNA, 0000
CATHLEEN M. MC QUADE, 0000
PATRICK G. MELER, 0000
PHILIP B. MELTMAR, 0000
ROSARIO P. MERRELL, 0000
ANDREW P. MESHEL, 0000
XANTHE R. MIEDEMA, 0000
JULIE K. MILLER, 0000
PAUL C. MILLER, 0000
ANN K. MINAMI, 0000
CHAD A. MITCHELL, 0000
MONICA E. MITCHELL, 0000
CARLOS MONTANEZ, 0000
JOHN P. MOON, 0000
KARIN S. MOREAN, 0000
MARK S. MORRELL, 0000
DANIEL MORITSCH, 0000
SYLVIA I. NAGY, 0000
JAMES A. NEUMAN, 0000
THANH V. NGUYEN, 0000
PAMELA E. NICKRAND, 0000
JEREMY C. NIKEL, 0000
JOHNNY M. NILSEN, 0000
EDWARD B. O'BRIEN, III, 0000
NATHAN R. OGLE, 0000
JANICE K. O'GRADY, 0000
SHIRLEY E. OGUIN, 0000
JOHN A. OLIVEIRA, 0000
CLYDE D. OWEN, 0000
ERIC OXENDINE, 0000
JERRI A. PALMER, 0000
PHILIP D. PARKER, 0000
DOUGLAS K. PARRISH, 0000
JUSTICE M. PARROTT, 0000
JOE T. PATTERSON, III, 0000
BETHANY L. PAYTON, 0000
DONALD D. PEALER, 0000
BARTON L. PHILPOTT, 0000
JOSE M. PI, 0000
ROBERT D. POLLEY, JR., 0000
BRIAN F. PRENDERGAST, 0000
COLE C. PRIZLER, 0000
PAUL A. PURDY, JR., 0000
EVELYN M. QUATTRONE, 0000
MARK K. RAKESTRAW, 0000
LINDA I. RAKOSNIK, 0000
DALE D. RAMIREZ, 0000
DEIDRA M. RAMOS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. REDDIN, 0000
DAVID C. REITER, 0000
JOANNA M. REITER, 0000

JANELLE A. RHODERICK, 0000
JEFFREY P. RICHARD, 0000
TIMOTHY R. RICHARDSON, 0000
SHAWN A. RICKLEFS, 0000
GEORGE P. RILEY, 0000
JOHN ROROS, 0000
KEVIN S. ROSENBERG, 0000
PAUL W. ROUSSEAU, 0000
ROBIN L. ROWEADLER, 0000
BRET A. RUSSELL, 0000
REGINALD T. RUSSELL, 0000
SCOTT A. RUSSELL, 0000
PHILIP J. RYNN, 0000
LINDA M. SALEH, 0000
SCOTT A. SAMPLES, 0000
JOSE L. SANCHEZ, 0000
PETER M. SCHEUFELE, 0000
GRACE K. SEABROOK, 0000
SHERRY J. SEAGRAM, 0000
DAVID E. SEMON, 0000
JAMES L. SHELTON, 0000
LATANYA E. SIMMS, 0000
STEPHEN D. SIMS, 0000
TANYA B. SINCLAIR, 0000
JOHN P. SMETAK, 0000
CAROL A. SMITH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. SMITH, 0000
ERIN G. SNOW, 0000
GEOFFREY W. SPENCER, 0000
MARK O. STEARNS, 0000
MICHAEL J. STEFFEN, 0000
TODD M. STEIN, 0000
MELISSA R. STERNLICHT, 0000
TIMOTHY D. STONE, 0000
TIFFANY J. STYLES, 0000
SANDRA M. SUDDUTH, 0000
JOHN D. SULLIVAN, 0000
CHARLES D. SWIFT, 0000
DEANNA L. THOMAS, 0000
CARLA K. THORSON, 0000
CONNIE L. TODD, 0000
TOBEY A. TOLBERT, 0000
VALORIE A. TOTH, 0000
JENNIFER L. TREDWAY, 0000
JOANNE M. TUIN, 0000
JEFFREY F. TULLIS, 0000
PATRICK O. TURPIN, 0000
SUSAN R. TUSSEY, 0000
LISA M. UMPHREY, 0000
JOHN E. URBAN, 0000
JODY A. VANKLEEF, 0000
NIEVA K. VANLEER, 0000
JOHN F. VANPATTEN, 0000
JOHN A. VAZZANO, 0000
ESTELA I. VELEZ, 0000
CHERRI L. VILHAUER, 0000
DAWN M. WAGNER, 0000
KURTT H. WALTON, 0000
CHAD E. WEBSTER, 0000
TYNAH R. WEST, 0000
WENDY WIESE, 0000
BARRY E. WILCOX, II, 0000
JACK E. WILCOX, 0000
FLOYD M. WILLIAMS, JR., 0000
SHENEKIA D. WILLIAMS, 0000
DOUGLAS A. WINEGARDNER, 0000
LISA M. WING, 0000
THERESA M. WOOD, 0000
REGINALD G. WYCOFF, JR., 0000
NICOLAS D.I. YAMODIS, 0000
DEBRA L. YNIGUEZ, 0000
LENORA J. YOUNG, 0000
KIM T. ZABLAN, 0000
JANICE E. ZERISHNEK, 0000

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

CYNTHIA J. ANDRESEN, 0000
REID B. APPLEQUIST, 0000
CLAUDE W. ARNOLD, JR, 0000
STEVEN A. ATTENWEILER, 0000
JOHANNES M. BAILEY, 0000
SAMANTHA D. BALDWIN, 0000
DEETTA L. BARNES, 0000
MELISSA A. BARNETT, 0000
ERNESTO B. BARRIGA, 0000
SUZANNE L. BLANTON, 0000
DONALD W. BOWKER, 0000
DONNA N. BRADLEY, 0000
THOMAS R. BROADWAY, JR., 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. BROWN, 0000
ELIZABETH M. BROWN, 0000
ROBERT B. BUCHANAN, 0000
KELLY M. CANTLEY, 0000
JOHN E. CARROLL, II, 0000
STEVEN B. CARROLL, 0000
YONG K. CHA, 0000
RALPH C. CICCI, JR., 0000
CHRISTOPHER F. CIGNA, 0000
MARK A. CLARK, 0000
RICHARD A. CLARK, 0000
LANA M. COLE, 0000
BILLIE D. COLEY, 0000
DANIEL W. COOK, 0000
JON C. CRUZ, 0000
DAVID A. CZACHOROWSKI, 0000
EILEEN J. DANDREA, 0000
JOEL D. DAVIS, 0000
CONSTANTINO F. DELACRUZ, 0000
WHITNEY E. DELOACH, 0000
WILBER C. DELORME, 0000
WILLIAM F. DENTON, 0000
NAOMI N. DOMINGO, 0000
PAUL B. DOUGHERTY, 0000
DAVID E. DOYLE, 0000
FRANK L. DUGIE, 0000
ROBERT H. DURANT, 0000
JOHN E. EAVES, JR., 0000
MELISSA A. FARINO, 0000
STEFAN C. FARRINGTON, 0000
PAUL A. FEIKEMA, 0000
PAUL S. FERMO, 0000
LONNIE L. FIELDS, 0000
EARL D. FILLMORE, 0000
JEAN F. FISAK, 0000
KENNETH L. FLAHERTY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER G. FOLLIN, 0000
PATRICK M. FOSTER, 0000
KEITH A. FREESE, 0000
RHONDA A. L. GABEL, 0000
ORLANDO GALLARDO, JR., 0000
NATASHA A. GAMMON, 0000
DANIEL G. GARCIA, 0000
JAYSON L. GARRELS, 0000
MARK R. GARRIGUS, 0000
JOHN D. GATES, 0000
WILLIAM P. GILROY, 0000
BRADLEE E. GOECKNER, 0000
LEON M. GUIDRY, 0000
MARY E. GWINN, 0000
ELIZABETH M. HAMILTON, 0000
JOHN P. HAMILTON, 0000
KENT B. HARRISON, 0000
JEREMY J. HAWKS, 0000
STEPHEN C. HAYES, 0000
JERRY R. HAYWALD, 0000
JOSHUA J. HENRY, 0000
BRETT C. HERSHMAN, 0000
BRENT A. HOLBECK, 0000
JOHNNIE M. HOLMES, 0000
RICARDO F. HUGHES, 0000
ALEXANDER K. HUTCHISON, 0000
ROLANDO R. IBANEZ, 0000
DENNIS J. JACKO, 0000
TEDDI M. JOHNSON, 0000
GREGORY S. JONES, 0000
WILLIAM L. JONES, 0000
NICHOLAS S. KAKARAS, 0000
MICHAEL T. KELLEY, 0000
ROBERT D. KETCHELL, 0000
JERRY A. KING, 0000
TERESA M. KRONENBERGER, 0000
KEVIN A. LANE, 0000
JASON R. LEACH, 0000
GREGORY J. LELAND, 0000
PAUL S. LETENDER, 0000
PAUL A. LOESCHE, 0000
LAVERNE R. LOWRIMORE, 0000
SHELTON L. LYONS, II, 0000
DEBORAH L. MABEY, 0000
MICHAEL A. MARSTON, 0000
CLYDE D. MARTIN, JR., 0000
DAVID H. MCALISTER, 0000
JAMES E. MCCULLOUGH, II, 0000
DEIRDRE M. MCGOVERN, 0000
CHAD E. MCKENZIE, 0000
KRISTOFER D. MICHAUD, 0000
BRIAN T. MUTTY, 0000
GINO S. NARTE, 0000
CHARLES R. NEU, 0000
DANIEL L. NORTON, 0000
COLLEEN M. O'NEILL, 0000
KEVIN J. OPPLE, 0000
TROY D. OSTEN, 0000
STEVEN J. PARKS, 0000
JIMMY F. PATE, JR., 0000
ROBERT D. PEREZ, 0000
JOHN M. PETHEL, 0000
BRYAN A. PETTIGREW, 0000
ROBERT R. PHILLIPS, 0000
KEMAL O. PISKIN, 0000
JEFFREY J. POOL, 0000
NATHANAEL B. PRICE, 0000
JAMES G. REESE, JR., 0000
VIRGLE D. REEVES, 0000
CRAIG A. RETZLAFF, 0000
MARK C. RICE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. RINAUDO, 0000
TOMMY RODRIGUEZ, 0000
JENNIFER K. RUEGG, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. SACCO, 0000
JAIME J. SALAZAR, 0000
SONDRA M. SANTANA, 0000
MATTHEW I. SAVAGE, 0000
ZOAH SCHENEMAN, 0000
KENNETH E. SCHEUERMANN, 0000
RICHARD M. SCHMIDT, 0000
STEVEN K. SCHULTZ, 0000
JOEL K. SENSENIG, 0000
JOHN O. SIMPSON, 0000
SHEILA A. SMITH, 0000
STEVEN J. STASICK, 0000
ANDY S. STECZO, 0000
JAMES J. STEVENS, 0000
NANCY L. STEWART, 0000
JOHN D. STONER, JR., 0000
ANDREA L. STUHLMILLER, 0000
GRETCHEN M. SWANSON, 0000
DONALD T. SYLVESTER, 0000
ROBERT THOMAS, 0000
ERIK M. THORS, 0000
MICHAEL J. TODD, 0000
MICHAEL A. TORRES, 0000
KHIEM Q. TRAN, 0000
KAREN D. TREANOR, 0000
ANDREW E. TUTTLE, 0000
BENTON K. VAUGHAN, III, 0000
AARON J. WAGNER, 0000
LISA L. WAND, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. WEAVER, 0000
GEORGE A. WESTLAKE, 0000
DAVID L. WHITLEY, 0000
ANN WILLIAMS, 0000
DANNY A. WILLIAMS, 0000
TRA D. WILLIAMS, 0000
MICHAEL L. WITHERSPOON, 0000
NORMAN B. WOODCOCK, 0000
SARAH L. WRIGHT, 0000
MICHAEL D. YOUNG, 0000

To be ensign

DAVID R. ARNING, 0000
PATRICK J. FORD, 0000
GARY HULING, 0000
SHIKINA M. JACKSON, 0000
MICAH D. NEWTON, 0000
ANTONIO J. SCURLOCK, 0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 13, 1999:

THE JUDICIARY

MARYANNE TRUMP BARRY, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT.

DAVID N. HURD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY KIRSTEN FRENCH AND RICHARD K. EAMER

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dorothy Kirsten French and Richard K. Eamer, co-founders of The John Douglas French Alzheimer's Foundation; and to Dennis F. Holt for his philanthropic work in advancing the research of causes of Alzheimer's disease.

I am happy to report that on Sunday, October 24, 1999, The Founding Associates will celebrate its 15th anniversary during a special ceremony that will honor Dennis F. Holt, Chairman and CEO of Western International Media, Inc., and an active member of the Board of Directors of The John Douglas French Alzheimer's Foundation. Mr. Holt has engaged in philanthropic work to advance research in the causes of Alzheimer's Disease. He has donated $2 million of broadcast time towards public service announcements in 24 markets. He is a distinguished leader in changing the nature of advertising and media buying practices. Mr. Holt is an inspiration in perseverance and triumph over adversity. He demonstrates an uncommon commitment to help others and exemplifies this commitment with The John Douglas French Alzheimer's Foundation.

Dorothy French and Richard Eamer co-founded The John Douglass French Alzheimer Foundation to honor Dorothy's husband Dr. John Douglas, co-founder of UCLA's Brain Research Institute, and who sadly became a victim of Alzheimer's disease himself in 1989.

Since 1983, the John French Alzheimer's Foundation has been dedicated to finding the cause and cure of Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia. The foundation has raised more than $18 million through its fundraising efforts, and has helped to fund the work of such noted scientists as Dr. Stanley B. Pruisner, a 1997 Nobel Laureate.

Alzheimer's is one of the most costly and debilitating of illnesses, afflicting more than four million Americans every year, slowly robbing them of their memory and ability to care for themselves. As our nation ages, and more and more families face this terrible disease, the need for organizations such as the John Douglas French Alzheimer Foundation will be increasingly important. I am pleased Congress has in recent years substantially increased the nation's investment in medical research. For the current budget year, fiscal 1999, Congress has approved a budget of $15.6 billion, a 14 percent increase, for the National Institute of Health, which leads the nation's biomedical research effort. This increase will fund important research into understanding and treating Alzheimer's and other diseases.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in honoring Dorothy French, Richard Eamer, and Dennis Holt, three citizens committed to the finding of a cure for Alzheimer's disease and improving the lives of their fellow Americans.

TRIBUTE TO BUDDY G. BELSHE

HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Buddy G. Belshe, who has completed his 50th year as an ocean lifeguard in Orange County, California.

Buddy Belshe, a longtime lifeguard with the City of Newport Beach, California, has devoted his life to preserving the lives of others. Beginning his career in 1950, he continues to serve today working with and overseeing the number of men and women who keep our Southern California beaches safe and protected.

In addition to his service to the residents and visitors of Newport Beach, Buddy's accomplishments also include his longtime service with the United States Lifesaving Association, where he has served as both Vice President and Secretary, and on the board of the California State Lifesaving Association.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring Buddy G. Belshe. It is fitting that all of us join with the family, friends, and the community of Newport Beach, California in recognizing his lifelong service and dedication to public safety.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 9, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, once again, the Republican leadership is attempting to cut housing programs that assist our nation's most vulnerable citizens. In the midst of one of the greatest economic expansions our country has ever known, we should be doing everything we can to help people move from homelessness to home ownership, and public housing is critical in this transition.

All the talk about revitalization and economic integration becomes mere rhetoric when we see such drastic funding cuts proposed for our nation's most impoverished communities.

While the President's budget would have increased vital investments in families and communities by $2 billion, the Republican version of this bill, if passed, would have a devastating impact on these same communities nationwide.

In my district, Florida's third, the effects of these cuts could prove disastrous. Jacksonville stands to lose more than $5 million if the VA–HUD bill passes, Orlando could lose $1.9 million, and Daytona could lose $842,000.

These cuts would be devastating to the families that rely on public housing services. The number of families with worst case housing needs—defined as paying more than 50 percent of income on rent—remains at an all-time high. Furthermore, families in the transition from welfare to work have a special need for assistance since housing is typically their greatest financial burden.

The slight increase in section 8 funding is not enough, since virtually all other housing programs designed to help the needy, such as HOPE VI, Community Development Block Grants, and of particular concern to me are the funding cuts for Brownfields clean up and development, and lead based paint abatement, especially since there is a new superfund site in my district!

Overall, the cuts represent an estimated 156,000 fewer housing units for low-income families; 16,000 homeless families and persons with AIDS who will not receive vital housing and related services; and 97,000 jobs that will not be generated in communities that need them.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2684.

CONGRATULATING PHILIP J. McLEWIN ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Philip J. McLewin on the occasion of his retirement as president of the Bergen County Central Trades and Labor Council of the AFL–CIO. Mr. McLewin has been a dedicated and respected labor leader in northern New Jersey, fighting for the rights of working men and women as they seek to achieve the American dream. Mr. McLewin exhibited progressive leadership, building coalitions and consensus among labor groups and working with business management to achieve the goals of employers and employees alike. His success was symbolic of a time when the industrial revolution had blossomed into a spirit of cooperation between labor and management that helped give the United States the leading economy of the world.

Mr. McLewin actively participated in the Council's activities for 25 years. He began in

1974 as a labor educator, teaching worker education courses at Ramapo College, where he is still employed as a professor of economics. He was elected president of the council in 1983 and served 16 years before his retirement this year.

By bringing together affiliated local unions, Mr. McLewin was able to form a unified and highly effective voice for labor in Bergen County. Under his leadership, the council played a key role in endorsing and electing political candidates, lobbying for worker-friendly legislation and fighting against opponents of labor. He rekindled the grass roots activism of trade unionists in Bergen County in support of workers on strike, those whose jobs were threatened by plant closings or privatization, and supporting efforts to organize new unions or expand union membership. Under his tenure, the number of local unions affiliated with the Council more than doubled and participation of local unions in the Council's activities increased tenfold.

One of Mr. McLewin's proudest accomplishments was the establishment of the United Labor Agency of Bergen County, which assists union members with individual and family social service needs.

AFL–CIO President John Sweeney recognized Mr. McLewin's leadership when he appointed him to the 24-member National Central Labor Council Advisory Committee in 1995 to help develop the regeneration of labor councils across the country.

In addition to heading the Bergen County Central Trades and Labor Council, Mr. McLewin was vice president of the New Jersey Industrial Council and a former president of American Federation of Teachers Local 2274. He was a member of the AFT bargaining team and state council.

Mr. McLewin has been an active leader in the local community, serving on the board of directors for New Jersey Citizen Action, on the leadership team of the Bergen County Workforce Investment Board and working extensively with the United Way.

Born in Portland, Maine, he moved to San Diego at the age of six. He is a graduate of San Diego State University and holds a master's degree in economics from the University of California at Riverside and his doctorate in economics from Cornell University. He moved to Bergen County in 1974. He and his wife, Lynne, have been married 37 years and have two sons.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Mr. McLewin on his successful career and in wishing him the best in his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO IRA FREEMAN

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. SHERMAN, and I, rise to pay tribute to our good friend, Ira Freeman, who is this year's recipient of the Annual Achievement Award from Action Democrats of the San Fernando Valley. Ira Freeman has built his life on the proposition that we are put on earth to help others. The list of organizations, associations and causes that have benefitted from Ira's tireless activism is almost as enormous as his heart. We have no idea how he has managed—for nearly 40 years—to balance his busy and distinguished career with his myriad civic and political activities.

In 1964, Ira opened Key Pharmacy—a community resource pharmacy—in North Hollywood. While building a very successful business, he also played a leadership role within his profession. From 1972 to the present, Ira has served as a board member of the Pharmacists Professional Society of the San Fernando Valley. He is a member, a past-Treasurer and a past-President of the statewide Pharmacists Political Action Committee and from 1996 to 1998 was Chief Financial Officer of the United Pharmacists Network.

A tireless booster of his community, Ira served as President of the Sun Valley Chamber of Commerce in 1985 and again in 1988. He has been a member of the Sun Valley Chamber Board for 14 years, and was appointed by Assemblyman Bob Hertzberg to his Small Business Advisory Commission.

Ira loves politics. He is a voter, contributor, fund raiser, volunteer and unofficial advisor. Virtually every campaign in the San Fernando Valley has benefitted from Ira's hard work and generosity. He has served on the Leadership Council of the Democratic Party of the San Fernando Valley, and is a member of Action Democrats, Democrats for Change and the Sherman Oaks Democratic Club.

Ira gives his talents and resources to charitable causes ranging from AIDS to Diabetes. He is a contributing member to The Executives, a support group for the Jewish Home for the Aging and works with the Fair Housing Council of the San Fernando Valley.

Ira has been awarded the Circle of Friends Award by the Juvenile Justice Connection Project (1987), the Dareen McDonald Award from the Independent Living Centers of Southern California (1994) and the Helen and Sam Greenberg Award, as well as recognition from the California Pharmacists and the Sun Valley Chamber of Commerce.

We ask our colleagues to join us in saluting Ira Freeman, whose selfless acts and dedication to this community inspire us all. We are proud to be his friend.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD NOT HAVE GRANTED CLEMENCY TO TERRORISTS

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 9, 1999

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 180, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should not have granted clemency. This resolution is largely another attempt to smear the policy of an Administration that has been under scrutiny for quite some time now. I will not support transferring a battle regarding our Administration's scruples into attempts to reflect a similar suspicious light on our Administration's policy.

This resolution was not reviewed by the Judiciary Committee, which is the Committee of referral. In fact, the resolution was not even submitted until one day before the vote. Most of the Puerto Rican nationalists who were granted clemency have already served at least 19 years of their sentences. Our Constitution clearly states that the President has the sole and unitary power to grant clemency. It does so because the President is uniquely positioned to consider the law and facts that apply in each request for clemency. We, as individual Members of Congress, have neither the time nor the staff to individually review the Administration's belief that the sentences were out of proportion with the offenses. For this precise reason, bills are referred to the committees that can provide such expertise. It is a shame that we would not take the time to allow expert evaluation of the level of merit behind this resolution and refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee.

This is neither the time nor the topic for political pandering. Terrorism and clemency are matters to be taken very seriously. They are not to be used for political games. I will not support turning the fight against terrorism into a political game, and that is why I am voting against this bill on final passage.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 9, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Veterans Equitable Resources Allocation (VERA) is an excellent system for directing veterans health care dollars to the states where our veterans receive their care. Since its inception in 1997 the VERA program has helped to more properly and equally distribute the scarce dollars we provide for our veterans healthcare.

My state of Florida has the second largest and oldest veterans population in the nation, and continues to suffer from lack of funding for its veterans programs. We recently had a veterans nursing home that was built and ready to care for our elderly veterans but could not open because there were no operating costs. We have a great state and we welcome all our new residents with open arms, but we must have the funds to provide for these new residents.

The VERA program was developed to more equally distribute needed funds to our veterans. The program is working and should be allowed to continue to work for our veterans. We've already shortchanged our veterans in this VA–HUD Appropriations. Lets not do it

again. I ask my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 9, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give voice to the concerns of scientists and other citizens of southern Arizona who have grave misgivings about the funding decisions in this bill. As an appropriator and a subcommittee Chair myself, I understand and sympathize with the gentleman from New York on the difficulty of writing a bill under the caps by which we are currently governed.

However, as the elected representative of some of this country's pre-eminent scientists, I must speak on their behalf and relate to you the impact these funding cuts for basic research could have.

Many of you followed the success a year ago when the Mars Pathfinder mission landed on the Martian surface on the 4th of July. The camera that provided the stunning images of that new world was built at the University of Arizona and the world was watching. in that project we proved we could do significant science for a fraction of the cost and it was the front-page story around the world.

This project was a dramatic example of the core, basic research accomplished by our nation's universities and grant based research. Many of these programs are funded under NASA's Science, Aeronautics and Technology Account. In this bill, that account is funded at $628 million, more than half a billion dollars below last year's budget.

Competitively awarded space science grants in every state in the nation will be drastically cut, with the biggest cuts coming in California, Maryland, Arizona, Colorado, Texas, Alabama and Pennsylvania.

In addition to cuts to space science programs, the subcommittee's decision to cut $150 million from the Earth Observing System (EOS) program and an additional $50 million from the EOS Data Information System (EOSDIS) significantly impairs our ability to understand our environment.

These cuts will make it difficult, if not impossible, to process data we are collecting from Landsat 7 and that we will collect on the EOS series of satellites. It makes little sense to have spent billions of dollars building these satellites over the last decade and fail to provide the funds to analyze the data they collect.

And the impact from this lack of data analysis will hurt important sectors of our economy; Farmers won't gain advance warning of oncoming severe weather like droughts or flooding; coastal areas like the southeastern U.S. won't be able to anticipate the severity of hurricanes.

In summary, these cuts in NASA's science programs will set back our nation. They are not balanced. They pose a great threat to our future competitiveness in research and technology.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting some of the amendments to this bill which will help restore some of the funding cut by this bill. However, I am still concerned about the level of funding and ask the chairman of the VA–HUD Subcommittee to continue to work to find funds to fully support basic, core research.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Nadler amendment providing $305 million for 50,000 Section 8 housing vouchers for low- and moderate-income families.

Just last year Congress recognized the critical need for housing by passing the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act, which authorized 100,000 new Section 8 vouchers. The Majority's appropriation provides zero funding for these vouchers—essentially turning our work of last year into an empty promise.

In my district in New York City alone, the Majority's appropriation would support housing for 375 fewer lower-income families than in FY 1999.

HUD recently reported that the wait for public housing has increased by 50 percent over the past 2½ years. Before we race ahead with budget-busting tax cuts, we must assist families living in substandard housing.

Join me in supporting the Nadler amendment and build on our work of last year.

TRIBUTE TO RAMON SANCHEZ

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to commend one of Northwest Indiana's most distinguished citizens, Ramon Sanchez, of Merrillville, Indiana. Mr. Sanchez will be honored by the Lake County Council for his exemplary and dedicated service to our community on September 14, 1999.

Born in Villalba, Puerto Rico, Mr. Sanchez is the eldest of four children born to the late Francisco and Candida Sanchez. Ramon, fondly referred to as ''Ray'' by his many friends, has been an active and visible leader in the Hispanic community since his arrival to the United States in 1951.

Mr. Sanchez began his career in the United States as a steelworker at Inland Steel, a job from which he retired in 1989 after 38 years of service. From 1972–1995, he served as Chief Bailiff with the Gary City Court. Most recently, Ramon Sanchez retired from the Merrillville Town Court after two years of service as Bailiff.

Outside of his professional career, Ramon Sanchez has devoted a large portion of his life to the betterment of Northwest Indiana. Mr. Sanchez is committed to improving the standard of living in Northwest Indiana, particularly in the Hispanic community. He has played an instrumental role in representing the needs of the community and has been an advocate of minority rights. Mr. Sanchez is a well recognized and respected figure in Northwest Indiana's political arena, having served the City of Gary in various capacities including a 20 year term as precinct committeeman. He has spearheaded various political campaigns and is affiliated with numerous civic organizations throughout Northwest Indiana.

While serving the community has always been an extremely important part of Mr. Sanchez's life, there can be no comparison to the dedication he has for his family. Ramon and his loving wife, Nancy, have raised four wonderful children, Amy, Ingrid, Mishelle, and Zayda. He is also a proud grandfather of nine grandchildren which provide an eternal source of joy and love for both he and his wife.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Ramon Sanchez for his dedication, service, and leadership to the people of Indiana's First Congressional District. Northwest Indiana's community has certainly been rewarded by the true service and uncompromising dedication displayed by Mr. Ramon Sanchez.

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD ROUSE

HON. DAN MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to honor a gentleman who dedicated over a quarter of a century in service to Veterans in Manatee County, Florida. I am sad to report that on May 11 of this year, my district lost one of its most respected and valued citizens, Harold Rouse.

Harold Rouse was a Vietnam Veteran and dedicated public servant. He served the veterans and their families through his position as the Manatee County Veterans Service Officer. He was a champion of disabled veterans and a leader in the veterans community. I doubt anyone can remember an occasion honoring veterans at which Harold wasn't present. His enthusiasm, vigor, and heartfelt love for veterans was evident in everything he did. Harold was instrumental in establishing the ''Walkway of Memories'' at the Manatee Veterans Monument Park—the location of Manatee County's veterans' events.

It is especially fitting that today's remarks coincide with the opening of the Manatee County Veterans' Clinic. While Harold cannot be on hand for the grand opening of the clinic, his legacy will be evident in the service provided to the deserving veterans of the area.

Harold Rouse was a gentleman, a friend, a family man and a truly dedicated patriot. He is sorely missed and I consider it a personal honor to have known him.

CHILDREN'S ASTHMA RELIEF ACT OF 1999

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 2840, Children's Asthma Relief Act of 1999, legislation providing a comprehensive, community-based response to the increasingly serious incidence of childhood asthma. I am pleased that my colleague, HENRY WAXMAN, is the original cosponsor of this bill.

Chronic asthma is a serious and growing health problem confronting our nation, and particularly our nation's children. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that 6.4 percent of our population report having asthma—a dramatic 75-percent increase over the last two decades. Childhood asthma has increased even more dramatically—over 160 percent since 1980—and is the most common childhood chronic disease. It is particularly prevalent among the urban poor, in all likelihood because of lack of access to health care and the high number of allergens in the environment. Asthma deaths have tripled over the past two decades, despite improvements in clinical treatment. In my own state, 5.7 percent of the population, or 542,300 Michiganders suffer from asthma.

The legislation we are introducing today will help us marshal and coordinate our resources to much more effectively wage war against this significant threat to our nation's health. First, the bill creates a $50 million program within the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant program to assist communities in areas with a high prevalence of childhood asthma and a lack of access to medical care to establish treatment centers. In addition to providing medical care on site and in various areas of the community through ''breathmobiles,'' the centers will also provide education to parents, children, health providers and others on recognizing the signs and symptons of asthma, provide medications, and provide training in the use of these medications. The centers will also provide other services, such as smoking cessation programs and home modifications to reduce exposure to allergens.

In order to be eligible to receive grants under this program, applicants will be required to demonstrate that they will coordinate the services they are offering with other federal, state and local programs that may be serving these children and their families. Further, grantees are required to demonstrate that they are getting results and making progress in improving the health status of children in the program.

The bill encourages coordination of services in several other ways. First, it establishes a $5 million matching grant program to encourage states to incorporate asthma prevention and treatment services in their state Child Health Insurance Programs. Second, it makes reducing the prevalence of asthma and asthma-related illnesses among urban populations an explicitly allowable activity under the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant program. Third, it requires the director of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, acting through the National Asthma Education Prevention Program Coordinating Committee, to identify all federal programs that carry out asthma-related activities and develop, in consultation with these agencies and voluntary health organizations, a federal plan for responding to asthma. Finally, it requires the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to conduct surveillance activities that will help us get a better handle on the prevalence and severity of asthma and the quality of asthma management.

With these provisions in place, I am convinced that we can significantly advance our efforts to reduce the prevalence and severity of asthma in communities across the nation. I encourage you to sign on as a cosponsor and work with Representative WAXMAN and me for the passage of this law.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Nadley/Crowley/Shays amendment to restore HOPWA funding to its FY99 level—so that AIDS patients are not forced to choose between having a home and having their medication.

In my district alone, 130 fewer homeless and people with AIDS will be served without the amendment.

HOPWA allows communities to design local-based, cost-effective housing programs for people living with AIDS.

It supports patients with rent and mortgage assistance and provides information on low-income housing opportunities.

While basic housing is a necessity for everyone, it is even more critical for people living with AIDS. Many AIDS patients rely on complex medical regimens and have special dietary needs. Lack of a stable housing situation can greatly complicate their treatment.

We must not forget that while medical science has made important advances in treating AIDS, a cure remains elusive. Projections of the number of new cases during FY00 indicate that seven additional jurisdictions may become eligible for HOPWA funding next year. Without the funds in the Nadler/Crowley/Shays amendment, jurisdictions already participating in the program will face even greater cuts in order to accommodate the newly eligible participants.

I urge you to vote for this bipartisan amendment in support of the 75,000 people across the country, in 100 communities, who currently benefit from HOPWA.

TRIBUTE TO VERA LILLARD-YOUNG

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of Indiana's First Congressional District, Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young, of Gary, Indiana. After forty years of dedicated public service, Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young announced her retirement from the Child Welfare Unit of the Lake County Office of the Division of Family and Children on Friday, August 27, 1999. Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young, along with her friends and family, will celebrate her retirement at a reception on September 18, 1999, at St. Timothy's Community Church Fellowship Hall in Gary, Indiana.

Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young has dedicated a substantial portion of her life to the betterment of the people and families of Northwest Indiana. Her distinguished career with the Lake County Division of Family and Children has had a positive impact on our community. For more than forty years, she has served as an important figure within the Division of Family and Children. She has held several positions throughout her tenure, but none as important as Division Manager with the Child Welfare Unit, the position from which she retired in August of this year.

A 1945 graduate of Wendell Phillips High School in Chicago, Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young enrolled as a student at Woodrow Wilson Junior College, which she attended for two years. In 1950, she earned a Bachelor of Science in Biology from De Paul University. Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young continued her education by taking graduate courses at Indiana University Northwest with an emphasis in social work. Additionally, she has attended several social work seminars in Chicago as well as at the University of Georgia.

In 1958, Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young began her career in social work as a caseworker at what was formerly called the Lake County Department of Public Welfare, which is today known as the Lake County Division of Family and Children. She has held several positions while employed with the Lake County Division of Family and Children, including: Caseworker with the Aid to Dependent Children Unit in Hammond, Indiana; Supervisor with the Child Welfare Unit in Hammond, Indiana; Assistant Division Head with the Child Welfare Unit in Hammond, Indiana; Assistant Division Head with the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Unit in Gary, Indiana; Assistant Division Director with the Child Welfare Unit in Gary, Indiana; and Division Manager with the Child Welfare Unit in Gary, Indiana.

After forty years of dedicated service, Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young is retiring as Division Manager with the Child Welfare Unit of the Lake

County Division of Family and Children. During her tenure with the Lake County Division of Family and Children, she instituted and organized a foster parent recognition dinner, served on the Corrective Action Committee which initiated new policies and procedures within the Lake County Division of Family and Children, and chaired the foster parent training committee. Additionally, she is an active member of St. Timothy's Community Church.

On this special day, I offer my heartfelt congratulations to Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young. Her large circle of family and friends can be proud of the contributions this prominent individual has made. Her exceptional work with the Lake County Division of Family and Children will be greatly missed. I sincerely wish Mrs. Vera Lillard-Young a long, happy, and productive retirement.

TRIBUTE TO BILL MEDEIROS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a beloved and fondly remembered man. Bill Medeiros, a native of San Benito County, was a longtime rancher and cattleman who embraced the rural lifestyle of the county and helped to shape its image during his life-long residence. Mr. Medeiros passed away in August at the age of 76.

Bill Medeiros was noted for his active interest in the history and traditions of our community. Born and raised in the rural community of San Benito County, he served as the director of the San Benito Saddle Horse Show for 46 years, always embracing and upholding the county's historical traditions. His devotion to maintaining the rural roots of the county was a life-long pursuit of Bill's that was only interrupted by his service in the U.S. Army Air Force during World War II as a pilot in the 389th Bomber Group.

After his heroic tour of duty, including many hazardous missions over Europe, Bill Medeiros returned to his cherished county and his rural lifestyle as a cattleman and rancher. Bill was a member of the San Benito County Cattleman's Association for which he was also elected president.

In the San Benito County, an original cowboy and local hero is lost. My thoughts remain with his family.

HONORING FATHER DAJAD DAVIDIAN

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to one of the most honorable and well-respected individuals in the 8th Congressional District of Massachusetts, Father Dajad Davidian. This past Sunday, September 12, marks the thirty-first anniversary of Father Davidian's arrival to the St. James Armenian Apostolic Church in Watertown, Massachusetts. Sadly, however, it also marked his retirement, and the end of a remarkable career of a man who unselfishly dedicated his life to serving his parishioners and his community.

The son of Rose Davidian, an Armenian Genocide survivor, Father Davidian has been a courageous voice in the Armenian-American community for many decades. For the last thirty years, he has provided his parishioners with strong leadership that has resulted in the church playing an active role in various projects to aid the people of Armenia. During his tenure, the people of St. James have regularly held food drives and other activities that have raised money for the Armenian Relief Fund.

Father Davidian is a man of great tolerance, respect and integrity. His strong conviction to love his fellow man is a model that all should follow. It is a principle that Father Davidian taught wherever he went. Recently, he spoke to students at Watertown High School. The theme was ''Respect for Differences Day'' and Father Davidian, reflecting on his personal experiences with discrimination, set the tone by telling students to ''judge the individual, not the group''.

Father Davidian has dedicated his life to helping others discover goodness and the spirit of generosity. He is a man of vision and a man of compassion. The impact of his work has traveled well beyond Watertown and is felt by countless people around the world. His work was truly a labor of love.

Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous gratitude that I stand before Congress today to honor such a man, and I want to sincerely thank Father Davidian for all his service to the community and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

THE POCKET PARKS PROGRAM IN PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the City of Paramount, California, and its Pocket Parks Program for winning the U.S. Conference of Mayors' City Livability Awards competition. The program led 17 semifinalists nationwide to win this very prestigious honor, which was presented by Andrew Cuomo, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The Pocket Parks Program is yet another innovative approach that Paramount has taken to improve the quality of life for its residents. In 1996, the City began the program as a way to make unsightly vacant lots into safe, attractive public spaces for residents. These lots are privately owned and located on major boulevards. Not only were the vacant lots eyesores, they posed potential public safety problems.

The City entered into a partnership with the private owners of the lots and assumed responsibility for landscaping the lots. As a result of the Pocket Parks Program, Paramount has increased its park space by two acres at a fraction of what it would have cost to acquire the land for open space. Today, more children in Paramount have safe, well-kept places to play. Residents have more park spaces within walking distance. And Paramount's appearance more closely matches the reality that it is a great place in which to work and live.

The award won by the Pocket Parks Program is simply the latest example of Paramount's innovative, successful efforts to revitalize itself. By forging a partnership with the private sector in the Pocket Parks Program, Paramount showed its willingness to find innovative solutions that do not rely entirely on government. Because of the optimism and hard work of its residents, Paramount has turned itself around in the past two decades. The City Livability Award is well-deserved recognition of Paramount's latest success. I praise the people of Paramount and their progressive City Council and city management.

Trees and parks help make a city. Keep going, Paramount.

CITY OF BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA SHELTER PLUS CARE CURRENT RENEWAL CRISIS

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to your attention a grave housing situation in my congressional district the 9th of California and all across the Nation. Funding for renewals of the Shelter Plus Care Programs is in a state of crisis, and unfortunately, the fiscal year 2000 Veterans, Housing and Independent Agencies bill does not address this critical funding situation.

By the way of background, the City of Berkeley, which I represent, administers a HUD-supported Shelter Plus Care Program which currently provides permanent, supportive housing to 145 households, involving 105 formerly homeless individuals and 40 formerly homeless families. All of the individuals and families served by this program are disabled, either by severe mental illness (34 percent), chronic substance abuse (23 percent), dually diagnosed (both severe mental illness and chronic substance abuse) and/or by AIDS/HIV-related diseases (5 percent).

The Shelter Plus Care Program has been key in moving these individuals and families from chronic homelessness to self-sufficiency. All of the City of Berkeley's Shelter Plus Care participants are now living in private market housing with a range of needed support services (mental health, primary health care and social services).

The current lack of available McKinney Act funding to renew the City of Berkeley's existing Shelter Plus Care Program threatens these households that have made such significant strides with displacement to homelessness. This result is both unnecessary and potentially a major impact to the more costly emergency and safety net systems of care in the Berkeley and Oakland community.

Let me tell you abut two individuals who are currently participants in the City of Berkeley Shelter Plus Care Program.

Killian is a 54-year-old male veteran who served in the United States Air Force from 1963–67. In the fall of 1989 he was hospitalized in the VA Hospital with severe symptoms of mental illness; he has been seriously disabled and homeless since then. Three years ago, the Shelter Plus Care Program provided him with housing and needed mental health services in the Berkeley community. Killian has achieved a level of stability in terms of both his housing and mental health issues

since entering the Program. In his words, ''without the Shelter Plus Care Program, I would have been unable to survive.''

Glenda is a single mother in recovery who until recently was homeless in Berkeley with her young son. She has been diagnosed with clinical depression, ADD and bulimia. Since entering the Shelter Plus Care Program, she participates in regular case management counseling as well as receiving needed medical follow-up for her health conditions. In her words, ''I know that without Shelter Plus Care I would still be on drugs, homeless or dead and my son not with his mother like God intended him to be. Without the services that Shelter Plus Care requires, I would never be where I am today. In September I start school. I need Shelter Plus Care to continue to progress in my life and future.''

The positive impact that Shelter Plus Care housing has had on people could be repeated in any other city in the U.S., because it is such a vital and successful program. Mr. Speaker, I hope we can work together in conference to make the expiring Shelter Plus Care projects eligible for renewals from the Section 8 program rather than the current year McKinney appropriation. I also ask that Section 8 be provided with adequate funding to incorporate this request.

AMERICAN ZIONIST FUND BANQUET

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 10, the Pittsburgh District of the Zionist Organization of America will hold its 54th Annual American Zionist Fund Banquet. The banquet, which is dedicated to the memory of Doctor Norman Cohen, a longstanding supporter of Israel and the Pittsburgh Jewish community, will honor community businessman Jeffrey Markel and Pittsburgh City Council President Bob O'Connor.

Mr. Markel will be honored with the Israel Service Award for his many efforts in support of Zionism. Mr. Markel is currently the chairman of the United Jewish Federation's Partnership 2000 Initiative, which links Jewish communities in the United States with communities in Israel. The Partnership 2000 Initiative works to foster person-to-person contacts and economic development between American and Israeli Jews. Mr. Markel has served the UJF in many other capacities as well. In addition, Mr. Markel serves or has served on the Board of Directors of the Jewish Family and Children's Service, the Board of Directors of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, the Board of Directors of the American Jewish Information Network, and as a member of the Technical Advisory Board of the Jerusalem One Network, the first computer network to link the major universities in Israel with the Knesset.

Pittsburgh City Council President Bob O'Connor will receive the Natalie E. Novick Community Leadership Award for his many contributions to the Pittsburgh Jewish community and to community life in Pittsburgh. Council President O'Connor is in his second term on Pittsburgh City Council. His service on City Council has been marked by action on transportation issues, public safety, and programs that benefit children. Mr. O'Connor also serves on the Board of Directors of a number of civic and charitable organizations, including St. Francis Central Hospital, the Carnegie Institute, the Pittsburgh Cultural Trust, the Southwest Regional Planning Commission, and the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Alliance. Mr. O'Connor was a founding member of the Pittsburg Center for Grieving Children. In addition, he was actively involved in the United Jewish Federation's Renaissance Project, which built or renovated a number of Jewish community facilities. And Mr. O'Connor provided substantial assistance to Pittsburgh's Beth Shalom Congregation after a 1997 synagogue fire.

On behalf of my constituents and myself, I want to thank Mr. Markel and City Council President O'Connor for their many contributions to the City of Pittsburgh and Pittsburgh's Jewish community, and I want to congratulate them on their selection as honorees at the 54th Annual American Zionist Fund Banquet.

TRIBUTE TO ISOLINA FERRÉ

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Isolina Ferré, an outstanding individual who has devoted her life to serving the poor. Sister Isolina, a Missionary Servant of the Most Blessed Trinity, received the nation's highest civilian honor during a White House ceremony on Wednesday, August 11, 1999. She was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Sister Isolina, known as the ''Angel of Ponce Beach,'' was born on September 5, 1914 to one of the most affluent families in Puerto Rico. Raised in a wealthy family, she decided early in life that she wanted to dedicate her life to the less fortunate. She joined the Missionary Servants of the Most Blessed Trinity at age 21 in Philadelphia. After she completed her training, she was assigned to the Appalachian coal mining region of West Virginia and then worked among Portuguese immigrants on Cape Cod, Massachusetts.

In 1957 Sister Isolina went to work at the Doctor White Community Center in Brooklyn, where she offered to be a mediator between African-American and Puerto Rican gangs. For her efforts she received the key to the city of New York from Mayor John Lindsay and the John D. Rockefeller Award for Public Service and Community Revitalization.

Mr. Speaker, Sister Isolina Ferré founded community service centers, clinics and programs to empower the poor in Puerto Rico, New York and Appalachia. She does this through the Centros Sor Isolina Ferré, a group of five community-service centers she has run for 30 years. One U.S. author who wrote about turning around poor, crime-ridden communities called her ''Mother Teresa of Puerto Rico.''

The Centros Sor Isolina Ferré has 350 employees, five offices throughout Puerto Rico, a postgraduate business and technical school and 40 programs aimed at stemming juvenile delinquency and strengthening families. With government and private funding, it serves more than 10,000 people a year.

The operation is built on Ferré's main principle: Poor communities have many resources they can use to improve their condition, and they can be taught to seek their own solutions and take control of their lives. Staff members teach leadership and strategic planning to people in public-housing projects, in Ponce—skills used to start businesses and organize community improvements. Through counseling and other services for youth and families, Ferre's group has dramatically reduced the school dropout rate within a public housing project in the San Juan area.

Mr. Speaker, Sister Isolina is the fourth Puerto Rican to receive the award. The others are former Puerto Rico Gov. Luis Muñoz Marin, a founder of the Popular Democratic Party; Anotnia Pantojas, founder of Aspira, an agency known for helping Hispanic youth; and Sister Isolina's brother, former Puerto Rico Gov. Luis A. Ferré, founder of the pro-statehood New Progressive Party.

Sister Isolina attended Fordham University in New York where she earned a bachelor of arts and master's degree in psychology.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Sister Isolina Ferré for her outstanding achievements and in wishing her continued success.

TRIBUTE TO CANDY COONERTY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a beloved local entrepreneur. Candy Coonerty, co-owner of Bookshop Santa Cruz, died this last July of a stroke at the age of 49.

Candy was more than just a local businesswoman; she provided the community with an eclectic and unique selection of books as well as an environment where local community members could meet and interact. Bookshop Santa Cruz serves as a hub and mainstay of the historic downtown. Candy was also actively involved in the community serving on the board of directors of Friends of the UC Santa Cruz Library and advisory council of the Santa Cruz Hillel Foundation.

Candy Coonerty will be sorely missed and remembered for her presence in the Santa Cruz community as a local hostess and her compassion for literature. My thoughts are with her family.

HONORING MAMA ANNA MKABA, FIRST LADY OF TANZANIA

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and profound admiration that I rise today to welcome the First Lady of Tanzania, Mama Anna Mkaba, to the United States.

Mrs. Mkaba has gained international recognition for her extensive humanitarian work and efforts on behalf of charitable organizations. She has founded the Equal Opportunities for All Trust Fund (EOTF), a registered,

non-profit, non-governmental charitable organization whose mission is to empower women through increased economic and educational opportunity. EOTF is dedicated to fighting and eradicating poverty by providing women, especially rural women, with access to credit, health care, job training, and market education. In addition, EOTF provides a forum for women to exchange ideas, express their concerns, and communicate with a larger network of national and international organizations. EOTF has also initiated a multidisciplinary program, Women in Poverty Eradication (WIPE.)

This week, Mrs. Mkaba is visiting Massachusetts to meet with the Cambridge-based Sabre Foundation, Inc, in an effort to establish a partnership with the Foundation to promote a book donation and distribution project in Tanzania. This project is a testament to Mama Anna Mkaba's relentless desire to further educate and empower the people of Tanzania. With a population of over 30 million, and an increasing number of public and private schools, colleges, and universities, Tanzania is richly endowed with human and natural resources. The initiative between EOTF and the Sabre Foundation will contribute to Tanzania's remarkable intellectual development and will help her nation as it prepares for the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to celebrate Mama Anna Mkaba's achievements and the cooperation of our constituents in her many good works, and I wish Mrs. Mkaba well in all of her future endeavors on behalf of the people of Tanzania.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH GOLD

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Joseph Gold. Thought to have been the oldest living Marine in the country, Joseph Gold passed away at the age of 107 on Wednesday, August 25, 1999, in Tenafly, New Jersey.

In so many respects, Joseph Gold was a genuine American hero. A native of Cleveland, Ohio, he enlisted in the Marines at the onset of World War I and served as a distinguished member of the American Expeditionary Force. As part of one of the first Marine contingents to fight in Europe, Mr. Gold fought in the historic battle of Belleau Woods. It was at this battle in 1918 that he and his American comrades fought through a dense forest and ultimately captured terrain from well entrenched German forces.

Only about 2 months ago, on July 8, 1999, the French Government, in commemoration of the 80th anniversary of the end of World War I, awarded Mr. Gold the French Legion of Honor. This prestigious award, granted to Mr. Gold, was a well deserved tribute to a true American patriot.

I want to express my condolences to the Gold family on the passing of their father, grandfather and great-grandfather. I also want to express my admiration to the Gooney Bird detachment of the U.S. Marine Corps League who arranged to have an honor guard ceremony at Mr. Gold's funeral.

Joseph Gold was an extraordinary person, whose legacy to our Nation is a story of selfless sacrifice and a story that all Americans would do well to remember.

TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS. FELTON KILPATRICK OF CULLMAN, ALABAMA

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 6th of this year, a wonderful couple, Mr. and Mrs. Felton Kilpatrick will celebrate their 70th wedding anniversary. In 1929, Mrs. Clara McClellan Kilpatrick and Mr. Felton Kilpatrick exchanged wedding vows to spend a lifetime together.

Now 70 years later, they shine as pillars of matrimony. The Kilpatricks are a loving man and woman who have come together to share their lives, raise a family and prove that family values and selfless commitment still have a place in a world whose fleeting values can be confusing and fastpaced.

Many generations of the Kilpatrick family look up to the remarkable couple as role models on how to live and love successfully.

This tribute is a fitting honor for the Kilpatricks who have shown us that commitments can be honored through seven decades of the trials and tribulations of life.

I commend Mr. and Mrs. Felton Kilpatrick on their happy and strong marriage and I wish them a joyous and special celebration on October 6th with their friends and family.

BROTHER MCGINNIS INDUCTED AS PRESIDENT OF LA SALLE UNIVERSITY

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that Brother Michael J. McGinniss, FSC, Ph.D., will be inducted as La Salle University's 28th President on September 24 at a 3 p.m. ceremony at the University's Hayman Center.

Brother McGinniss was a member of the school's religion department and for the past five years was president of Christian Brothers University in Memphis, TN. He maintained a close connection with La Salle—his alma mater—while serving on the school's Board of Trustees.

McGinniss, 51, grew up in a Philadelphia neighborhood near the university. As a boy, he and his aunt would often ride the Number 26 trolley past College Hall. ''She'd tell me that some day I would go to school in that building. I can't help but wonder what she would say about my being president if she were alive today,'' he said.

He joined the Christian Brothers in 1965 and graduated Maxima Cum Laude from La Salle in 1970 with a degree in English. He obtained his Master's and Ph.D. in theology from the University of Notre Dame.

His first teaching assignment was at the South Hills Catholic High School in Pittsburgh, PA, where he was a member of the English and Religion departments. He returned to La Salle as a visiting instructor in the Graduate Religion program in the summer of 1978. McGinniss has also taught at Washington Theological Union and Loyola University's Summer Institute of Pastoral Studies.

In 1984 he joined the faculty at La Salle on a full-time basis, reaching the rank of full professor in 1993. Recognized by the De La Salle Christian Brothers for his qualities as a leader, he attended La session internationale des études lasalliennes (a program of study of Lasallian spirituality) in Rome. He eventually became Chair of La Salle's Religion Department and in 1992 he received the Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching.

During his tenure as President of Christian Brothers University, undergraduate enrollment and retention rates increased; a Master's of Education program was established; the Athletic Department joined the NCAA Division II Gulf South Conference; new residence halls were constructed; science labs and facilities were enhanced; engineering departments were reaccredited; information technology systems throughout the campus were upgraded; and the Center for Global Enterprise was founded. He also played a key role in the school's 125th anniversary celebration.

Brother McGinniss also took an active part in the Memphis area community, serving on the boards of the Economic Club of Memphis; National Conference of Christians and Jews, Memphis Chapter; Memphis Brooks Museum of Art; the Memphis Catholic Diocesan Development Committee; and Christian Brothers High School, Memphis, TN.

He has published articles in scholarly journals on many topics, written chapters in religious books and edited six volumes of the Christian Brothers' Spirituality Seminar Series. He has lectured to academic and professional groups on issues related to spirituality, pastoral care, and theology. His processional memberships include Catholic Theological Society of America, American Academy of Religion, and College Theology Society.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize Brother McGinniss today. He is a man who has contributed greatly to many educational institutions and to the communities in which they are located. I would like to extend Brother McGinniss my warmest wishes and congratulations on his induction as President of La Salle University.

TRIBUTE TO LINDA BOURGAIZE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a woman who tirelessly worked to advocate for the rights of special education students and disabled individuals. Ms. Linda Bourgaize passed away on June 15, 1999 in Santa Cruz.

Linda began her career after graduating from San Jose State University as a school psychologist after which she was selected to be the Special Education Local Plan Area Administrator for Santa Cruz and San Benito counties. Ms. Bourgaize devoted herself to ensuring students in these communities had equal access to the best possible special education services. Linda went beyond the scope

of her profession with her compassion. Throughout her career she also helped to write numerous legislative proposals to meet the needs and improve the lives of people suffering from disabilities and lobbied for these rights at both state and federal levels.

Ms. Linda Bourgaize will always be fondly remembered and sorely missed for her ardent and passionate contributions to our community and to the Nation in her advocacy for the rights of special education students and disabled individuals. My thoughts remain with her family.

EBENEZER UNITED METHODIST CHURCH CELEBRATES ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE YEARS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the historic Ebenezer United Methodist Church, a beacon of hope and ''The Stone of Help.'' For 161 years, Ebenezer has been a leading church in the Nation's capital. To know something of Ebenezer's history is to understand why the city and the Congress have abundant reasons to celebrate the church's history and its continuing contributions.

The history of Ebenezer United Methodist Church dates back to the beginning of Washington, D.C. In 1805, the meeting place of the Methodist Episcopal Church is known to have been a dwelling located on Greenleaf Point (South Capitol and N Street). The membership consisted of ''61 whites and 25 coloreds''. In 1807, the congregation moved to Dudley Carroll's barn on New Jersey Avenue, SE. In 1811, services were held in a newly constructed edifice at Fourth Street, SE between South Carolina Avenue and G Street.

This first church built by Methodists in Washington was named the Fourth Street Station. In 1819, the church was renamed Ebenezer, and was later changed to the Fourth Street Methodist Church. At a later date, this Parent Church of Ebenezer Church was relocated to Fifth and Seward Square, SE, where the name was changed to Trinity Methodist Church. On April 30, 1961 Trinity United Methodist Church merged with three other churches to form the Capitol Hill United Methodist Church.

In 1827 the ''colored'' membership had outgrown the galleries which were reserved for them in the Mother Church. A lot, located at the corner of Fourth and D Streets, SE, was purchased from Rachel and William Prout on April 27, 1838. A small frame church building was erected under the supervision of the pastor of the Mother Church with the assistance of three local preachers. The church was named Little Ebenezer, and Reverend Noah Jones became the first colored pastor in 1864. A private school for colored children was held there, and Reverend H. Henson served as the teacher.

In the District of Columbia, as in other southern areas, education was considered the concern of the individual and not the community. As long as Negroes were a comparatively minor factor in the community, concern over their welfare was not a major consideration of the white population. After the start of the Civil War, the situation changed. Slaves in the District of Columbia were freed in 1962. Between 1860 and 1863, the local Negro population increased about 68 percent. Such an increase could not be ignored by the whole community. For the mutual benefit, private charitable agencies, associations, and individuals, northern and local, white and colored, began to recognize the need of assistance in this situation.

In the Spring of 1864, the first public government sponsored school for colored children in Washington, D.C. was established and housed there. The teachers of the school were Miss Frances W. Perkins, sent by the New England Freedmen's Aid Society of Boston, who taught without pay, and Mrs. Emma V. Brown, a prominent colored worker who was employed by the District Columbia for $400.00 per year. Thirteen months later, because of the increasing student population, the school had to relocate to a new location at Second and C Street, SE and was named the Abraham Lincoln School.

The significant increase in the congregation of Little Ebenezer necessitated the building of a larger church. The second church was planned by the Reverend Tillman Jackson in 1867, and built in 1870 under the pastorship of the pastorship of the Reverend C.G. Keys. Many dedicated pastors followed in this period including the Reverend George T. Pinckney, under whose pastorate the first Annual Conference was held in Ebenezer in 1885. During this period, the term ''Little'' was dropped from the name of the church. The Ebenezer Colored Station of the Washington Conference Methodist Episcopal Church was incorporated on September 28, 1891 at 2:00 PM.

In 1896, the second church was damaged beyond repair during a severe storm. Reverend Matthew A. Clair, who later became Bishop, developed plans to construct a third church. Reverend John H. Griffin, who succeeded him, undertook the implementation and completion of the new church.

In 1939, when the three branches of Methodism met and formed the Methodist Church, Ebenezer became Ebenezer Methodist Church. In 1968, the Methodist Church and the Evangelical United Brethren Church merged and formed the United Methodist Church. Ebenezer's namer changed to Ebenezer U.M.W. Church. In 1975, the Ebenezer U.M.W. Church was designated a Historical Landmark.

Ebenezer continues to be known for her support of education for Black children and continues to strive to obtain quality education. From October through May, the Work Areas in Education of the church sponsors a tutoring program to help students who are having difficulty with reading and writing. Church school classes for children of all ages and Bible classes for adults are held every Sunday. The Saturday Concerns Program involves the youth of the church and the community. The church also conducts a Summer Enrichment Program and a Vacation Bible School.

Mr. Speaker, we in the District of Columbia are happy to have the Congress join in recognizing Ebenezer for its many contributions to the Nation's capital.

HONORING TRW

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize exceptional performance by Thompson-Ramo-Wooldridge (TRW). TRW, a leader in the aerospace industry, is also a leader in the minority business community of Southern California.

TRW has been actively involved in the development of minority businesses. They have worked to provide minority businesses broader access to markets and help business owners enhance their marketing, technical, and operational skills for long-term growth and development. TRW has provided guidance and support in an effort to help minority businesses firmly establish themselves in the community.

The Minority Business Enterprise Input Committee (MBEIC) of the Southern California Regional Purchasing Councils, Inc. (SCRPC) recognized TRW's contributions and they have awarded TRW its 1999 Local Corporation of the Year Award. The MBEIC strives to empower minority businesses through corporate driven mentoring alliances to compete successfully in a changing economy.

TRW is a founding member of the SCRPC. Recognizing the importance of minority businesses, they had the vision to help create an organization specifically for expanding business opportunities for minority suppliers and encourage mutually beneficial economic links between minority enterprises and corporate members.

I commend TRW for being a major supporter of programs that encourage the development of minority owned businesses. I congratulate the men and women of TRW on receiving this prestigious award and I wish them continued success.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 9, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Weygand-Crowley amendment. I want to especially thank my friend from Rhode Island for his tireless work in support of every American who has dedicated his or her life to our Armed Forces. This language should serve as an unequivocal statement of support by this Chamber for the brave men and women who wore their nation's uniform into battle.

Mr. Chairman, every member of this body respects and deeply appreciates the contributions of our veterans. This institution is the home of many proud war veterans—liberal and conservative; Democrat and Republican.

This issue is not one of partisanship but rather one of dignity.

Veterans may appear like regular people—but they are not. They are an uncommon brand of hero. These people made the conscious decision to put their own life, their hopes, and their future on hold to stand up for the basic principles of their homeland: freedom, liberty, and a proud tradition of justice. They are the men and women of courage and integrity.

I would like to share with my colleagues a story of one of these men of integrity—Mr. Eugene Mozer of Jackson Heights, in my district.

He was a World War II veterans decorated with a Purple Heart after being wounded in battle. He was a patriot. Mr. Mozer personifies the thousands of veterans that live in each of our home communities.

This past February, Mr. Mozer passed away. His wife, Faustina Gobrili, and their son attempted to acquire a Military Honor Guard for his burial service. They believed that an Honor Guard would be a fitting tribute to this man's life—a life he was prepared to sacrifice for this nation.

After contacting the military and explaining the situation, Ms. Gobrili was informed by the military that they, incredulously, could not fulfill her family's request for a military Honor Guard.

Or, Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the countless other stories of families of deceased veterans contacting the military to request an Honor Guard only to receive a cassette tape of TAPS in the mail.

These are gross indignities to the people who were willing to die for our freedom—for people they would never know, let alone meet.

Mr. Mozer and his family and the thousands of other distinguished veterans and their families deserve a more apt tribute—a tribute that appropriately reflects the gratitude and indebtedness of this nation.

A military Honor Guard at the funeral of a veterans serves as the final salute of a grateful nation. Let us not deny them this final call of respect. I urge you to support this amendment.

TRIBUTE TO SARAH HOLMES BOUTELLE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a woman who with boundless energy and enthusiasm researched and authored an award-winning book and became the world's foremost authority on the renowned architect Julia Morgan. Sarah Holmes Boutelle passed away in Santa Cruz last May at the age of 90.

Born on January 29, 1909 in South Dakota, Sarah was a history teacher and school administrator when she came to Santa Cruz county in 1972 and visited Hearst Castle with her son, Christopher. Upon learning that Julia Morgan was the architect who built San Simeon, Mrs. Boutelle's interest, as a teacher, in female role models led her to seek more information about the renowned architect. Sarah's research on Julia Morgan cumulated in a book that won a California Book Award and Mrs. Boutelle's naming as an honorary member of the American Institute of Architects. Throughout the remainder of her life, Sarah continued to travel extensively, investigating new Julia Morgan material and lecturing.

Sarah Holmes Boutelle was truly a remarkable woman who will be fondly remembered for her energy and enthusiasm as well as her extraordinary effort and contribution to the appreciation of architecture. She will be missed by the many people she touched both personally and through her writing and lectures during her lifetime.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS CHILDREN'S EQUITY ACT OF 1999

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, along with Representatives ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and CONNIE MORELLA, the ''Federal Employees Health Benefits Children's Equity Act of 1999.''

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 required States to enact legislation requiring employers to enroll a child in an employee's group health plan when a court orders the employee to provide health insurance for the child but the employee fails to do so. The Federal Employee Health Benefits (FEHB) law provided that a Federal employee ''may enroll'' in a FEHB plan ''either as an individual or for self and family'' coverage. The law does not allow an employing agency to elect coverage on the employee's behalf. Further, FEHB law generally preempts State law with regard to coverage and benefits. Therefore, a federal agency is unable to ensure that a child is covered in accordance with a court order, even when the same order would ensure coverage for the child if the child's parent were employed by an employer other than the federal government.

To correct this inequity, my proposal would enable the federal government to enroll an employee and his or her family in the FEHB Program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee. If the affected employee is already enrolled for self-only coverage, the employing agency would be authorized to change the enrollment to self and family. If the affected employee is not enrolled in the FEHB Program, the employing agency would be required to enroll him or her under the standard option of the Service Benefit Plan, Blue Cross Blue Shield.

Finally, the employee would be barred from discontinuing the self and family enrollment as long as the court order remains in effect, the child meets the statutory definition of family member, and the employee cannot show that the child has other insurance.

I am very pleased about the broad constituency that supports my proposal. Among the groups that have offered support for the change are the American Payroll Association, which represents employers, the Center for Law and Social Policy, which represents the rights of indigent parents and several state child support program officials.

I am also pleased to introduce this important legislation during National Payroll Week—September 13–17—and to have the support of those who are key to the wage and medical support withholding process.

Please join me and Representatives ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and CONNIE MORELLA in cosponsoring this worthwhile measure. It will help our efforts to ensure that our children have access to needed health insurance coverage.

CONGRATULATIONS ON THE NAMING OF THE GLORIA S. WILLIAMS BUILDING AT WILLIAM PATERSON UNIVERSITY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives a very special event which will take place on Tuesday, September 14, 1999. On that date, the campus of New Jersey's William Paterson University will undergo a transformation which, in itself, exemplifies their commitment to their mission of providing quality instruction in an environment of leadership and diversity. This transformation is the renaming of one of the University buildings in honor of a remarkable person, the late Gloria S. Williams. This ceremony marks a truly historic event, the first time that a structure has been named for an African-American on the campus of William Paterson University.

Gloria S. Williams, a native of Newark, excelled throughout her educational career here in New Jersey. She began her quest for knowledge in Newark's public school system and it eventually led her to William Paterson University where she received her Bachelor's degree in Business Administration with a minor in Economics. Throughout her rich life, Gloria S. Williams made certain to place the needs of others before those of herself. This selfless behavior was evident in her decision to share her knowledge and experiences as a teacher in the Paterson School District after her college graduation. Her experiences at William Paterson University was not simply limited to an undergraduate education. As an undergraduate, Gloria was an employee of the University and immediately following graduation she remained with the University as a dorm assistant and summer camp coordinator. After that, her career at William Paterson flourished. Gloria held many important positions including Residence Hall Director, Assistant Registrar, and ultimately she was named Associate Director of the Advisement Center where she was well known for always having on open door. Because of Gloria's rich involvement with others and with William Paterson University, it is a fitting tribute that the University chose to name a building in her honor. Gloria S. Williams was also very active in the church. As a youngster she was a member of St. Luke's A.M.E. Church where her parents, Daisy and O'Donnel Williams,

were lifelong members. While living in Wayne, New Jersey, Gloria joined New A.M.E. Zion Church, where she served diligently on the Scholarship Committee. After returning to Newark and joining St. James A.M.E. Church, Gloria realized her ambition to become a religious counselor.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in congratulating William Paterson University as they honor Gloria S. Williams in this way. Her life story embodies all the aspects that educational institutions strive for—determination, diligence and dedication. By naming a building in her honor, William Paterson University will preserve for future generations the admirable legacy of a great woman, Gloria S. Williams.

IN HONOR OF MR. MANUEL MOTA

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, it is with utmost pleasure and privilege that I rise today to recognize a wonderful American, Mr. Manuel ''Manny'' Rafael Geronimo Mota, for his spirited work with youth, his humanitarian service, and his outstanding accomplishments as a major league baseball player and coach. Through his compassion for others and his infectious enthusiasm for life, Manny has served as a model citizen for all Americans.

Born in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic on February 13, 1938, Manny Mota grew up loving the game of baseball. Soon, Manny realized that he had a gift for the grand old game. At the tender age of 19, Manny demonstrated a keen eye at the plate when he joined the minor leagues. Within a few years, Manny ascended to the major leagues and soon established himself as a premier hitter.

Manny joined the Los Angeles Dodgers in 1969 and contributed to Dodger success from 1969–1982. As a player for the Dodgers, Manny established the all-time major league record for pinch-hits with 150. Manny batted .304 over his entire 20-year major league career with Montreal, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. Manny Mota was selected to the 1973 National League All-Star team and led the league with a .351 batting average at the All-Star Break. When you add his tenure as a coach for the Los Angeles Dodgers, Manny has served the Dodgers for 30 years.

Just as important as Manny Mota's contributions on the field are his contributions off the field. Over a quarter of a century ago, Manny Mota established the Manny Mota International Foundation with the intention of giving youth opportunities to reach their full potential and pursue a quality education. Manny has used baseball as his medium to instruct and motivate Los Angeles youth. The Manny Mota International Foundation awards five $1,000 scholarships to Los Angeles area students each year.

Manny Mota's generosity extends beyond the borders of the United States. Manny has worked hard to raise money to build a medical clinic, baseball field, and school in the Dominican Republic. Manny Mota was at the forefront of relief efforts when natural disasters devastated the Dominican Republic, Central America, and other regions of Latin America. Repeatedly, Manny demonstrates that he does not forget his roots, as he swiftly extends aid to those who are disadvantaged.

Manny has also served as a loving caretaker of a successfully family. He resides with his wife Margarita in Glendale and is the proud father of eight children: Cecilia, Jose, Andres, Domingo, Manuel, Maria, Rafael, and Antonio. His wife and children remain active in foundation activities and embrace the same commitment to public service that has inspired Manny to share his gifts with others.

Just as Manny so often delivered ''in the pinch'' at the plate, so has he delivered ''in the pinch'' in life. Mr. Speaker, family and friends of Manny Mota gathered at the California Plaza Watercourt in Downtown Los Angeles, California on Saturday, August 28, 1999 to celebrate the 30th anniversary of his association with the Los Angeles Dodgers, it is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me today in saluting this exceptional man.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES H. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 9, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concern about the deep cuts in the Veterans Administration-Housing and Urban Development annual (VA/HUD) appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2000. This legislation not only substantially slashes funds for programs that have enhanced economic development and improved housing in Connecticut and the 5th Congressional District, but also guts many of our important NASA science programs. My support for the VA/HUD Appropriations bill is conditioned on a conference agreement which restores funding for HUD, the Veterans Administration and NASA.

If allowed to stand, the cuts to HUD programs will have a significant impact on the State of Connecticut and on my own congressional district, affecting both economic development initiatives and a variety of housing services. The Republican budget cutters have dug deep into initiatives that have proven track records of success. There is simply no reason to reduce our efforts to provide economic development for our towns and cities in the form of Brownfields monies and Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) funds. By doing so, we will set our communities and our economies backwards, rather than spur them forward.

The VA/HUD Appropriations legislation also slashes funding for key NASA science programs. This shortsighted action jeopardizes our country's leadership in space. Unless NASA funding is restored, this legislation should not pass Congress.

My colleagues, I support the VA/HUD Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations in the House because it restores badly needed funds for the Veterans Administration. I urge all of you to join me in working to reverse the housing, CDBG, economic development and NASA cuts in this bill. If this important funding is not restored, I will oppose the House-Senate conference agreement on the final version of the bill. I urge you to do the same.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1999

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, due to notifications from the Federal Emergency Management Agency that hurricane ''Floyd'' is likely to hit my district within 48 hours, I will not be able to be present and voting this evening and tomorrow. Hurricane ''Floyd'' is currently a category 4 storm and gaining strength as it approaches the Southeast coast. I will remain in my district to assist constituents and my family with pending evacuation and mitigation plans.

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 Tuesday, September 14, 1999 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 15

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
Business meeting to markup proposed legislation authorizing expenditures for the period October 1, 1999 through February 28, 2001 by standing, select, and special committees of the Senate.
SR–301

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the issue of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act and tribal contract support cost.
SR–485

10 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of David J. Hayes, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior; the nomination of Sylvia V. Baca, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and the nomination of Ivan Itkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Department of Energy.
SD–366

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on the nomination of Sally Katzen, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.
SD–628

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine certain clemency issues for members of the Armed Forces of National Liberation.
SD–226

Finance
To hold hearings on the nomination of James G. Huse, Jr., of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Social Security Administration; and the nomination of Neal S. Wolin, of Illinois, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.
SD–215

2 p.m.
Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.
SH–219

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on how telemedicine technologies are impacting rural health care.
SR–253

SEPTEMBER 16

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Investigations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the practices and operations of the securities day trading industry.
SD–628

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Public Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to children's health.
SD–430

Judiciary
Business meeting to markup S.J. Res.3, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims.
SD–226

2 p.m.
Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.
SH–219

Governmental Affairs
International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the annual report of the Postmaster General.
SD–628

Judiciary
Youth Violence Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Office of Justice Program and to examine a proposed reorganization plan.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Administration's Northwest Forest Plan.
SD–366

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on foreign missile developments and the ballistic missile threat to the United States through 2015.
SD–419

SEPTEMBER 21

9 a.m.
United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control
To hold hearings on counterinsurgency vs. counter-narcotics issues in regards to Colombia.
SH–216

9:30 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings on issues relating to hybrid pension plans.
SD–430

SEPTEMBER 22

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on Indian trust fund reform.
SR–485

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–430

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

SEPTEMBER 29

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1508, to provide technical and legal assistance for tribal justice systems and members of Indian tribes.
SR–485

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–430

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the practices of the Bureau of Reclamation regarding operations and maintenance costs and contract renewals.
SD–366

SEPTEMBER 30

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1457, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to assess opportunities to increase carbon storage on national forests derived from the public domain and to facilitate voluntary and accurate reporting of forest projects that reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations.
SD–366

OCTOBER 6

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SR–485

POSTPONEMENTS

SEPTEMBER 15

2 p.m.
Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To hold hearings on Immigration and Naturalization Service reform issues.
SD–226

Daily Digest
Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S10743–S10792

Measures Introduced: Four bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1577–1580, and S. Res. 182. **Page S10779**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 566, to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to exempt agricultural commodities, livestock, and value-added products from unilateral economic sanctions, to prepare for future bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations affecting United States agriculture, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–157) **Page S10779**

Department of the Interior Appropriations: Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 2466, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S10754–69, S10771–73**

Pending:

Gorton Amendment No. 1359, of a technical nature. **Page S10754**

Hutchison Amendment No. 1603, to prohibit the use of funds for the purpose of issuing a notice of rulemaking with respect to the valuation of crude oil for royalty purposes until September 30, 2000. **Pages S10754, S10771–73**

Bryan Amendment No. 1588, to make available certain funds, by reducing the subsidy for the below-cost timber program administered by the Forest Service and for the construction of logging roads in national forests, for other Forest Service programs including road maintenance, wildlife and fish habitat management, and for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species habitat management. **Pages S10754–69**

Bryan/Wyden Amendment No. 1623 (to Amendment No. 1588), to make available certain funds for survey and manage requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan Record of Decision. **Pages S10755–67**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 55 yeas to 40 nays (Vote 271), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to close further debate on Hutchison Amendment No. 1603 (listed above). **Pages S10771–73**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for a vote on or in relation to Bryan/Wyden Amendment No. 1623 (to Amendment No. 1588), to occur on Tuesday, September 14, 1999, at 10:30 a.m. **Page S10767**

FALN Terrorist Clemency—Cloture Vote: By a unanimous vote of 93 yeas (Vote No. 270), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to a motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 33, deploring the actions of President Clinton regarding granting clemency to the Armed Forces of National Liberation (the FALN) terrorists. **Pages S10769–71**

Commerce/Justice/State Appropriations—Additional Conferee: Senator Leahy was added as a conferee to H.R. 2670, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. **Page S10786**

Removal of Injunction of Secrecy: The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following treaty:

Tax Convention with Slovenia (Treaty Doc. No. 106–9).

The treaty was transmitted to the Senate today, considered as having been read for the first time, and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and was ordered to be printed. **Pages S10786–87**

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 a report entitled "United States Participation in The United Nations"; referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM–56). **Page S10778**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

David N. Hurd, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

Naomi Reice Buchwald, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Maryanne Trump Barry, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Pages S10773–74, S10786, S10792

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations: John F. Potter, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences for a term expiring May 1, 2005.

Roger Walton Ferguson, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Roger Walton Ferguson, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2000.

William B. Bader, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

Sim Farar, of California, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Fifty-fourth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Marine Corps. **Pages S10787–92**

Messages From the President: **Pages S10778**

Messages From the House: **Page S10778**

Communications: **Pages S10778–79**

Petitions: **Page S10779**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S10779–82**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S10782–84**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S10784**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S10784**

Authority for Committees: **Page S10784**

Additional Statements: **Pages S10784–86**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—271) **Pages S10771, S10773**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon, and adjourned at 6:52 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, September 14, 1999. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S10787.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 10 public bills, H.R. 2839–2848, and 1 resolution, H. Res. 287, were introduced.

Page H8148

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2681, to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents (H. Rept. 106–313); and

H. Con. Res. 171, congratulating the American Public Transit Association for 25 years of commendable service to the transit industry and the Nation (H. Rept. 106–314). **Page H8148**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Gibbons to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H8101

Recess: The House recessed at 12:42 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. **Page H8102**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Congressional Award Reauthorization: S. 380, to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act—clearing the measure for the President; **Pages H8103–06**

Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Jurisdiction Act: H.R. 2112, amended, to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow a judge to whom a case is transferred to retain jurisdiction over certain multidistrict litigation cases for trial, and to provide for Federal jurisdiction of certain multiparty, multiforum civil actions; **Pages H8106–09**

Lackawanna Valley Heritage Area: H.R. 940, amended, to establish the Lackawanna Heritage Valley American Heritage Area. Agreed to amend the title; **Pages H8109–12**

Fishermen's Protective Act: H.R. 1651, amended, to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country. Agreed to amend the title; **Pages H8113–15**

Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act: H.R. 2368, to assist in the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll by amending the terms of the trust fund established during the United States administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; **Pages H8115–18**

Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act: H.R. 898, designating certain land in the San Isabel National Forest in the State of Colorado as the ''Spanish Peaks Wilderness''; **Pages H8118–21**

Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act: H.R. 1619, amended, to amend the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 to expand the boundaries of the Corridor; **Pages H8121–23**

Thomas Cole National Historic Site: H.R. 658, amended, to establish the Thomas Cole National Historic Site in the State of New York as an affiliated area of the National Park System (passed by a recorded vote of 396 ayes to 6 noes, Roll No. 406); and **Pages H8112–13, H8129–30**

Importance of Family Friendly Television: H. Con. Res. 184, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance of ''family friendly'' programming on television (agreed to by a recorded vote of 396 ayes with none voting ''no'', Roll No. 407). **Pages H8123–25, H8130–31**

Presidential Message—United States Participation in United Nations Activities: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted his report on the participation of the United States in the activities of the United Nations during the calendar year 1998—referred to the Committee on International Relations. **Page H8125**

Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies Appropriations: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1906, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives: Skeen, Walsh, Dickey, Kingston, Nethercutt, Bonilla, Latham, Emerson, Young of Florida, Kaptur, DeLauro, Hinchey, Farr, Boyd, and Obey. **Pages H8125–26, H8128**

Agreed to the Obey motion to instruct conferees to provide maximum funding, within the scope of conference, for food safety programs at the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration. **Page H8126**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:08 p.m. and reconvened at 5:01 p.m. **Page H8126**

Energy and Water Development Appropriations: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2605, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives Packard, Rogers, Knollenberg, Frelinghuysen, Callahan, Latham, Blunt, Young of Florida, Visclosky, Edwards, Pastor, Forbes, and Obey. **Pages H8126–27**

Agreed to the Visclosky motion to instruct conferees to insist on the higher funding levels for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works program included in the House-passed bill. **Pages H8126–27**

Department of Defense Appropriations: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2561, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives Lewis of California, Young of Florida, Skeen, Hobson, Bonilla, Nethercutt, Istook, Cunningham, Dickey, Frelinghuysen, Murtha, Dicks, Sabo, Dixon, Visclosky, Moran of Virginia, and Obey. **Pages H8127–28, H8129**

Agreed to the Obey motion to instruct conferees to insist on Section 8113 of the House bill providing $50 million to enhance United States defense capabilities against domestic terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction, and on Section 8114 of the House bill providing $150 million to improve the protection of DoD computer systems from non-authorized access. **Pages H8127–28**

Agreed to the Lewis of California motion that the conference meetings be closed to the public when classified national security information is under consideration by yea and nay vote of 388 yeas to 7 nays, Roll No. 405. **Page H8129**

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2670, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives Rogers, Kolbe, Taylor of North Carolina, Regula, Latham, Miller of Florida, Wamp, Young of Florida, Serrano, Dixon, Mollohan, Roybal-Allard, and Obey. **Page H8128**

Agreed to the Obey motion to instruct conferees to insist on the higher funding levels for the programs related to embassy security included in the House-passed bill. **Page H8128**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:20 p.m. and reconvened at 6:02 p.m. **Page H8129**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate appears on page H8101.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea and nay vote and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H8129, H8129–30, and H8130–31. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Joint Meetings

TAX CUTS AND THE BUDGET SURPLUS

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded hearings on the economic impact of certain tax cut provisions and budget surplus issues, after receiving testimony from James Gwartney, Chief Economist, Joint Economic Committee; James C. Miller III, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and Robert Greenstein, Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, both of Washington, D.C.; and Wayne D. Angell, Bear Stearns and Company, New York, New York.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1999

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings on the benefits of exercise for the elderly, 2 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, to hold hearings on proposed fiscal year 2000 youth violence initiative, 9:30 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings on issues concerning the sinking of the USS *Indianapolis* and the subsequent court-martial of Rear Admiral Charles B. McVay III, USN, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation, to hold hearings on S. 1051, to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to manage the Strategic Petroleum Reserve more effectively. (Subcommittee will meet immediately following the 9:30 a.m. full committee meeting), Time to be announced, SD–366.

Full Committee, 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, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps, Narcotics and Terrorism, to hold hearings to review the United States counterterrorism policy and the President's decision to grant clemency to FALN terrorists, 9 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings on issues relating to educational readiness, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings on issues relating to hate on the internet, 10 a.m., SD–226. Full Committee, to hold hearings on pending nominations, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business: to hold hearings on issues relating to grocery industry slotting fees (fees charged by the retailer that manufacturers pay to hold a certain amount of shelf space), and its effect on small business and the consumer, 9:30 a.m., SD–608.

House

Committee on Agriculture, hearing to review the farm financial crisis, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, hearing on French and Austrian Banks and Issues Relating to Forced Labor and the Settlement of Insurance Claims by Holocaust Victims and their Heirs, 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on ''The Failed Promise of the Corporation for National Service,'' 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, hearing on Trafficking of Women and Children in the International Sex Trade, 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, to continue markup of H.R. 2260, Pain Relief Promotion Act of 1999 and to mark up H.R. 2436, Unborn Victims of Violence Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on the GAO Report: ''Federal Wildlife Activities; Current Strategy and Issues Needing Attention.'' 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2737, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Illinois certain Federal land associated with the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to be used as an historic and interpretive site along the trail; and S. 382, Minuteman Missile National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: conference report to accompany H.R. 2490, 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; conference report to accompany S. 1059, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces; H.R. 1551, Civil Aviation Research and Development Authorization Act of 1999; and H.R. 1655, Department of Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1999, 1 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on Reformulated Gasoline (Part I) , 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Technology, hearing to Review the Department of Commerce's Plan to Terminate the National Technical Information Service, 2:30 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, September 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 2466, Department of the Interior Appropriations, with a vote on or in relation to Bryan/Wyden Amendment No. 1623 to occur at 10:30 a.m. Also, Senate will consider S.J. Res. 33, FALN Clemency, with a vote on final passage to occur thereon.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Tuesday, September 14

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Go to conference on H.R. 2606, Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000;

Consideration of 1 Suspension: H.R. 1883, Iran Nonproliferation Act; and

Consideration of H.R. 417, Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (structured rule, one hour of general debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E1856
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E1848
Borski, Robert A., Pa., E1853
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1847, E1848
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E1851, E1852
Cox, Christopher, Calif., E1847
Coyne, William J., Pa., E1852
Cramer, Robert E. (Bud), Jr., Ala., E1853
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E1854
Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E1855
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1851, E1852, E1853, E1855
Horn, Stephen, Calif., E1851
Kilpatrick, Carolyn C., Mich., E1848
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E1856
Kolbe, Jim, Ariz., E1849
Kuykendall, Steven T., Calif., E1854
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1851
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1849, E1850
Maloney, James H., Conn., E1856
Miller, Dan, Fla., E1849
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1854
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E1855
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E1853
Roukema, Marge, N.J., E1847
Serrano, José E., N.Y., E1852
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E1847
Upton, Fred, Mich., E1850
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1849, E1850

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.