United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1999 No. 133

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 5, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HEATHER WILSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

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 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

CONGRESS SHOULD HELP FLOOD-RAVAGED NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I represent the Third District of North Carolina that sustained unprecedented damage from Hurricane Floyd. I believe I echo the feelings of my North Carolina colleagues in Congress who also represent storm-damaged areas when I say that the amount of devastation that we have witnessed is almost impossible to comprehend.

While the storm itself has passed, the flooding has wreaked havoc on homes, farms, businesses, and entire communities. Some families lost their homes, jobs, and vehicles; and they are financially and emotional stressed and shattered.

Many of our rivers did not fully crest until days after Floyd hit and the additional rainfall last week only added to the problem.

But despite the amount of devastation that surrounds the citizens of eastern North Carolina, everyone is working together in a spirit that reminds us of the strength of this great Nation.

I want to thank the individuals, communities, businesses and organizations in North Carolina and across the country that have stepped up to the plate to help the citizens of eastern North Carolina. It has been a tremendous encouragement to our people.

Madam Speaker, just let me list some of the companies that are assisting: BlueCross/BlueShield of North Carolina, Food Lion, Lucent Technologies, Glaxo Welcome, International Paper, AJT and Associates of Florida, Mt. Olive Pickle Company, Sara Lee, Winn Dixie, Anheuser-Busch.

These and many other companies have sent help to eastern North Carolina. The charitable agencies and relief organizations have also been wonderful. The Second Harvest Food Bank of Northwestern North Carolina collected more than 100,000 pounds of food in one week. AmeriCares donated cleaning supplies. The Red Cross, Salvation Army, and the United Way are also coordinating donations of clothing and food drives. Religious communities across the country are also donating time as well as money to help their brothers and sisters across our district and the country.

All branches of the armed services, especially the United States Coast Guard and the United States Marines, Air National Guard, Army National Guard, and Air Force were tireless with their time and resources rescuing residents stranded by flooding. Their dedication to the State and Nation is second to none, and their efforts have been critical in saving and protecting human life.

Madam Speaker, now Congress must do its part. This Congress has an obligation to help the American people first when they are in trouble. We have a moral contract with the taxpayers. Madam Speaker, every year we send money to countless countries across the globe in foreign aid and we know through a variety of sources and reports sometimes billions of these dollars never reach the people they were sent to help. Billions of dollars in U.S. aid to Russia has reportedly been laundered through foreign banks including possible IMF funds. Now the President has pledged to forgive the debt of 36 countries owed to the United States in order to help these countries finance basic human needs. To forgive this debt would cost the American taxpayer $5 billion.

I would say to the President, there are families in North Carolina who have lost everything. They are living in shelters dependent upon the goodwill of friends and neighbors to provide them with the most basic human needs. Imagine what the community of eastern North Carolina could do with even $1 billion to help rebuild and repair the devastation.

Now Congress has appropriated over $12 billion in foreign aid for fiscal year 2000. Madam Speaker, I understand that we have strategic obligations to allies in the Middle East such as Israel; however, I cannot justify voting for a foreign aid package when families in my district are hurting so badly. Madam Speaker, we must help the American taxpayer first. I will not break faith with our own American citizens in their time of need. Not one

Printed on recycled paper.

dime of foreign aid should be appropriated until we take care of the people of our United States of America.

Madam Speaker, if this sounds like ''America first,'' so be it. The people in flood-ravaged eastern North Carolina need our help now, not next year. They are striving to exist each and every day. I call on the leadership of both parties to work together in a bipartisan effort to bring much-needed relief to these families in eastern North Carolina immediately.

CLOSING BOGUS CORPORATE LOOPHOLES BEST WAY TO PAY FOR PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, in June, I spoke to the House in connection with the introduction of the Abusive Tax Shelter Shutdown Act. This cover of Forbes magazine pretty much tells the entire story. Forbes magazine bills itself as ''The Capitalist Tool,'' yet its cover story is ''Tax Shelter Hustlers: Respectable accountants are peddling dicey corporate tax loopholes.'' And when you open the magazine and begin the article, they continue: ''Respectable tax professionals and respectable corporate clients are exploiting the exotica of modern corporate finance to indulge in extravagant tax dodging schemes.''

During recent months, a number of individuals and groups have recognized the need to address these abusive and bogus loopholes. ''The Joint Committee on Taxation staff is convinced that the present law does not sufficiently deter corporations from entering into arrangements with a significant purpose of avoiding or evading Federal income tax. The corporate tax shelter phenomenon poses a serious challenge to the efficacy of the tax system. The proliferation of corporate tax shelters causes taxpayers to question the fairness of the tax system.'' And the Treasury Department has emphasized that, ''the proliferation of corporate tax shelters presents an unacceptable and growing level of tax avoidance behavior.''

Within the last several weeks, the American Bar Association tax section has again declared, ''growing alarm with the aggressive marketing of tax products that have little or no purpose other than the reduction of Federal income taxes.''

The New York State Bar Association expressed concern as to ''the negative and corrosive effect that corporate tax shelters have on our system of taxation and again called for congressional action.'' And even the Republican chair of the Committee on Ways and Means proclaimed much earlier this year that ''the area of corporate tax shelters is one field which merits review. . . . We are going to try to eliminate every abuse that circumvents the legitimate needs of the Tax Code.''

Unfortunately, neither that committee nor any of this House has addressed specific legislation to even slow down these guys, the corporate tax hustlers, with or without a fedora like this follow on the cover of Forbes. And no other Member of the House, except those of us who joined behind the Abusive Tax Shelter Shutdown Act, has offered a specific legislative answer.

Madam Speaker, tomorrow the House will hopefully have an opportunity to cast a vote for tax fairness and tax equity. The supporters of the bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvements Act, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), Republicans and Democrats, are supporting this Tax Shelter Shutdown legislation both to deal with this problem and in order to pay for the costs of the bill.

I want to commend their efforts. While I think that the costs of managed care reform have been greatly overstated, all of us who are committed to the Patients' Bill of Rights are taking the fiscally prudent approach and recognizing that this must be a pay-as-you-go Congress even on a measure as important as protecting the rights of those in managed care.

And I am particularly pleased that it is the tax dodgers that will be financing this important measure to improve the health care of the millions of Americans who must rely on managed care.

My legislation which should be considered as an amendment to the Patients' Bill of Rights, will curtail egregious behavior without impacting legitimate business transactions. It will eliminate the well-justified feeling of many people that high rollers are cheating and gaming the system, a feeling which leads to distrust on behalf of our taxpaying public.

My bill seeks to shut down abusive tax shelters by prohibiting loss generators, transactions which lack any legitimate purpose and are ginned up to obtain lower taxes. Second, a company that thinks it has a proper shelter is required to provide complete, clear, and concise disclosure. And third, the penalty for tax dodging is increased and tightened. Getting some downtown lawyer to bless what some high-priced accountant has cooked up will not save the corporation from penalties anymore, if it has clearly overstepped the line.

Some of the worst tax inequities arrive from those who use abusive tax shelters to exploit loopholes. The Abusive Tax Shelter Shutdown Act is not a panacea, but offered as an amendment to the Patients' Bill of Rights. It will not only advance the cause of quality health care, but it will help law enforcement to close the loopholes, eliminate sham transactions, and stop hustlers like this.

Madam Speaker, as we say in Texas: shut them down and move them out.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

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

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, I come today to the floor for a couple of reasons. Later today we are going to be considering H.R. 764, the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act. We call that CAPE. I just wanted to come here this morning during morning hour and talk a little bit about what we are trying to do with this important piece of legislation.

I go back quite a ways with this bill, which is sponsored by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE). Before that, it was the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Molinari). We recognize that there is a very serious problem with child abuse. The bill is not a panacea nor does it answer all the questions raised in this important area of social concern. But what it does is allow what I think is really good government, and that allows for the money which we are now spending in many regards which is tied up with government bureaucracy and rules and regulation, to allow those at the local level to have flexibility in using this money in child abuse prevention programs.

Just look at the statistics: 3 million cases of child abuse and neglect. That is 9,000 reports a day. This bill is a step towards the goal of trying to achieve better use of the resources which we have out there to fight this growing problem in American society.

□ 0915

It bothers me when I look at young couples, and we talk to people and some of my own children, they have had grandchildren, when we talk to a parent, and they are doing everything they can to be sure that the child that they are going to have is healthy, not taking medicine for a cold, not taking an aspirin, not touching liquor or tobacco, things that we know could injure the child. Then we have the disparity on the other side of the equation where a child does not get that kind of care, does not get that kind of nurturing once they have been born.

That is who we want to try and help are those who are having trouble, who are under difficult pressures in our society so that they can be able to raise their child in a good atmosphere and that that child can grow and be nurtured to adulthood.

It is so important to our society because the child that is abused will very likely follow that same pattern when they grow as an adult. So today, when we take up H.R. 764, it is a small step

in the direction of correcting and assisting in this very major social problem.

The other thing that I wanted to talk about a minute today was a report that I saw in the newspaper about the failure of the administration to seek or to report to us about seeking assistance on repaying for the Kosovo operation.

We all know, I think, that, in this Congress for sure we know, it has cost us billions of dollars in Kosovo. We have shelled out probably easily 75 to 90 percent of the cost of that operation. It was really an American operation under the guise of NATO.

I think it was well founded when we put in the legislation that we sent to the President that he signed, that he agreed to report to us his efforts in trying to get contributions from our allies who took so much credit for what was done there and yet paid so little of the cost of that. I think that it is important that this administration come up with the report that is already now 2 weeks late.

Let us know what they are doing, make efforts to be sure that we get some assistance. As we go around the world, as we do our share of keeping peace in the world, we want to do that as American citizens. I do not think as American citizens we want to be taken advantage of, that we want to pay for all of that when there are others in this world equally able to share in that burden.

So I say to the administration, let us have the report. Let us know what they are doing. We should be able to do easily as well as we did when President Bush was President and we got $53 billion reimbursement for the Persian War, which was a very nice shot in the arm for the American budget and the American taxpayers.

So I say, Mr. President, let us know what you are doing. We really, really need your report on this.

NATIONAL TECHIES DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I am here this morning in recognition of the first ever National Techies Day to bring attention to the lack of adequately trained and educated workers to fill the many information and technology jobs that are available today.

Reports estimate about 350,000 Information Technology or IT jobs are currently unfilled in America with an expected 1 million jobs over the next 10 years.

The goal of National Techies Day is to match technology professionals with students, to encourage their involvement in science and technology with particular emphasis on children and disadvantaged communities.

Many of these communities are still without access to the Internet. We must work together to ensure that this digital divide will be eliminated. With Federal initiatives such as the E-Rate to wire all of the Nation's public schools and libraries, we are definitely on the right track.

So I am pleased to support National Techies Day and applaud organizations like the Association for Competitive Technology, the Kids Computer Workshop, and Be Healthy Lifestyles for reaching out to children in urban areas and opening their eyes to the endless possibilities of theirs.

LIBERALS DO NOT CARE ABOUT FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. RILEY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.

Mr. RILEY. Madam Speaker, here we go again. Yesterday we debated whether we should allow Federal funding to be used to pay for offensive art exhibits. Last night the Democrats offered a motion to instruct conferees to agree to increase the funding for the NEA and NEH.

I said it then, and I will say it again; under the Constitution, expression must be government protected, but there is no requirement that it be government funded.

Madam Speaker, liberals just do not grasp that concept. What makes the motion even more insulting is that it comes at a time when Congress is fighting to maintain fiscal responsibility and protect the Social Security Trust Fund.

Madam Speaker, this motion only proves what we have been saying all along, liberals do not care about fiscal responsibility. They do not care if American families get a tax cut. They do not care about what the American people want in general. They only care about raiding the surplus to protect their unjustified and often unneeded social programs.

Madam Speaker, it's going to take all of us working together to live within a balanced budget and we will never be able to do so until we set priorities in this Congress.

Social Security is a priority.

Funding obscene art is not.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, we are expecting that tomorrow we will have a debate on the Patients' Bill of Rights on HMO reform. We do not have the rule yet coming out from the Committee on Rules, and I have expressed many times on the floor of the House my concern that this rule, this procedure that may be adopted would allow the Republican leadership in the House to add poison pills, extraneous issues to the Patients' Bill of Rights in an effort to defeat it.

But I do not want to dwell on that today because I am still hopeful, still optimistic that that will not be the case and we will be allowed to have a clean vote on the Patients' Bill of Rights and provide for patient protections for those Americans who have their health insurance through HMOs or managed care.

But I am concerned, Madam Speaker, about the fact that, in the last few weeks and certainly the last 2 days, we have had a barrage of ads and articles that are basically put out by the HMO industry, by the insurance companies in an effort to defeat and spread erroneous information about the Patients' Bill of Rights, about the bipartisan Norwood-Dingell bill.

One that I think that we have basically disputed effectively but keeps coming up is the argument that, under the Patients' Bill of Rights, there will be too many lawsuits because now patients will be able to sue their HMO if they suffer damages; and, secondly, that the cost of health insurance will skyrocket because of the fact that there will now be the ability to sue the HMO as well as the various patient protections that are in place.

I think that the Texas law which has been on the books now in the State of Texas for 2 years, very similar to the Norwood-Dingell bill, effectively disputes the cost argument as well as the HMO liability or ability to sue the HMO argument.

Over 2 years now in Texas, there have only been four lawsuits filed against HMOs. In addition, the costs of health insurance premiums for those in managed care have not gone up at all. In fact, Texas rates have actually been less than a lot of other States. The increases have been actually less in Texas than a lot of other States where they do not have patient protections, where they do not have the Patients' Bill of Rights.

But, today, I hear another argument which I think needs to be effectively refuted as well, and that is that, somehow, employers, not the HMOs, but employers are going to be liable to suit under the Norwood-Dingell bill and that because employers will be sued, a lot of employers will drop health insurance, and the ranks of the uninsureds will increase. Well, nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact of the matter is that under the Norwood-Dingell bill, under the Patients' Bill of Rights, we have specific language that shields the employer from being sued in almost every circumstance. An employer would actually have to actually be involved in the very decision about whether or not one is going to have a particular operation or be able to stay in the hospital before they could be liable for suit, which is simply not the case.

In every case, the insurance company or a third party administrator handles those decisions for employers pursuant to their insurance policy. We have very effective shield language in the bill that effectively precludes the employer from being sued.

Now, I want to say I thought there was a very interesting article in today's Washington Post, an op ed by Anthony Burns where he tries to say and he admits that we do have shield language in the bill that would effectively preclude an employer from being sued.

But it goes on to say, essentially, in the article, and this is sort of a new twist on this theme, that even though the shield language is there, it will not matter because crafty trial lawyers will find a way to get around it.

He talks about, first, that plaintiffs could argue that insurance companies or third-party administrators are merely the agents of the employer, or a crafty lawyer could argue that, by selecting one health-care provider over another, the employers' discretionary decision played a role in a decision or an outcome with regard to patient care. Well, that is totally bogus.

Any trial lawyer, of course, can make any argument, and anybody can be sued and make an argument. But the bottom line is, if one has effective shield language, those arguments are not going to work.

One of the things that disturb me the most is that, if one sees what is happening around the country, one will see in a recent Illinois Supreme Court decision, or even a case that is now being obtained by our own U.S. Supreme Court, that the courts increasingly are getting around the prohibition on the right to sue.

But just because that is happening does not mean that we, when we pass legislation, which we are hopefully going to consider in the next few days, that if we put specific language in that says the employers cannot be sued, that should be sufficient for those who are concerned about this issue. Because any lawyer can make any argument. Any court can overturn any decision or any Federal language. But the bottom line is that we are putting that protection in the bill. I think that that should be sufficient. It is a recognition of the fact that the employers cannot be sued.

Please support the Norwood-Dingell bill. Do not be persuaded by these false arguments.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

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

O gracious God, we profess that You are the creator of the whole world and yet when we look at that world we see so much pain and suffering, wars and rumors of wars, and we become distressed. We affirm that You have created every person in Your image and yet in our communities we see alienation and estrangement one from another.

Almighty God, teach us that before we can change the world or our communities we need to change our own hearts and our own attitudes so that Your spirit of faith and hope and love touches our souls and the work of our daily lives. This is our earnest prayer. 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.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. VITTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 one-minute speeches on each side.

FEDERAL TELEPHONE ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 1999

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, a report released in August by the Department of Justice's Office of the Inspector General revealed hundreds of cases in which Federal inmates used prison telephones to commit serious crimes, including murder, drug trafficking, witness tampering, and fraud.

Although the Federal Bureau of Prisons has been aware of this problem for some time, it has not taken sufficient steps to address the abuse of Federal prison telephone systems.

To help the Bureau undertake immediate and meaningful action to correct these problems, I am introducing the Federal telephone abuse reduction act. My bill requires the Bureau of Prisons to implement changes to efficiently target and increase the monitoring of inmate conversations. It will also refocus officers to detect and deter crimes committed by inmates using Federal telephones.

I urge my colleagues to join me in squarely addressing what appears to be widespread inmate abuse of prison telephones and cosponsor the Federal telephone abuse reduction act.

REPUBLICANS REJECT GOVERNOR BUSH'S ADVICE ON PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is good news. The House Republicans have apparently yielded on their cruel plan to defer the earned income tax credit for working families, a plan deplored by Governor George W. Bush as, in his words, ''balancing the budget on the backs of the poor.''

But there is also bad news. The Republicans are so out of touch with the needs of American families that they have rejected Governor Bush's advice on the Patients' Bill of Rights that we will be debating tomorrow.

Our Lone Star State has been a national leader on reforming managed care. Although Governor Bush initially fell victim to the same old tired insurance company rhetoric upon which our House Republican friends now rely, he permitted our Texas Patients' Bill of Rights to be signed into law. And last week his office declared it has ''worked well.'' Who could say otherwise with only five lawsuits from 4 million Texans over 2 years in managed care.

Governor Bush's insurance commissioner has declared it ''a real success story,'' ''one of the leading'' consumer protection measures in the country. If the Republican leadership will get out of the way, we will do the same for all of America.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of my colleague on the left from

the State of Texas. And indeed he is making news today. Because, apparently, he is endorsing the candidacy of his governor, Governor Bush. And we certainly appreciate that act of bipartisanship. But in all sincerity and in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we do this as we defend patients' rights.

The key on this House floor and in the hospitals and clinics and homes of America is this: We must make sure that we have a true Patients' Bill of Rights instead of a lawyer's right to bill. And as we see this morning in one of our national publications, Mr. Speaker, sadly this is true.

I quote now, ''Yet trial lawyer money talks loudest of all now to many Democrats.'' And indeed it is increasingly clear the Democrat Party, with no ideological link to the private economy, is now reduced to redistributing income through litigation.

We do not want a lawyer's right to bill. We want a patients' bill of rights.

ENFORCEABLE PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, we will have a chance as bipartisan in this House to really have a patients' bill of rights, yes, a patients' bill of rights that respects the right of patients to expect that the plan they have with their insurance company is indeed enforceable.

That is a fundamental right of consumers to believe that which they have purchased is enforceable. They also expect that they will be able to be treated for disease and illness that they may be suffering, which is covered under that. So the patients' bill of rights does include the right to sue. But it does not include the right that employers should be sued.

So I am urging my colleagues not to have that scare tactic, to make sure that we have an opportunity to debate the right, the right for patients to be covered for those illnesses that they are insured, the right to enforce their plan and, yes, indeed if there is a failure or fraud, the right to sue finally.

The patients' bill of rights is an opportunity for us to say, yes, patients have a right to expect that their insurance company will follow through on their commitment.

REPUBLICANS ARE STOPPING RAID ON SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, Washington big spenders have raided Social Security for 30 years to pay for big government programs. Republicans are stopping that raid.

As a result, the President and the Democrats in Congress are desperately looking for new ways to pay for their big government programs. As usual, they think they found it in the wallets of the working Americans.

The Democrats' scream to increase tobacco taxes in order to pay for a fatter, more bloated government is nothing more than a money grab that will hurt low-income workers.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, as this chart shows, over 53 percent of the Democrats' tax increase will be paid by Americans earning less than $30,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to assure the hard-working taxpayers of this country that this Republican Congress will not schedule a bill that raises their taxes and this Republican Congress will not schedule a bill that raids their Social Security. It is time to stop the raid on Social Security and time to stop the raid on the taxpayers' wallets.

Mr. Speaker, if the Democrats raise tobacco taxes, they will feed the most insidious addiction in this town, the addiction they have for our money.

UNCLE SAM IS PROPPING UP COMMUNISM IN CHINA

(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, last week China celebrated 50 years of communist rule. They had parades with tanks, missiles, communism on display after all our efforts to defeat communism.

What is troubling, Mr. Speaker, is they were partying in China on our cash, a $70-billion trade surplus. Unbelievable. The truth is, communism in China would be belly up today if it were not for our trade policy.

Beam me up. Uncle Sam is now propping up communism. I yield back Taiwan, Johnny Huang, Charlie Trie, and all the Chinese spies running around our nuclear labs.

DAY 131 OF SOCIAL SECURITY LOCKBOX HELD HOSTAGE

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, today is day 131 of the Social Security lockbox held hostage by President Clinton and the minority party in the Senate.

One hundred thirty-one days ago, this House, both Democrats and Republicans, voted overwhelmingly 416–12 to lock up Social Security dollars to protect them from being spent on unrelated programs.

Since the passage of the Social Security lockbox in the House, the Senate leadership is on record six times attempting to bring the Social Security lockbox for a vote on the Senate floor. And for six times the approval to even consider the Social Security lockbox was denied on a straight party-line vote.

Mr. Speaker, the House is committed to ending the 30-year raid on Social Security. I urge the Democrat minority in the Senate to allow for the same.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain during one-minute speeches from references to proceedings in the other body.

KIDDIE MAC

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the new millennium, the American family has taken a new shape. Our children are now reared not only by two working parents, sometimes by single parents, grandmothers, guardians.

Many Americans say that finding safe, affordable child care is one of their most important concerns. We have not been able to finance a sufficient number of needed child care centers. Parents who can afford to pay for modest child care, many spend more on yearly quality child care tuition than on public college tuition.

As one step in addressing this crisis, I have introduced bipartisan legislation with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) called Kiddie Mac. Kiddie Mac is designed to build a partnership between the Federal Government and private lending institutions to finance safe and affordable child care.

Unless we act to pass Kiddie Mac, the new American family of the new millennium may collide head-on with the unmet needs for safe and affordable child care.

SOCIAL SECURITY LOCKBOX

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

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 of this year, 3 days before my election, this body passed a Social Security lockbox bill authored by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER). It was by an overwhelming vote of 416–12.

We are here today, and we will be here every day to demand that the Senate act on this measure. A lot has happened since passage on May 26. Four months, a total of 131 days, have gone by. The American League won the All Star game. The NHL and the NFL began play. The President got a home loan. And the other body voted six times to block Social Security lockbox legislation.

But one thing has not changed. The American people are rightly demanding that we protect Social Security through institutional safeguards like the lockbox. Simply put, the other body is holding the lockbox bill hostage. One hundred thirty-one days is long enough.

REPUBLICAN BROKEN PROMISES

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress, the new Republican leadership made America a few promises. They said that they would finish their work on time, that they would not break the balanced budget spending limits, and that they would not spend money from the Social Security trust fund.

□ 1015

Months later, all we can say about these three promises is broken, broken, and broken. The Republicans have not finished their work on time. Last week we had to pass an emergency spending measure to prevent the government shutdown. The Republicans are breaking the spending caps, proposing budget-busting tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans. And their plan to bring spending back in line? Delay the small tax credit given to low-income working families, a plan so callous even GOP Presidential candidate George Bush denounced it saying, ''Republicans should not balance their budget on the backs of the poor.''

Finally, Republicans promised not to take money from Social Security, but now the Congressional Budget Office says that the Republicans have already taken $16 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund this year. Another promise broken. They have broken the lock-box and they have taken the money out and spent the Social Security Trust Fund. Promises made, promises broken. That is the legacy of this Congress.

MIAMI RIVER CLEANUP

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the President has signed into law the first Federal appropriations to clean up the Miami River, that was in the fiscal year 2000 energy water appropriation bill. The next step will be up to the governments at the State and local levels as well as the broad coalition of community groups represented by the Miami River Commission and the Miami River Marine Group.

The Miami-Dade County manager has reiterated our county's support for this key environmental project. This is the beginning of a 4-year phased dredging project proposed by the Miami River Commission with the assistance of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

This $5 million Federal initial appropriation will begin maintenance dredging of the river which will cost $64 million from Federal, State, and local sources. The Miami River project shows what can be accomplished when governments at all levels join with grass-roots activists to achieve a common goal. The cleanup will ensure the continued growth of the Miami River as one of our Nation's critical shipping links to the Caribbean and Latin America.

We congratulate the Miami-Dade County manager. Let us do our job at the local level now.

MANAGED CARE REFORM

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just when Congress appears ready for managed care reform with the Norwood-Dingell bill, there is an effort to propose gimmicks and ways to poison the bill with harmful provisions that will wind up doing nothing for patients.

For months, the Republican leadership has complained that the Patients' Bill of Rights would increase cost and open employers to unfair lawsuits, both of which would supposedly force employers to drop coverage. That is just not true.

As a Northeastern Member of Congress said a couple of weeks ago, even Texas is a leader and California just passed a bill recently and the governor signed it, passed a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. My home State of Texas has passed many of the patient protections. They are already in place, including external appeals, accountability, and there has been no premium increase or exodus by employers to drop coverage.

What Texas residents do have is the health care protections they need. Provisions included in this Patients' Bill of Rights should be extended to every American including eliminating ''gag clauses,'' open access to specialists, a timely appeals process, coverage for immediate emergency care, and holding the medical decision-maker accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray we are not headed for more delays and maneuverings and will pass a strong bill for our constituents.

EVERYONE WANTS TO GO TO HEAVEN, BUT NOBODY WANTS TO DIE

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the late heavyweight champion of the world, Joe Louis, once said, ''Everyone wants to go to heaven but nobody wants to die.''

Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of that statement will be shown to be true this week and next. Everybody in this House says that they want to protect Social Security. Everybody. But how many will support the spending cuts we need to get there?

Every time the majority offers budget cuts to get there, the other side votes ''no,'' or offers tax increases, or screams bloody murder.

We must cut spending to preserve Social Security. We must pass the Social Security lock-box. But as Joe Louis said: ''Everybody wants to go to heaven, but nobody wants to die.''

TECHIES DAY

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Techies Day and the positive impact technology had on our lives.

Techies Day allows us to recognize and applaud today's technology professionals. In addition, it brings current techies and schoolchildren together in hopes of encouraging more of them to pursue careers in science or technology.

The United States leads the world in technology development, but we continue to lag behind in educating and training the workforce that is prepared to fill thousands of technical jobs. With more of our day-to-day activities being done electronically, it is important we ensure a competent workforce that is prepared to meet the growing needs of this industry. These needs will be met by educating our children and preparing them for the technology field. This is essential to America's long-term economic strength as we enter the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, our children's future matters to all of us, and we have a responsibility to bring them into this new economy equipped with the tools needed to keep pace with technology innovations. Techies Day is the right direction to make this possible.

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN COULD LEAD TO DISASTER

(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, we have been fortunate that a nuclear accident like the recent disaster at a Japanese uranium processing plant has not occurred in the United States in the last 3 decades.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to hold on to their gas masks because things could change.

A recent article in the Las Vegas Review Journal clearly stated that ''a nuclear chain reaction similar to the one that released dangerous levels of radiation from a Japanese uranium plant could happen with spent fuel the U.S. Government wants to store at Yucca Mountain.''

Unfortunately, the Department of Energy continues to ignore the scientific facts and warnings offered by the nuclear energy experts. Scientists have already concluded that water will drip through the porous rock barrier

and accelerate corrosion of the nuclear waste containers, potentially causing a reaction similar to the Japanese nuclear disaster.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot in good faith place the lives of thousands of citizens living in the surrounding area of Yucca Mountain in peril. The plan to store nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is simply unwarranted, unwise, and dangerous. We can and must prevent such a disaster.

IN SUPPORT OF THE DINGELL-NORWOOD PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the bipartisan Dingell-Norwood Patients' Bill of Rights. We need protections for patients to ensure that they have access to specialists, to ensure that they get accurate information about all of their medical options and not just the cheapest options. We need to ensure that they can get reimbursed for emergency room care. That is what the Patients' Bill of Rights is about.

I am not here to paint the HMOs as the ultimate villains, but I will say that the profit motive leads to greed and greed leads to some of the worst abuses of patients we have seen.

Mr. Speaker, we need a Patients' Bill of Rights that is enforceable. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership wants to give an empty can. If we cannot enforce patients' rights, the rights are meaningless. Some would say that is a boon for trial attorneys. Not so. The importance of having the right to sue is so there is a deterrent against bad medical practices.

Texas has shown that there is not a significant increase in lawsuits when there is an enforceable bill of rights. We will also hear that this will drive up costs. Not so. Minimum cost increases are a couple of dollars. What is important is that we have an enforceable bill of rights with teeth to protect all Americans.

DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM

(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, this week the House Committee on Education and the Workforce will consider the Dollars to the Classroom resolution stating that our schoolchildren and teachers in our public schools throughout this country can benefit by directing Federal funding for elementary and secondary education directly to classrooms where the learning process actually takes place.

By seeking to get 95 cents of every dollar into the classrooms of our public schools, the children and teachers of this Nation would see an additional $870 million out of the existing appropriation. That is $10,000 per school translating to about $450 for every classroom in America.

By seeing that dollars actually get into the hands of those who directly teach our kids their ABCs and their 1, 2, 3s, we will get maximum efficiency out of the use of our tax dollars.

As the House considers the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, let us look at how we can empower teachers at the local level. No longer do we want our seventh graders saying their books were printed when their teachers were in the eighth grade.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Dollars to the Classroom resolution.

CONGRESS MUST PASS PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just recently we read a report that tells us that 43 million Americans are uninsured and without health insurance. Shame on America and shame on this Congress. That is why among many things that we have to do to include those who are uninsured, we must pass the Patients' Bill of Rights.

Tragically in my own State of Texas under Republican leadership, Texas is number one with uninsured persons with no coverage to protect them and provide for health insurance. Shame on Texas and shame on the Republican leadership in the State of Texas.

But the Patients' Bill of Rights will give minimal relief to those who are covered. It provides access to any emergency room. It will stop the closed-door policy of an emergency room because of nonapproval, allow women to have OB/GYNs as their primary caregiver, and will give relief to sue HMOs, not frivolously but if they decide to determine a patient's medical destiny and they are hurt.

Mr. Speaker, does it mean patients will sue their employer? Of course not. Does it mean this will work? Yes, because it worked in the State of Texas.

We must pass the Patients' Bill of Rights, otherwise more shame on America.

TRIBUTE TO THE CINCINNATI REDS FOR AN INCREDIBLE SEASON

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, this was a special year for baseball in my hometown of Cincinnati, Ohio. The Cincinnati Reds with a handful of dedicated veterans, a lot of young talent, and one of the lowest payrolls in baseball captured the Nation's attention with their unbridled enthusiasm and passion for the game.

Last night the Reds' incredible run ended earlier than we had hoped. And while it may be of little consolation to the players, their inspirational efforts have brought many fans, both young and old, back to baseball.

Sadly, baseball's economics may not allow this same talented team to return to the field for another run at the pennant, but we will not soon forget the 1999 Cincinnati Reds. We will remember Barry Larkin and Pokey Reese turning spectacular double plays; Mike Cameron running down balls in the gap; Sean Casey and Greg Vaughn and many others driving pitches over the outfield walls; and the determined outings by the pitching staff.

Every Member of the Reds and their fans should hold their heads up high today. They gave it their all day in and day out and reminded the country that our national pastime is alive and well in the home of baseball's first professional team: Cincinnati, Ohio.

GOP OBSTACLES TO PATIENT PROTECTIONS

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to set the record straight on managed care reform. Just this week, the GOP leadership accused the President of trying to rush through a health plan simply to get it done and said that, ''Republicans want to get it done right, not fast.''

However, Republicans want it done right for their special interests like insurance companies, not for the American people. Their plan would protect insurance companies from liability, rather than protect patients when insurance bureaucrats deny them care. Our proposal on the other hand is the right approach for the American people. We guarantee patients the right to hold plans accountable when they arbitrarily deny medical care.

The Republican leadership's proposal is right for insurance companies because it lets insurance bureaucrats rather than doctors make decisions about medical treatment. Our proposal is right for the American people because it ensures that doctors make medical decisions that are in the best interest of a patient, not the health plan.

So I ask, who is really doing what is right for the American People?

□ 1030

CONGRESS AWAITING PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, where is it? Let me ask my Democrat and Republican friends, where is it? They

know what I am talking about: H.R. 1, the President's plan to save Social Security.

Right there he stood, Mr. Speaker, right there, and said, let us put Social Security first. Of course he only wanted to preserve 62 percent of it and has continuously stuck with that by trying to raid it every chance he gets, but he has not introduced a bill.

This box right here, he could put it in here any time, but he has not. That was back in January, Mr. Speaker. Where is the President's plan?

He goes from coast to coast bragging to America's seniors how he is going it take care of them; and yet, he has not introduced his plan to save Social Security.

Instead, he has kept saying, let us spend the money. He puts pressure on Congress: Spend more money on appropriations bills. I am going to have to veto this bill; not enough money in it.

Guess where he is going to get the balance, right from Social Security. That is why he is against the security box concept for Social Security, the lockbox that would keep his hands out of the till. That is why he is fighting it.

Mr. President, the box is waiting. Congress is ready when you are. Go ahead and introduce your plan.

NO MORE TAX INCREASES; BRING SPENDING UNDER CONTROL

(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, is it true that Bill Clinton, AL GORE, and House Democrats want to raise taxes one more time? Mr. Speaker, is it true that Bill Clinton, AL GORE, and House Democrats want to raid Social Security one more time?

Is it true that those who cheered Bill Clinton's reckless and irresponsible veto of the Republican efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty want to raise taxes one more time?

We can balance the budget. We must balance the budget without the Clinton-Gore tax hike. Let us not forget that Bill Clinton, AL GORE, and House Democrats gave America our biggest tax hike in history in 1993.

Our goal as Republicans is to wall off the Social Security Trust Fund, to stop the raid on Social Security, because we believe 100 percent of Social Security should go for retirement, Social Security, and Medicare.

We can save Social Security. We can help our local schools. We can lower the tax burden by eliminating the marriage tax penalty. We can pay down the national debt, all without raising taxes, all without dipping into Social Security.

No more tax increases. No more raids on Social Security. Let us balance the budget. Let us bring spending under control.

WORK TOGETHER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are surprised to learn that the President's budget proposal spends the Social Security surplus rather than put Social Security first.

The President's proposal takes 38 percent of the surplus for Social Security and spends it, and that excludes his hidden tax increases, as if our taxes are not high enough already.

The Republican proposal sets aside 100 percent of Social Security, 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund. As many Americans are learning, the budget surplus this year is due to the surplus in the Social Security trust fund.

Republicans propose to take 100 percent of the retirement surplus, the money coming from the FICA taxes, the payroll deductions, and set it aside for both Social Security, and also set aside all the money from payroll deductions for Medicare. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Medicare is included in our retirement surplus proposal. Our plan sets aside 100 percent of the retirement surplus for both Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, the ''Workhorse Congress'' is ahead of schedule and moving ahead to deal with Medicare and Social Security, which will be insolvent in over a decade unless we act to protect the Trust Funds now. Let us work together to protect Social Security and Medicare.

OUR FUTURE DEPENDS ON A SOCIAL SECURITY LOCKBOX

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, if we in this Congress accomplish nothing else in our session but to set in stone the idea of a Social Security lockbox, we will have accomplished a great deal for America.

If we have been able to get across to the people in this country the idea that FICA taxes coming into this government will be used for nothing else but Social Security, if we can firmly establish this concept, the lockbox concept, we will, in fact, save Americans well over $2 trillion in the next 10 years.

We will do it this way: by assuring that those dollars coming in for Social Security will actually pay down debt, not go for new programs as they have gone for the last 34 or 35 years. We have expanded government by using Social Security money; and if we can stop just that one thing from happening and do nothing else here, we will have accomplished an enormous amount.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please think about the future of the country and how much it depends upon our ability to advance the idea of a Social Security lockbox.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU) laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 9, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR DENNIS: Enclosed please find copies of resolutions approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on August 5, 1999, in accordance with 40 U.S.C. § 606.

With warm regards, I remain

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 12, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted on August 5, 1999 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

There was no objection.

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. Any rollcall vote postponed on questions will be taken later today.

NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1663) to designate as a national memorial the memorial being built at

the Riverside National Cemetery in Riverside, California to honor recipients of the Medal of Honor, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1663

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Medal of Honor Memorial Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Medal of Honor is the highest military decoration which the Nation bestows.

(2) The Medal of Honor is the only military decoration given in the name of Congress, and therefore on behalf of the people of the United States.

(3) The Congressional Medal of Honor Society was established by an Act of Congress in 1958, and continues to protect, uphold, and preserve the dignity, honor, and name of the Medal of Honor and of the individual recipients of the Medal of Honor.

(4) The Congressional Medal of Honor Society is composed solely of recipients of the Medal of Honor.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR SITES.

(a) RECOGNITION.—The following sites to honor recipients of the Medal of Honor are hereby recognized as National Medal of Honor sites:

(1) RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA.—The memorial under construction at the Riverside National Cemetery in Riverside, California, to be dedicated on November 5, 1999.

(2) INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.—The memorial at the White River State Park in Indianapolis, Indiana, dedicated on May 28, 1999.

(3) MOUNT PLEASANT, SOUTH CAROLINA.—The Congressional Medal of Honor Museum at Patriots Point in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, currently situated on the ex-U.S.S. Yorktown (CV–6).

(b) INTERPRETATION.—This section shall not be construed to require or permit Federal funds (other than any provided for as of the date of the enactment of this Act) to be expended for any purpose related to the sites recognized in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Stump).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUMP. 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. 1663.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1663, the National Medal of Honor Memorial Act, is a significant bill that is supported by all veterans and their service organizations.

The Medal of Honor is this country's highest military honor, awarded for distinguished gallantry at the risk of life above and beyond the call of duty.

This bill recognizes three sites dedicated to honoring the Medal of Honor recipients. They are a memorial under construction at the Riverside VA National Cemetery in California; the memorial recently dedicated at White River State Park in Indianapolis, Indiana; and the Congressional Medal of Honor Museum at Patriots Point in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, on the U.S.S. *Yorktown*.

H.R. 1663 is supported by the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, an exclusive group consisting of all Medal of Honor recipients. I ask my colleagues to support the bill, H.R. 1663, as amended.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as original cosponsor of H.R. 1663, the National Medal of Honor Memorial Act, I am very pleased this legislation is being considered today.

The Medal of Honor is, of course, the highest award for valor and action against an enemy force which can be bestowed upon a member of the armed forces of the United States.

Established in the Civil War, only 3,429 Medals of Honor have been awarded since that time. Because of the extraordinary nature of this Medal and those extraordinary Americans who have earned it, it is fitting that the Medal of Honor recipients be honored at designated Medal of Honor sites.

I particularly want to particularly commend the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) for the amendment in the nature of a substitute which she offered to H.R. 1663 during its consideration by the committee. As perfected by the Carson amendment, the Congressional Medal of Honor Society has expressed enthusiastic support for H.R. 1663, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR SOCIETY,
Mt. Pleasant, SC, September 3, 1999.

Hon. LANE EVANS,
House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Washington, DC.

RE: H.R. 1663.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVANS: This letter is to express enthusiastic support of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society and its members for H.R. 1663 that designates three locations within the United States of America as ''National Medal of Honor sites.'' The designation will properly acknowledge the tireless efforts of the respective communities in honoring the service of our veterans. By recognizing the recipients of the Medal of Honor each memorial in turn acknowledges the men and women with whom each recipient served.

The Society will follow the progress of H.R. 1663 and if signed into law, the Society will issue bronze plaques to be affixed to each site declaring each a National Site.

On behalf of the Society and its members, I thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

PAUL W. BUCHA,
President.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an excellent piece of legislation. I urge all my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me the time and for his decisive action in moving this important legislation through the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 1663, the National Medal of Honor Memorial Act of 1999, to honor the sacrifice and bravery of 3,417 Medal of Honor recipients. The Medal of Honor is the highest honor given by Congress for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of life beyond the call of duty.

H.R. 1663 would designate three sites as National Medal of Honor Memorials, the Riverside National Cemetery memorial in Riverside, California; the White River State Park memorial in Indianapolis, Indiana; and the U.S.S. Yorktown memorial in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina.

My bipartisan bill has the Medal of Honor Society's endorsement and does not use taxpayer money for the construction of the three memorial sites. I am also happy to report that the companion legislation to H.R. 1663 has been introduced in the Senate.

I know that the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) will speak about the sites within their districts; therefore, I want to speak about my own Riverside National memorial site in Riverside, California.

Riverside National Cemetery is presently the final resting place for two Medal of Honor recipients: Staff Sergeant Ysmael Villegas, United States Army, awarded posthumously for actions in the Philippines; and Commander John Henry Balch, United States Navy, awarded for action in France.

The memorial will name 3,417 Medal of Honor recipients. For each Medal of Honor recipient, an Italian Cyprus tree will be planted. These trees live in excess of 100 years, grow well in southern California, and require minimal maintenance. The monument itself will include a walled area which will surround a pool and a miniature waterfall.

The Riverside memorial site will bring honor to our Medal of Honor recipients in a solemn manner appropriate to its place in a national cemetery. The memorial site will be dedicated in November as the Medal of Honor Society convenes their 1999 convention.

In closing, I wish to encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1663 and the Medal of Honor Society's mission to serve our country in peace as we did in war, to inspire and stimulate our youth to become worthy citizens of our country, to foster and perpetuate Americanism.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and others for being so generous in terms of incorporating all of the Medal of Honor memorials into H.R. 1663.

I would encourage the enthusiastic support of the Congress given the old adage that says given honor unto whom honor is due.

Earlier this year in my district on May 28, thanks to the civic virtue of John Hodowal, and the civic enterprise of the Indianapolis Power and Light Company Enterprises Foundation, a new memorial was unveiled in Indianapolis in honor of those special American heroes who, for military service above and beyond the call of duty, were rewarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

We were fortunate to have one of the attendees included there when the presentation was made, Mr. Melvin Biddle of Anderson, Indiana, who was awarded the Medal of honor following his displayed conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action against the enemy near Soy, Belgium, on December 23 and 24, 1944.

We not only, Mr. Speaker, do our respective districts proud, we do America proud by passing H.R. 1663 in honor of the 3,400 persons that those memorials honor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today for this legislation that would recognize as National Medal of Honor sites the memorial at the White River State Park in Indianapolis, Indiana, dedicated on May 28, 1999; the memorial under construction at the Riverside National Cemetery in Riverside, California, to be dedicated on November 5, 1999; and the Congressional Medal of Honor Museum at Patriots Point in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, currently situated on the ex-U.S.S. Yorktown. I am pleased that my colleagues on the Veterans Committee supported my substitute amendment to Representative CALVERT'S original bill.

This legislation is supported by the Congressional Medal of Honor Society. I would like to recognize and thank Paul Bucha, President of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, for his continued support of the Indianapolis memorial, this legislation, and the extraordinary work he does on behalf of the Medal of Honor recipients. This bill has received the support of several other veterans organizations—AMVETS, the Non Commissioned Officers Association, the Disabled American Veterans, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Medal of Honor is only bestowed on those who have performed an act of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of life above and beyond the call of duty. Acts of bravery and courage are not unusual among those in uniform, and engaging in direct battle with an enemy or carrying out one's duties under enemy attack is an act of bravery and courage performed by many members of our Armed Forces. The level of heroism cited among those who receive the Medal of Honor is uncommonly high and of a far greater magnitude. The individuals who have received this medal for acts of valor have been signaled out not to glorify war, but to recognize that, for all of its destructiveness, war often is the backdrop for extraordinary acts of bravery.

As a symbol of heroism, this medal has no equal in American life. As of now, 2,363 Medals have been awarded to the Army, 745 to the Navy, 295 to the Marines, 16 to the Air Force, 1 to the Coast Guard, and 9 Unknowns. There have been a 3,410 total recipients and 3,429 total Medals awarded. Of those, nineteen (19) have received the Medal of Honor twice.

Earlier this year in my district on May 28th, thanks to the civic virtue of John Hodowal, and the civic enterprise of the corporation he leads, IPALCO Enterprises and the IPALCO Enterprises Foundation, a new memorial was unveiled in Indianapolis in honor of those special American heroes who, for military service above and beyond the call of duty, were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. The dedication ceremony, with ninety-six of the 155 living recipients of the Medal of Honor, was attended by one of the largest ever gatherings of these reputable men and women. One of these attendees included Mr. Melvin E. Biddle, of Anderson, Indiana, who was awarded the Medal of Honor following his displayed conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action against the enemy near Soy, Belgium, on December 23 and 24, 1944.

This magnificent memorial, compose of 27 curved walls of glass, each between seven and ten-feet high and representing specific conflicts in which the medal was awarded, features the names of the 3,410 people who have received the medal since it was first awarded during the Civil War. The location of this memorial, on the north bank of the Central Canal in White River State Park is particularly significant, since it is adjacent to Military Park, which served as a training facility during the Civil War. Nearly half of the Medals of Honor issued, 1,520, were bestowed upon soldiers who fought in the Civil War. This memorial joins the many memorials that line downtown Indianapolis paying homage to the men and women in uniform who served our nation at war and at peace down through the years. Nearby, a memorial to the men of the USS Indianapolis marks their service, and on Monument Circle, at the very heart of downtown Indianapolis, stands the Soldier's and Sailors' Monument, standing nearly as tall as the Statute of Liberty, a multifaceted recognition of the contributions of Indiana's Soldiers, Sailors and Marines from the Civil War through the Spanish American War, the Boxer Rebellion and our other foreign military engagements up to World War I.

I am pleased to support this measure to honor these three sites as National Medal of Honor Sites, allowing us the opportunity to say "thank you" to these men and women who have showed us what heroism is all about.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

I think it interesting that, over 100 years ago, an Army officer leaned down in the ground and scratched in the Pennsylvania soil and said this was sacred ground. As it turns out, his comments were prophetic, because that happened to be near a little place called Gettysburg.

What I think is prophetic about this bill and so important about this bill is that, basically, it reaches out and it consecrates three national shrines to the theme of patriotism, to the theme of persistence.

I think that it is particularly fitting that one of those shrines be the U.S. *Yorktown*. The *Yorktown*, as has already been mentioned, is tied up off Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, there along the coast of South Carolina, and it is named "The Fighting Lady."

The reason it got that name is that it earned 11 battle stars in World War II. It earned five battle stars off the coast of Vietnam prior to its retirement in 1970. In fact, it took a direct hit back in 1945. Yet, despite the fact that The Fighting Lady had been hit, she continued air operations. She continued to fight. Several men were killed, others were wounded, but they kept on fighting.

□ 1045

The sailors on board the Yorktown, those Navy officers and enlisted folks, just would not give up.

I think that that is what is so important about the Medal of Honor; it embraces this theme of patriotism, combined with the idea of persistence, and that is a theme I think we could all learn about, whether in wartime or in peacetime.

So I would just applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and applaud the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) for their leadership with this bill and how it again consecrates these three national shrines to the theme of patriotism and persistence.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I, too, rise in strong support of H.R. 1663, the National Medal of Honor Memorial Act.

As a Californian and original cosponsor of the bill, I am very pleased that H.R. 1663 recognizes the Riverside National Cemetery in Riverside, California, as a national Medal of Honor site, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for his efforts in that regard.

I was also cosponsor of an amendment offered in full committee by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) to recognize two additional national Medal of Honor sites, one at the White River State Park in Indianapolis, Indiana, and the other at the Congressional Medal of Honor Museum in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, which we just heard about.

As many people know, the Medal of Honor is the first military decoration formally authorized by the American Government to be worn as a badge of

honor, and it was created by this Congress in 1861. Senator James Grimes of Iowa, chairman of the Senate Naval Committee, proposed legislation to require that a medal of honor, similar to the Victoria Cross of England, be given to naval personnel for actions of bravery in action. His legislation, which was signed into law by President Lincoln on December 21, 1861, established a Medal of Honor for enlisted men of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps. Subsequently, legislation was enacted extending eligibility for the medal to Army-enlisted personnel as well as officers of the Armed Services.

Senator Robert F. Kennedy once said, ''It is from numberless diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped. Each time a man stands up for an ideal or acts to improve the lot of others or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope.''

Those extraordinary Americans who have won the Medal of Honor have, through their acts of remarkable courage, certainly shaped the history of our country and our world. We are doing the right thing today by honoring these courageous citizens.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1663 and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1663, the National Medal of Honor Memorial Act. This is a good bill because it honors the incredible courage and valor of our most distinguished veterans. Moreover, it ensures that future generations of Americans will know of the great sacrifices made by these men and women who answered the call to national service for their country. Medal of Honor winners have shown that they were willing to defend our liberty no matter what the price. Their heroism in battle has become legendary.

Since the Civil War, our country has recognized their outstanding acts of courage and bravery through the Congressional Medal of Honor. As there have been only 3,429 award winners in the history of our Nation, these veterans truly occupy a very special place in the hearts of all Americans. Therefore, I think that it is important that we designate sites around the country as national memorials for our Medal of Honor winners.

With this bill, we recognize memorials in Riverside, California; Indianapolis, Indiana; and Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, to honor the contributions to our freedom and to our country of these brave, fine Americans. I therefore strongly endorse this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to join in unanimously approving this bill.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), for all his help in bringing this to the floor; and also the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chief sponsor, for bringing this bill to us and for working so closely with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1663, the National Medal of Honor Memorial Act.

As the 20th Century draws to a close, many veterans wonder if the nation has lost sight of the sacrifices which have been made to preserve freedom. This bill, loudly states that we the Congress, who represent the people of this great nation, have not lost sight of the heroic sacrifices made in the name of freedom. We appreciate the great contributions of these brave individuals who knowingly placed themselves in harm's way, ready to sacrifice life and limb so that their comrades may live and this nation's values remain strong.

Over this last Memorial Day weekend, I had the distinct pleasure to assemble with nearly 100 Medal of Honor recipients to dedicate the Congressional Medal of Honor Memorial site at the White River State Park in Indianapolis, Indiana. It was truly an inspiring gathering, and at the same time, proved a very humbling experience. These individuals epitomize the true meaning of selfless sacrifice and personal commitment.

While many have answered the call to duty, they have answered a higher calling. A calling that is spiritual in nature and bigger than one's self. For love of God, country, family and friends. Their significant contributions have helped secure a more democratic and peaceful world over the last century. More importantly, their actions serve as a testament to all Americans about serving and caring for others.

Recognizing these Congressional Medal of Honor memorials sites in California, Indiana, and South Carolina as National Medal of Honor memorials continues our commitment to these gallant and heroic men and women and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1663.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1663, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMMENDING VETERANS OF THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 65) commending the World War II veterans who fought in the Battle of the Bulge, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 65

Whereas the battle in the European theater of operations during World War II known as the Battle of the Bulge was fought from December 16, 1944, to January 25, 1945;

Whereas the Battle of the Bulge was a major German offensive in the Ardennes forest region of Belgium and Luxembourg which took Allied forces by surprise and was intended to split the Allied forces in Europe by breaking through the Allied lines, crippling the Allied fuel supply lines, and exacerbating tensions within the alliance;

Whereas 600,000 American troops, joined by 55,000 British soldiers and other Allied forces, participated in the Battle of the Bulge, overcoming numerous disadvantages in the early days of the battle that included fewer numbers, treacherous terrain, and bitter weather conditions;

Whereas the Battle of the Bulge resulted in 81,000 American and 1,400 British casualties, of whom approximately 19,000 American and 200 British soldiers were killed, with the remainder wounded, captured, or listed as missing in action;

Whereas the worst atrocity involving Americans in the European theater during World War II, known as the Malmédy Massacre, occurred on December 17, 1944, when 86 unarmed American prisoners of war were gunned down by elements of the German 1st SS Panzer Division;

Whereas American, British, and other Allied forces overcame great odds throughout the battle, including most famously the action of the 101st Airborne Division in holding back German forces at the key Belgian crossroads town of Bastogne, thereby preventing German forces from achieving their main objective of reaching Antwerp as well as the Meuse River line;

Whereas the success of American, British, and other Allied forces in defeating the German attack made possible the defeat of Nazi Germany four months later in April 1945;

Whereas thousands of United States veterans of the Battle of the Bulge have traveled to Belgium and Luxembourg in the years since the battle to honor their fallen comrades who died during the battle;

Whereas the peoples of Belgium and Luxembourg, symbolizing their friendship and gratitude toward the American soldiers who fought to secure their freedom, have graciously hosted countless veterans groups over the years;

Whereas the city of Bastogne has an annual commemoration of the battle and its annual Nuts Fair has been expanded to include commemoration of the legendary one-word reply of ''Nuts'' by Brigadier General Anthony McAuliffe of the 101st Airborne Division when called upon by the opposing German commander at Bastogne to surrender his forces to much stronger German forces;

Whereas the Belgian people erected the Mardasson Monument to honor the Americans who fought in the Battle of the Bulge as well as to commemorate their sacrifices and service during World War II;

Whereas the 55th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge in 1999 will be marked by many commemorative events by Americans, Belgians, and Luxembourgers; and

Whereas the friendship between the United States and both Belgium and Luxembourg is

strong today in part because of the Battle of the Bulge: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) commends the veterans of the United States Army, the British Army, and military forces of other Allied nations who fought during World War II in the German Ardennes offensive known as the Battle of the Bulge;

(2) honors those who gave their lives during that battle;

(3) authorizes the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to honor the veterans of the Battle of the Bulge with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities; and

(4) calls upon the President to reaffirm the bonds of friendship between the United States and both Belgium and Luxembourg.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUMP. 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 House Joint Resolution 65.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, this country is justifiably proud of the role its armed forces played during World War II. A few minutes ago, we recognized the relatively few Americans who have been awarded the Medal of Honor for extraordinary acts of gallantry. However, Americans performed hundreds of thousands of courageous acts wherever they were committed to battle during World War II.

The actions of Americans who fought in the Battle of the Bulge are some of the best examples of everyday tenaciousness and bravery of American fighting men. Throughout this battle, the largest pitched battle ever fought by Americans, tens of thousands of Americans and British troops exhibited great courage and determination. Their heroism and willingness to endure great hardship resulted in the defeat of a desperate, powerful and well-trained German army.

It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we recall today the service of over 600,000 American combat troops who eventually beat back the last bold thrust of Hitler's war machine. This resolution commends all veterans who served or gave their lives during the Battle of the Bulge, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 65 and urge the Members of the House to approve this measure. I also salute the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the vice chairman of the committee, for his leadership on this issue.

This measure, Mr. Speaker, commends those veterans who fought and died during World War II in the offensive known as the Battle of the Bulge. It also authorizes the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to honor the veterans of this battle with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

1999 marks the 55th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge, a costly and important victory for the United States. It is fitting that we as a Nation honor the sacrifices and service of America's veterans who fought and sacrificed during this battle. H.J. Res. 65, as amended, is an excellent bill; and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the vice chairman of the committee and the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the chairman of our full committee, for yielding me this time and for being a cosponsor and also extend my thanks to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) as well for cosponsoring and for the bipartisanship that he brings to the committee.

I also want to thank a number of other Members. There are 42 cosponsors of this resolution, including the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and several other Members who are deeply committed to remembering all veterans, but in particular those who fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will rightly honor the Americans and allied forces who fought in the Battle of the Bulge. As the son of a World War II combat infantryman who fought in the other major theatre in World War II, he fought in New Guinea, the Philippines, and several islands in the Pacific, I urge all Members to enthusiastically support House Joint Resolution 65, which was introduced to recognize the 55th anniversary of the largest battle in the history of U.S. modern warfare, the Battle of the Bulge.

H.J. Res. 65, as amended, was marked up in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as well as the Committee on International Relations, and, hopefully, will get the unanimous support of this body.

Let me also thank the veterans of the Battle of the Bulge Association, an organization that was formed back in 1981. They now have about 10,000 members. And the idea behind it is to perpetuate the memory of the sacrifices involved during the battle, to preserve historical data and sites relating to the battle, and to foster international peace and good will, and to promote friendship among the battle survivors as well as their descendants.

I also want to thank Stan Wojtuski, the National Vice President of Military Affairs for the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge for his work on this resolution, and Mrs. Edith Nowels, a constituent of mine living in Brielle, New Jersey. She has worked very closely in crafting this resolution, and I am very grateful for that.

I think it is very important to point out that Edith Nowels' brother, Bud Thorne, was killed in action during the battle, and was awarded the Medal of Honor along with 17 others who received that highest of medals for their valor and bravery. There were also 86 servicemen who were awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for their valor during this vital battle.

According to the citation presented to his family, Corporal Thorne single-handedly destroyed a German tank. And in the words of the citation, ''Displayed heroic initiative and intrepid fighting qualities, inflicted costly casualties on the enemy and insured the success of his patrol's mission by the sacrifice of his life.''

I would like to take just a very brief moment, Mr. Speaker, to provide a brief overview of the battle so that my colleagues will gain a better understanding as to why this chapter in World War II deserves special recognition today. One of the most decisive battles in the war in Europe, the Battle of the Bulge began on December 16, 1944, when the German Army, in an effort to trap the allied forces in Belgium and Luxembourg, launched an attack against what were perceived as a weak line of American and allied troops. Their goal was to submit the allied forces in Belgium and Luxembourg and race to the coast towards Antwerp.

Adolf Hitler and his generals knew the German Air Force could not maintain regional air superiority, so they were banking on bad weather and relatively green and a fatigued American troops, who were greatly outnumbered. At the outset of the battle, the German troops, forming three armies, numbered approximately 200,000 versus 83,000 Americans. Their goal was to capture bridges over the Meuse River in the first 48 hours of the attack and then press on to Antwerp.

At the time of their initial attack, the Germans had more than 13 infantry and 7 panzer divisions, with nearly 1,000 tanks and almost 2,000 larger guns deployed along the front of about 60 miles. Five more divisions were soon to follow, with at least 450 more tanks. Although the Americans were caught by surprise, they tenaciously fought back in those early days of the attack

in December, holding the line in the north while the Nazis pushed through in the middle of the bulge towards the Meuse River.

One incident which particularly hardened the Americans and allied forces as to the intent of the German Army was the Malmedy Massacre. Eighty-six American POWs were murdered by the Nazis as they moved towards the capture of the Meuse River. The same German unit which was responsible for this infamous massacre eventually killed at least 300 American POWs and over 100 unarmed Belgium civilians. News of these horrific events outraged and further galvanized the will of American forces to prevail.

Recognizing what they were up against, General Eisenhower transferred the command of all American troops north of the bulge to British General Montgomery. Those south of the bulge were under the command of General Bradley. Meanwhile, the Germans were being slowed down by the dogged defense of the town at St. Vith by Brigadier General Hasbrouck. St. Vith was strategically important due to the number of key roads which met in the town and were essential to the German drive towards Antwerp.

General Patton's Third Army, under the command of General Bradley, was proceeding north to cut through the southern flank of the German bulge in the lines and provide relief to Brigadier General Anthony McAuliffe, whose refusal to surrender to his German counterparts at Bastogne on December 22 is forever known in history with that famous phrase, when he just said back to the Germans, ''Nuts.'' He would not surrender. He just said nuts to them, and they wondered what that meant.

□ 1100

He was not going to give in. As more American reinforcements arrived, eventually totaling 600,000 troops, they assisted in holding up the northern and southern flanks of the Nazi advances. Hitler's generals found that they were running out of fuel and that their hope of seizing allied fuel supplies was becoming a pipe dream and their race to the Meuse river slowed down to a crawl. While Adolph Hitler insisted on pressing with air strikes against advancing allied reinforcements, his generals knew that they had been beaten, and he eventually authorized the retreat of his armies at the end of January.

Mr. Speaker, the cost in lives from this engagement is astronomical and absolutely staggering. The American armies had more than 81,000 casualties; and of these, 19,000 men were killed in action. The British had 1,400 casualties with 200 killed. Both sides lost as many as 800 tanks each, and the Germans lost 1,000 planes. All told, it was one of the largest pitched battles in history with more than three times the number of troops from both the North and the South that engaged in the Battle of Gettysburg. Three times the size of Gettysburg. In the words of British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and I quote, in addressing the House of Commons, he said, ''This is undoubtedly the greatest battle of the war and will I believe be regarded as an ever-famous American victory.''

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members will support this resolution. The veterans of the Battle of the Bulge every year travel to Europe and reacquaint themselves with those with whom they fought side by side and those that they liberated. They will be meeting again soon in both Luxembourg and Belgium. I hope we will go on record supporting their efforts, their valor and this resolution puts all of us on record in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I include a list of Medal of Honor recipients for the RECORD, as follows:

RECIPIENTS OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR—ARDENNES CAMPAIGN

Arthur O. Beyer	Jose M. Lopez
Melvin E. Biddle	Vernon McGarity
Paul L. Bolden	Curtis F. Shoup
Richard E. Cowan	William A. Soderman
Francis S. Currey	Horace M. Thorne
Peter J. Dalessondro	Day G. Turner
Archer T. Gammon	Henry G. Turner
James R. Hendrix	Henry F. Warner
Truman Kimbro	Paul J. Wiedorfer

Mr. Speaker, I include the following brochure regarding the Ardennes-Alsace Campaign for the RECORD:

ARDENNES-ALSACE

INTRODUCTION

World War II was the largest and most violent armed conflict in the history of mankind. However, the half century that now separates us from that conflict has exacted its toll on our collective knowledge. While World War II continues to absorb the interest of military scholars and historians, as well as its veterans, a generation of Americans has grown to maturity largely unaware of the political, social, and military implications of a war that, more than any other, united us as a people with a common purpose.

Highly relevant today, World War II has much to teach us, not only about the profession of arms, but also about military preparedness, global strategy, and combined operations in the coalition war against fascism. During the next several years, the U.S. Army will participate in the nation's 50th anniversary commemoration of World War II. The commemoration will include the publication of various materials to help educate Americans about that war. The works produced will provide great opportunities to learn about and renew pride in an Army that fought so magnificently in what has been called ''the mighty endeavor.''

World War II was waged on land, on sea, and in the air over several diverse theaters of operation for approximately six years. The following essay is one of a series of campaign studies highlighting those struggles that, with their accompanying suggestions for further reading, are designed to introduce you to one of the Army's significant military feats from that war.

This brochure was prepared in the U.S. Army Center of Military History by Roger Cirillo. I hope this absorbing account of that period will enhance your appreciation of American achievements during World War II.

GORDON R. SULLIVAN,
General, United States Army Chief of Staff.

ARDENNES-ALSACE

16 December 1944–25 January 1945

In his political testament *Mein Kampf* (''My Struggle'') Adolf Hitler wrote, ''Strength lies not in defense but in attack.'' Throughout World War II, attempts to gain or regain the initiative had characterized Hitler's influence on military operations. Thus, when the military situation in late 1944 looked darkest on the Western Front, an enemy offensive to redress the balance of the battlefield—and thereby cripple or delay the Allied advance—should have come as no surprise.

Hitler's great gamble began during the nights of 13, 14, and 15 December, when the initial assault force of German armor, artillery, and infantry gradually staged forward to attack positions along the Belgian-German-Luxembourg border. This mustered force, with more than 200,000 men in thirteen infantry and seven panzer divisions and with nearly 1,000 tanks and almost 2,000 guns, deployed along a front of 60 miles—its operational armor holdings equaling that on the entire Eastern Front. Five more divisions moved forward in a second wave, while still others, equipped with at least 450 more tanks, followed in reserve.

On the Allied side the threatened American sector appeared quiet. The 15 December daily situation report for the VIII Corps, which lay in the path of two of Hitler's armies, noted: ''There is nothing to report.'' This illusion would soon be shattered.

STRATEGIC SETTING

In August 1944, while his armies were being destroyed in Normandy, Hitler secretly put in motion actions to build a large reserve force, forbidding its use to bolster Germany's beleaguered defenses. To provide the needed manpower, he trimmed existing military forces and conscripted youths, the unfit, and old men previously untouched for military service. Panzer divisions were rebuilt with the cadre of survivors from units in Normandy or on the Eastern Front, while newly created Volksgrenadier (''people's infantry'') divisions were staffed with veteran commanders and noncommissioned officers and the new conscripts. By increasing the number of automatic weapons and the number of supporting assault gun and rocket battalions in each division, Hitler hoped to make up for hurried training and the lack of fighting fitness. Despite the massive Allied air bombardment of Germany and the constant need to replace destroyed divisions on both the Eastern and Western Fronts, where heavy fighting continued, forces were gathered for use in what Hitler was now calling Operation Wacht am Rhine (''*Watch on the Rhine*'').

In September Hitler named the post of Antwerp, Belgium, as the objective. Selecting the Eifel region as a staging area, Hitler intended to mass twenty-five divisions for an attack through the thinly held Ardennes Forest area of southern Belgium and Luxembourg. Once the Meuse River was reached and crossed, these forces would swing northwest some 60 miles to envelop the port of Antwerp. The maneuver was designed to sever the already stretched Allied supply lines in the north and to encircle and destroy a third of the Allies' ground forces. If successful, Hitler believed that the offensive could smash the Allied coalition, or at least greatly cripple its ground combat capabilities, leaving him free to focus on the Russians at his back door.

Timing was crucial. Allied air power ruled the skies during the day, making any open concentrations of German military strength on the ground extremely risky. Hitler, therefore, scheduled the offensive to take place when inclement weather would ground Allied planes, or at least limit their attacks on his

advancing columns. Because the requisite forces and supplies had to be assembled, he postponed the starting date from November until mid-December. This additional preparation time, however, did not ease the minds of the few German generals and staff officers entrusted with planning Wacht am Rhine.

Both the nominal Commander-in-Chief West Field Marshal Gerd von Rundstedt and Army Group B commander Field Marshal Walter Model, who had primary responsibility for Wacht am Rhine, questioned the scope of the offensive. Both argued for a more limited attack, to pinch out the American-held salient north of the Ardennes around Aachen. Borrowing a bridge-players term, they referred to Hitler's larger objectives as the grand slam, or big solution, but proposed instead a small solution more compatible with the limited force being raised.

Rundstedt and Model believed that Hitler's legions were incapable of conducting a blitzkrieg, or lightning war, campaign. The twin swords that had dominated the field during the 1940 drive across France, tanks and air power, no longer existed in the numbers necessary to strike a decisive blow, nor was the hastily conscripted infantry, even when led by experienced officers and sergeants, up to the early war standards. Supply columns, too, would be prone to interdiction or breakdown on the Eifel's limited roads. To Hitler's generals, the grand slam was simply asking for too much to be done with too little at hand.

The determining factor was the terrain itself. The Ardennes consists of a series of parallel ridges and valleys generally running from northeast to southwest, as did its few good roads in 1944. About a third of the region is coniferous forest, with swamps and marshes in the northlands and deep defiles and gorges where numerous rivers and streams cut the ridges. Dirt secondary roads existed, making north-south movement possible, with the road centers—Bastogne and Houffalize in the south, and Malmedy and St. Vith in the north—crucial for military operations. After the winter's first freeze, tanks could move cross-country in much of the central sector. Fall 1944, however, brought the promise of mud, because of rain, and the advancing days of December, the promise of snow. Either could limit the quick advance needed by Wacht am Rhine. Once the Meuse River, west of the Ardennes, was gained, the wide river itself and cliffs on the east bank presented a significant obstacle if the bridges were not captured intact. Since the roads and terrain leading to Antwerp thereafter were good, the German planners focused on the initial breakthrough and the run west to the Meuse. The terrain, which made so little sense as an attack avenue northwestward, guaranteed the surprise needed.

Previous offensives through the Ardennes in World War I and early in World War II had followed the major roads southwestward, and had been made in good weather. The defenses then had always been light screens, easily pushed away. In 1940 the weakly opposed German armor needed three days to traverse the easier terrain in the southern Ardennes in good weather, on dry roads. For Wacht am Rhine, the American line had to be broken and crushed immediately to open paths for the attacking panzers; otherwise, the offensive might bog down into a series of fights for roads and the numerous villages on the way to the Meuse. Precious fuel would be used to deploy tanks to fight across fields. More importantly, time would be lost giving the defenders the opportunity to position blocking forces or to attack enemy flanks. Only surprise, sheer weight of numbers, and minimal hard fighting could guarantee a chance at success. If the Americans fought long and well, the same terrain that guaranteed surprise would become a trap.

The Ardennes held little fascination for the Allies, either as a staging area for their own counterattacks or as a weak spot in their lines. General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Allied Commander, had concentrated forces north and south of the area where the terrain was better suited for operations into Germany. Field Marshal Sir Bernard L. Montgomery's 21 Army Group to the north began preparations for the planned crossing of the Rhine in early 1945. Lt. Gen. Omar N. Bradley's 12th Army Group to the south and Lt. Gen. Jacob L. Devers' 6th Army Group in the Alsace region would also launch attacks and additional Rhine crossings from their sectors.

Located in the center of Bradley's sector, the Ardennes had been quiet since mid-September. Referred to as a ''ghost front,'' one company commander described the sector as a ''nursery and old folk's home. . . .'' The 12th Army Group's dispositions reflected Bradley's operational plans. Lt. Gen. William H. Simpson's Ninth Army and most of Lt. Gen. Courtney H. Hodges' First Army occupied a 40-mile area north of the Ardennes, concentrating for an attack into the Ruhr industrial region of Germany. Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr.'s Third Army was in a 100-mile sector south of the forest, preparing a thrust into the vital Saar mining region. In between, the First Army hold 88 miles of the front with only four divisions, two ''green'' units occupying ground to gain experience and two veteran units licking wounds and absorbing replacements; an armored infantry battalion; and two mechanized cavalry squadrons. Behind this thin screen was one green armored division, whose two uncommitted combat commands straddled two separate corps, as well as a cavalry squadron and an assortment of artillery, engineer, and service units.

Bradley judged his decision to keep the Ardennes front thinly occupied to be ''a calculated risk.'' Nor was he alone in not seeing danger. Probability, not capability, dominated Allied thinking about the Wehrmacht's next moves on the Western Front in mid-December 1944. Commanders and intelligence officers (G–2) at every level—from the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF), to the divisions holding the line—judged that the Germans were too weak to attempt regaining the initiative by a large-scale offensive. Despite their awareness that enemy units were refitting and concentrating across the line, they concluded exactly what Hitler had intended them to conclude. Knowing that the Germans were concerned with major threats to both the Ruhr and the Saar, Eisenhower's G–2 believed that they probably would use the uncommitted Sixth Panzer Army, suspected to be in the northern Eifel, to bolster their weakening northern defenses, or at least to cripple the impending Allied push toward the Ruhr. Both Hodges' and Patton's G–2s viewed the enemy as a reflection of their own operational plans and thus assessed the German buildup as no more than preparations to counterattack the First and Third Armies' assaults.

With only enough troops in the Ardennes to hold a series of strongpoints loosely connected by intermittent patrols, the Americans extended no ground reconnaissance into the German sector. Poor weather had masked areas from aerial photography, and the Germans enforced radio silence and strict countersecurity measures. Equally important, the Allies' top secret communications interception and decryption effort, code-named Ultra, offered clues but no definitive statement of Hitler's intentions. Yet Wacht am Rhine's best security was the continued Allied belief that the Germans would not attack, a belief held up to zero hour on 16 December—designated by the Germans as Null-tag (''Zero-Day'').

BATTLE PLANS

Field Marshal Model's attack plan, called Herbstnebel (''Autumn Fog''), assigned Lt. Gen. Josef ''Sepp'' Dietrich's Sixth Panzer Army the main effort. Dietrich would attack Hodges' First Army along the boundary separating Maj. Gen. Leonard T. Gerow's V Corps in the north from Maj. Gen. Troy H. Middleton's VIII Corps to the south, brushing aside or overrunning the V Corps' 99th Infantry Division and a cavalry squadron of the VIII Corps' 14th Cavalry Group before driving for the Meuse and Antwerp. South of the Sixth Panzer Army, Lt. Gen. Hasso von Manteuffel's Fifth Panzer Army would hit the VIII Corps' 106th Infantry Division and part of its 28th Infantry Division, tearing open Middleton's thin front and adding a secondary effort. Farther south, Lt. Gen. Erich Brandenberger's Seventh Army would attack the remainder of the 28th as well as the VIII Corps' 4th Infantry Division and then cover the advance of the panzers as far as the Meuse River. An airborne drop and infiltration by small teams disguised in American uniforms were added to create havoc in the American rear.

North of the Sixth Panzer Army, the six divisions of Lt. Gen. Gustav von Zangen's Fifteenth Army had a dual role. In addition to fighting and thereby holding American divisions in the crucial Aachen sector, Zangen would attack southward on order after Dietrich's panzers had broken the American line, a variation of the pincers attack originally preferred by Hitler's generals.

The Sixth Panzer Army was to attack in two waves. The first would consist of the LXVII Corps, with the newly organized 272d and 326th Volksgrenadier Divisions, and the I SS Panzer Corps, with the 1st and 12th SS Panzer, the 12th and 277th Volksgrenadier, and the 3d Parachute Divisions. The 150th Special Brigade and a parachute contingent would seize terrain and bridges ahead of the main body after the two corps broke through the American defenses. Dietrich planned to commit his third corps, the II SS Panzer Corps, with the 2d and 9th SS Panzer Divisions, in the second wave. The Sixth Panzer Army's 1,000-plus artillery pieces and 90 Tiger tanks made it the strongest force deployed. Although Dietrich's initial sector frontage was only 23 miles, his assault concentrated on less than half that ground. Relying on at least a 6:1 troop superiority at the breakthrough points, he expected to overwhelm the Americans and reach the Meuse River by nightfall of the third day.

According to Dietrich's plan, the LXVII Corps would secure the Sixth Panzer Army's northern flank. By sidestepping Monschau to seize the poorly roaded, forested hills and upland moors of the Hohe Venn, the LXVII's two divisions would block the main roads leading into the breakthrough area from the north and east. Simultaneously, the I SS Panzer Corps to the south would use its three infantry divisions to punch holes in the American line and swing northwesterly to join the left flank of the LXVII Corps. Together, the five divisions would form a solid shoulder, behind which the panzers of the I and II SS Panzer Corps would advance along the Sixth Panzer Army's routes leading west and northwest.

Three terrain features were critical to Dietrich's panzer thrust: the Elsenborn ridge, the Losheim Gap, and the Schnee Eifel ridge. The Elsenborn ridge, a complex series of fingers and spurs of the southern Hohe Venn, controlled access to two of the westerly panzer routes; a third passed just to the

south. The 277th Volksgrenadier Division would attack into the east defenses of the ridge, and to the south the 12th SS Panzer Division would debouch from its forest trail approaches into the hard roads running through and south of the ridge.

Further to the south the Losheim Gap appears as open rolling ground between the Elsenborn ridge to the northwest and the long, heavily wooded Schnee Eifel ridge to the southeast. Measuring about 5 miles wide at the German border and narrowing throughout its roughly 14-mile length as it runs from northeast to southwest, the gap is an unlikely military avenue, subdivided by lesser ridges, twists, and hills. Its roads, however, were well built and crucial for the German advance. Over its two major routes Dietrich intended to pass most of his armor.

The Sixth Panzer Army shared the Losheim Gap as an avenue with its southern neighbor, the Fifth Panzer Army. Their boundary reflected Hitler's obsession with a concentrated attack to ensure a breakthrough, but the common corridor added a potential for confusion. The Sixth Panzer Army was to attack with the 12th Volksgrenadier and the 3d Parachute Divisions through the northern portion of the gap, while the Fifth Panzer Army's northern corps, the LXVI, would open its southern portions. Additionally, the LXVI Corps had to eliminate the American forces holding the Schnee Eifel on the southern flank of the gap and seize the crucial road interchange at St. Vith about 10 miles further west. Manteuffel wanted part of the 18th Volksgrenadier Division to push through the southern part of the gap and hook into the rear of the Schnee Eifel, the remainder of the division to complete the encirclement to the south of the ridge, and the 62d Volksgrenadier Division to anchor the LXVI's flank with a drive toward St. Vith.

To the south of the Losheim Gap—Schnee Eifel area, along the north-south flowing Our River, the Fifth Panzer Army's major thrusts devolved to its LVIII and XLVII Panzer Corps, aligned north to south with four of their five divisions in the assault wave. Each panzer corps had one designated route, but the Fifth Panzer Army commander did not plan to wait for infantry to clear them. Manteuffel intended to commit his armor early rather than in tandem with the infantry, expecting to break through the extended American line quickly and expedite his advance to the west. The LVIII's 116th Panzer and 560th Volksgrenadier Divisions were to penetrate the area astride the Our River, tying the 106th and 28th Divisions together, and to capture the three tank-capable bridges in the sector before driving west to the Meuse. To the south the XLVII's 2d Panzer and 26th Volksgrenadier Divisions were to seize crossings on the Our and head toward the key Bastogne road interchange 19 miles to the west. The Panzer Lehr Division would follow, adding depth to the corps attack.

Covering the Fifth Panzer Army's southern flank were the LXXXV and LXXX Corps of Brandenberger's Seventh Army. The LXXXV's 5th Parachute and 352d Volksgrenadier Divisions were to seize crossings on the Our River, and the LXXX's 276th and 212th Volksgrenadier Divisions, feinting toward the city of Luxembourg, were to draw American strength away from Manteuffel's main attack. The 276th would attack south of the confluence of the Our and Sauer Rivers, enveloping the 3-mile defensive sector held by an American armored infantry battalion, and to the south the 212th, after crossing at Echternach, would push back the large concentration of American artillery in the sector and anchor Army Group B's southern flank. The Germans had a fairly good idea of the American forces opposing them. Facing Dietrich's Sixth Panzer Army was the V Corps' 99th Infantry Division. Newly arrived, the 99th occupied a series of forward positions along 19 miles of the wooded Belgian-German border, its 395th, 393d, and 394th Infantry regiments on line from north to south, with one battalion behind the division's deep right flank available as a reserve. Gerow, the V Corps commander, was focused at the time on a planned attack by his 2d Infantry Division toward the Roer River dams to the north and had given less attention to the defensive dispositions of the 99th. This small operation had already begun on 13 December, with the 2d Division passing through the area held by the 99th Division's northernmost regiment. Two battalions of the 395th Infantry joined the action. Slowed by pillboxes and heavy defenses in the woods, the 2d's attacks were still ongoing when the enemy offensive begin on the sixteenth.

To the south of the 99th Division the First Army had split responsibilities for the Elsenborn ridge—Losheim Gap area between Gerow's V Corps and Middleton's VIII Corps, with the corps boundary running just north of the village of Losheim. Middleton's major worry was the Losheim Gap, which potentially exposed the Schnee Eifel, the latter held by five battalions of the newly arrived 106th Division. When Bradley refused his request to withdraw to a shorter, unexposed line, the VIII Corps commander positioned eight battalions of his corps artillery to support the forces holding the Losheim Gap—Schnee Eifel region.

South of the corps boundary the 18th Cavalry Squadron, belonging to the recently attached 14th Cavalry Group, outposted the 9,000-yard Losheim Gap. Reinforced by a company of 3-inch towed tank destroyers, the 18th occupied eight positions that gave good coverage in fair weather but could be easily bypassed in the fog or dark. To remedy this, Middleton had assigned an additional cavalry squadron to reinforce the gap's thin line under the 14th group. The cavalry force itself was attached to the 106th Division, but with the 106th slowly settling into its positions, a coordinated defense between the two had yet to be decided. As a result, the reinforcing squadron was quartered 20 miles to the rear, waiting to be ordered forward.

South of the Schnee Eifel Middleton's forces followed the Our River with the 106th Division's 424th infantry and, to the south, the 28th Division. After suffering more than 6,000 casualties in the Huertgen Forest battles in November, the 28th was resting and training replacements in a 30-mile area along the Our. Its three regiments—the 112th, 110th, and 109th Infantry—were on line from north to south. Two battalions of the 100th Infantry held 10 miles of the front and the division's center while their sister battalion was kept as part of the division reserve. The 110th had six company-sized strongpoints manned by infantry and engineers along the ridge between the Our and Clerf Rivers to the west, which the troops called ''Skyline Drive.'' Through the center of this sector ran the crucial road to Bastogne.

South of the 28th Division the sector was held by part of Combat Command A of the newly arrived 9th Armored Division and by the 4th Infantry Division, another veteran unit resting from previous battles. These forces, with the 4th's northern regiment, the 12th Infantry, positioned as the southernmost unit in the path of the German offensive, held the line of the Sauer River covering the approaches to the city of Luxembourg. Behind this thinly stretched defensive line of new units and battered veterans, Middleton had few reserves and even fewer options available for dealing with enemy threats.

OPENING ATTACKS, 16–18 DECEMBER

At 0530 on 16 December the Sixth Panzer Army's artillery commenced preparation fires. These fires, which ended at 0700, were duplicated in every sector of the three attacking German armies. At first the American defenders believed the fires were only a demonstration. Simultaneously, German infantry moved unseen through the dark and morning fog, guided by searchlight beams overhead. Yet, despite local surprise, Dietrich's attack did not achieve the quick breakthrough planned. The LXVII Corps' attack north and south of Monschau failed immediately. One division arrived too late to attack; the other had its assault broken by determined resistance. The 277th Volksgrenadier Division's infiltrating attacks followed the preparation fires closely. The Germans overran some of the 99th Division's forest outposts, but they were repulsed attempting to cross open fields near their objectives, the twin villages of Krinkelt-Rocherath. By nightfall the Americans still contested the woods to the north and east of the villages. The 99th's southern flank, however, was in great peril. The 12th Volksgrenadier Division had successfully cleared the 1st SS Panzer Division's main assault avenue, taking the village of Losheim in the early morning and moving on to separate the VIII Corp's cavalry from its connection with the 99th.

South of the American corps boundary the Germans were more successful. Poor communications had further strained the loosely coordinated defense of the 106th Division and the 14th Cavalry Group in the Losheim Gap. The German predawn preparation fires had targeted road junctions, destroying most of the pole-mounted communications wire interchanges. With their major wire command nets silenced, the American defenders had to rely on radio relay via artillery nets, which the mountainous terrain made unreliable.

The attack in the Losheim Gap, in fact, was the offensive's greatest overmatch. The 3d Parachute Division ran up against only one cavalry troop and a tank destroyer company holding over half the sector, and its southern neighbors, the two reinforced regiments of the 18th Volksgrenadier Division, hit four platoons of cavalry. Although some American positions had been bypassed in the dark, the attacking Germans had generally cleared the area by late morning. Poor communications and general confusion limited defensive fire support to one armored field artillery battalion. More importantly, the cavalry's porous front opened the American rear to German infantry; by dawn some of the defenders' artillery and support units behind the Schnee Eifel encountered the enemy. Subsequently, many guns were lost, while others hastily clogged the roads to find safer ground.

The uncoordinated defense of the 106th Division and 14th Cavalry Group now led to tragedy. The cavalry commander quickly realized that his outposts could neither hold nor survive. After launching one abortive counterattack northward against 3d Parachute Division elements with his reserve squadron, he secured permission to withdraw before his road-bound force was trapped against the wooded heights to his rear. This opened the V and VII Corps boundary and separated the cavalry, Middleton's key information source on his northern flank, from the Schnee Eifel battle. Throughout the day of 16 December the 3d pushed north, ultimately overrunning the cavalry's remaining outposts and capturing a small force of the 99th Division. But all of these scattered forces fought valiantly so that by dark the Sixth Panzer Army's route was still clogged

by units mopping up bypassed Americans and their own supply and support rains. To the south the 18th Volksgrenadier Division's attack in the Losheim Gap had slid by the cavalry, but failed to clear the open ridge behind the Schnee Eifel. South of the Schnee Eifel the rest of the 18th was unable to push through the defenders to catch the 106th's units on top of the Schnee Eifel in a pincer. Further south the 106th's 42th Infantry had blocked the path of the 62d Volksgrenadier Division across the Our River. By dark the 106th had thus lost little ground. It had committed its reserve to block the enemy threat to its south and was expecting Combat Command B, 9th Armored Division, shifting from V Corps reserve, to conduct a relieving attach via St. Vith toward the Schnee Eifel. But while the defenders moved to restore their positions, the 18th, by searchlight and flare, continued to press south from the gap.

South of the 106th Division, the 28th Division fended off the Fifth Panzer Army's thrusts. In the north the 112th Infantry held back the LVIII Panzer Corps' two divisions, while the 110th Infantry blocked the paths of the XLVII Panzer Corp's three in the center. The 110th's strong points, which received some tank reinforcement from the division reserve, held firm throughout the sixteenth, blocking the route westward. By dark, although German infantry had crossed the Our and started infiltrating, American roadblocks still prevented any armor movement toward Bastogne.

South of the fifth Panzer Army, Brandenberger's Seventh Army also failed to break through the American line. The 28th Division's 109th Infantry managed to hold on to its 9-mile front. Although the LXXXV Corps' two divisions had seized crossings on the Our and achieved some penetrations between the regiment's company strong-points, they failed to advance further. Similarly, the Germans' southernmost attack was held by the 4th Division's 12th Infantry. The LXXX Corps' divisions met with heavy resistance, and by nightfall the Americans still held their positions all along the Seventh Army front, despite some infiltration between company strongpoints.

Hitler responded to the first day's reports with unbridled optimism. Rundstedt, however, was less sanguine. The needed breakthrough had not been achieved, no major armored units had been committed, and the key panzer routes were still blocked. In fact, the first day of battle set the tone for the entire American defense. In every engagement the Americans had been outnumbered, in some sectors facing down tanks and assault guns with only infantry weapons. Darkness, fog, and intermittent drizzle snow had favored the infiltrating attackers; but, despite inroads made around the defenses, the Germans had been forced to attack American positions frontally to gain access to the vital roads. Time had been lost and more would be spent to achieve a complete breakthrough. In that sense, the grand slam was already in danger.

American senior commanders were puzzled by the situation. The Germans apparently had attacked along a 60-mile front with strong forces, including many new units not identified in the enemy order or battle. Yet no substantial ground had been lost. With many communications links destroyed by the bombardment and the relative isolation of most defensive positions, the generals were presented with a panorama of numerous small-unit battles without a clear larger picture.

Nevertheless, command action was forthcoming. By nightfall of the sixteenth, although response at both the First Army and 12th Army Group headquarters was guarded, Eisenhower had personally ordered the 7th Armored Division from the Ninth Army and the 10th Armored Division from the third Army to reinforce Middleton's hard-pressed VIII Corps. In addition, shortly after midnight, Hodges' First Army began moving forces south from the Aachen sector, while the Third Army headquarters, on Patton's initiative, began detailed planning to deal with the German offensive.

Within the battle area the two corps commanders struggled to respond effectively to the offensive, having only incomplete and fragmentary reports from the field. Gerow, the V Corps commander in the north, requested that the 2d Division's Roer River dams attack be canceled; however, Hodges, who viewed the German action against the 99th Division as a spoiling operation, initially refused. Middleton, the VIII Corps commander in the south, changed his plans for the 9th Armored division's Combat Command B, ordering it to reinforce the southern flank of the 106th Division. The newly promised 7th Armored Division would assume the CCB's original mission of relieving troops on the Schnee Eifel via St. Vith. Thereafter, mixed signals between the VIII Corps and the 106th Division led to disaster. Whether by poor communications or misunderstanding, Middleton believed that the 106th was pulling its men off the Schnee Eifel and withdrawing to a less exposed position; the 106th's commander believed that Middleton wanted him to hold until relieved and thus left the two defending regiments in place.

By the early morning hours of 17 December Middleton, whose troops faced multiple enemy threats, had selected the dispositions that would foreshadow the entire American response. Already ordered by Hodges to defend in place, the VIII Corps commander determined that his defense would focus on denying the Germans use of the Ardennes roadnet. Using the forces at hand, he intended to block access to four key road junctions: St. Vith, Houffalize, Bastogne, and the city of Luxembourg. If he could stop or slow the German advance west, he knew that the 12th Army Group would follow with massive flanking attacks from the north and south.

That same morning Hodges finally agreed to cancel the V Corps' Roer dams attack. Gerow, in turn, moved the 2d Division south to strengthen the 99th Division's southern flank, with reinforcements from the 1st Infantry Division soon to follow. The First Army commander now realized that Gerow's V Corps units held the critical northern shoulder of the enemy penetration and began to reinforce them, trusting that Middleton's armor reinforcements would restore the center of the VIII Corps line.

While these shifts took place, the battle raged. During the night of 16–17 December the Sixth Panzer Army continued to move armor forward in the hopes of gaining the breakthrough that the infantry had failed to achieve. The Germans again mounted attacks near Monschau and again were repulsed. Meanwhile, south of Monschau, the 12th SS Panzer Division, committed from muddy logging trails, overwhelmed 99th Division soldiers still holding out against the 277th and 12th Volksgrenadier Divisions.

Outnumbered and facing superior weapons, many U.S. soldiers fought to the bitter end, the survivors surrendering only when their munitions had run out and escape was impossible. Individual heroism was common. During the Krinkelt battle, for example, T. Sgt. Vernon McGarity of the 393d Infantry, 99th Division, after being treated for wounds, returned to lead his squad, rescuing wounded under fire and single-handedly destroying an advancing enemy machine-gun section. After two days of fighting, his men were captured after firing their last bullets. McGarity received the Medal of Honor for his actions. His was the first of thirty-two such awards during the Ardennes-Alsace Campaign.

Ordered to withdraw under the 2d Division's control, the 99th Division, whose ranks had been thinned by nearly 3,000 casualties, pulled back to the northern portion of a horseshoe-shaped line that blocked two of the I SS Panzer Corps' routes. Although the line was anchored on the Elsenborn ridge, fighting raged westward as the Germans pushed to outflank the extended American defense.

During the night of the seventeenth the Germans unveiled additional surprises. They attempted to parachute a 1,000-man force onto the Hohe Venn's high point at Baraque Michel. Although less than half actually landed in the area, the scattered drop occupied the attention of critical U.S. armored and infantry reserves in the north for several days. A companion special operation, led by the legendary Lt. Col. Otto Skorzeny, used small teams of English-speaking soldiers disguised in American uniforms. Neither the drop nor the operation gained any appreciable military advantage for the German panzers. The Americans, with their resistance increasing along the Elsenborn ridge and elsewhere, were undaunted by such threats to their rear.

Further south, however, along the V and VIII Corps boundary, the Sixth Panzer Army achieved its breakthrough. In the Losheim Gap the advanced detachment of the 1st SS Panzer Division, Kampfgruppe Peiper, moved forward through the attacking German infantry during the early hours of the seventeenth. Commanded by Col. Joachim Peiper, the unit would spearhead the main armored assault heading for the Meuse River crossings south of Liege at Huy. With over 100 tanks and approximately 5,000 men, Kampfgruppe Peiper had instructions to ignore its own flanks, to overrun or bypass opposition, and to move day and night. Traversing the woods south of the main panzer route, it entered the town of Buellingen, about 3 miles behind the American line. After fueling their tanks on captured stocks, Peiper's men murdered at least 50 American POWs. Then shortly after noon, they ran head on into a 7th Armored Division field artillery observation battery southeast of Malmedy, murdering more than 80 men. Peiper's men eventually killed at least 300 American prisoners and over 100 unarmed Belgian civilians in a dozen separate locations. Word of the Malmedy Massacre spread, and within hours units across the front realized that the Germans were prosecuting the offensive with a special grimness. American resistance stiffened.

Following a twisted course along the Ambleve River valley, Kampfgruppe Peiper had completed barely half of its drive to the Meuse before encountering a unit from 9th Armored Division and then being stopped by an engineer squad at the Stavelot bridge. Unknown to Peiper, his column had passed within 15 miles of the First Army headquarters and was close to its huge reserve fuel dumps. But the Peiper advance was only part of the large jolt to the American command that day. To the south the 1st SS Panzer Division had also broken loose, moving just north of St. Vith.

As Kampfgruppe Peiper lunged deep into the First Army's rear, further south the VIII Corps front was rapidly being fragmented. The 18th Volksgrenadier Division completed its southern swing, encircling the two regiments of the 106th Division on the Schnee Eifel. While a single troop of the 14th Cavalry Group continued to resist the German spearheads, the 106th's engineers dug in to block the crucial Schoenberg road 2 miles east of St. Vith, a last ditch defense, hoping to hold out until the 7th Armored Division arrived.

St. Vith's road junctions merited the priority Middleton had assigned them. Although the I SS Panzer Corps had planned to pass north of the town and the LVIII Panzer Corps to its south, the crossroad town became more important after the German failure to make a breakthrough in the north on 16–17 December. There, the successful defense of the Elsenborn ridge had blocked three of the Sixth Panzer Army's routes, pushing Dietrich's reserve and supply routes southward and jamming Manteuffel's Losheim route. South of the Losheim Gap the American occupation of St. Vith and the Schnee Eifel represented a double obstacle, which neither Dietrich nor Manteuffel could afford. With thousands of American soldiers still holding desperately along the Schnee Eifel and its western slope village, the Germans found vital roads still threatened. Further west, the possibility of American counterattacks from the St. Vith roadnet threatened Dietrich's narrow panzer flow westward as well as Manteuffel's own western advance. And from St. Vith, the Americans could not only choke the projected German supply arteries but also reinforce the now isolated Schnee Eifel regiments.

For the 106th Division's men holding the Schnee Eifel, time was running out. The 7th Armored Division's transfer south from the Ninth Army had been slowed both by coordination problems and roads clogged by withdrawing elements. Led by Combat Command B, the 7th's first elements arrived at St. Vith in midafternoon of 17 December, with the division taking command of the local defense immediately. That night both sides jockeyed in the dark. While the 18th Volksgrenadier Division tried to make up lost time to mount an attack on the town from the northeast and east, the 7th, whose units had closed around St. Vith in fading daylight, established a northerly facing defensive arc in preparation for its attack toward the Schnee Eifel the next day.

South of St. Vith the 106th Division's southernmost regiment, the 424th Infantry, and Combat Command B, 9th Armored Division, had joined up behind the Our River. From the high-ground positions there they were able to continue blocking the 62d Volksgrenadier Division, thereby securing the southern approaches to St. Vith. But unknown to them, the 28th Division's 112th Infantry was also folding rearward and eventually joined the 424th and the 7th Armored Division, completing a defensive perimeter around the town. During the night of 17 December, with these forces combining, Middleton and the commanders in St. Vith believed that the VIII Corps' northern flank would be restored and the 106th trapped regiments relieve.

On 18 December Middleton's hopes of launching a counterattack toward the Schnee Eifel faded as elements of three German divisions converged around St. Vith. Although situation maps continued to mark the last-known positions of the 106gh Division's 422d and 423d Infantry on the Schnee Eifel, the massive weight of German numbers ended any rescue attempts. Communicating through a tenuous artillery radio net, both regiments believed that help was on the way and that their orders were to break out to the high ground behind the Our River, a distance of between 3 and 4 miles over difficult enemy-held terrain.

The following day, 19 December, brought tragedy for the 106th Division. The two stranded regiments, now behind the Schnee Eifel, were pounded by artillery throughout the day as the Germans drew their circle tighter. With casualties mounting and ammunition dwindling, the 423d's commander chose to surrender his regiment to prevent its annihilation. The 422d had some of its troop overrun; others, who were both segmented and surrounded, surrendered. By 1600 most of the two regiments and their attached support has thus been captured. Nevertheless, one battalion-sized group evaded captivity until the twenty-first, and about 150 soldiers from the 422d ultimately escaped to safety. The confused nature of the final battles made specific casualty accounting impossible, but over 7,000 men were captured.

The tragedy of the Schnee Eifel was soon eclipsed by the triumph of St. Vith. Every senior German commander saw the ''road octopus''—the omnidirectional junction of six roads in the town's eastern end—as vital for a massive breakthrough, freeing up the Sixth Panzer Army's advance. For the Americans, holding St. Vith would keep the V and VIII Corps within a reasonable distance of each other; without the town the enemy's spearheads would widen into a huge salient, folding back toward Bastogne further south. With intermittent communications, the St. Vith defenders thus operated with only one order from Middleton: ''Hold at all costs.''

Despite a ''goose-egg'' position extending 12 miles from east to west on tactical maps, the St. Vith defense literally had no depth. Designed to fight on the move in more favorable terrain, the four combat commands of the 7th and 9th Armored Divisions found themselves moored to muddy, steep sloped hills, heavily wooded and laced with mud trails. The first action defined the defense's pattern. Unengaged commands sent tanks and halftracks racing laterally across the perimeter to deal with penetrations and infiltrators, with the engaged tanks and infantry holding their overextended lines as best they could. After two days of sporadic attacks, the German commanders attempted to concentrate forces to crush the defense. But with clogged roads German preparations for a coordinated assault encountered continuous delays.

Although the VIII Corps' northern flank had been at least temporarily anchored at St. Vith, its center was in great danger. There, the 28th Division's 110th Infantry was being torn to bits. After failing repeatedly to seize crossing on the Our, Manteuffel had passed some of the 116th Panzer Division's armor through the 2d Panzer Division to move up the Skyline Drive ridgeline and enter its panzer route. Thus by 17 December the 110th had elements of five divisions bulldozing through its strongpoints along the ridge, forcing back the 28th's northern and southern regiments that were attempting to maintain a cohesive defense. The 2d entered Clervaux, in the 110th's center, by a side road and rolled on westward toward Bastogne; holdouts in Clervaux continued to fight from within an ancient castle in the town's eastern end. To the south some survivors of the ridge battle had fallen back to join engineers defending Wiltz, about 4 miles to the rear, and the southern approach to Bastogne. Even though the 110th has suffered over 80 percent casualties, its stand had delayed the XLVII Panzer Corps for a crucial forty-eight hours.

The southern shoulder provided VIII Corps' only clear success. The 4th Division has absorbed the folded back defenses of the 109th Infantry and the 9th Armored Division's Combat Command A, thus effectively jamming the Seventh Army's attack. With the arrival of the 10th Armored Division, a provisional corps was temporarily formed to block any advance toward the city of Luxembourg.

The events of 17 December finally demonstrated the gravity of the German offensive to the Allied command. Eisenhower committed the theater reserve, the XVIII Airborne Corps, and ordered three American divisions training in England to move immediately to north-eastern France. Hodges' First Army moved the 30th Infantry and 3d Armored Divisions south to extend the northern shoulder of the penetration to the west. Although Bradley remained the least concerned, he and Patton explored moving a three-division corps from the Third Army to attack the German southern flank.

Allied intelligence now began to discern German strength objectives with some clarity. The enemy's success apparently was tied to gaining the Meuse quickly and then turning north; however, most of the attacking divisions were trapped in clogged columns, attempting to push through the narrow Losheim Gap and enter the two panzer routes then open. The area, still controlled by the VIII Corps, seemed to provide the key to stabilizing the defensive effort. Somehow the VIII Corps, whose center had now been destroyed, would have to slow down the German drive west, giving the Americans time to strengthen the shoulders north and south of the salient and to prepare one or more major counterattacks.

Middleton committed his only reserves, Combat Command R of the 9th Armored Division and seven battalions of corps and army engineers, positioning the units at critical road junctions. Teams formed from tank, armored infantry, and engineer units soon met the 2d Panzer Division's lead elements. Outgunned in a frontal fight and disadvantaged by the wide-tracked German tanks' cross-country capability in the drizzle-soaked fields, Middleton's armored forces were soon overwhelmed, even though the fighting continued well into the night. By dawn on the eighteenth no recognizable line existed as the XLVII Panzer Corps' three divisions bore down on Bastogne.

Late on 17 December Hodges had requested the commitment of SHAEF reserves, the 82d and 101st Airborne Divisions. Promised to Middleton by the morning of the nineteenth, the VIII Corps commander intended to use them at Houffalize, 17 miles south of St. Vith, and at Bastogne, 10 miles further south, as a solid block against the German advance to the Meuse. But until the airborne divisions arrived, the VIII Corps had to hold its sector with the remnants of its own forces, mainly engineers, and with an armored combat command from the 10th Armored Division, which was beginning to enter the battle for the corps' center.

Middleton's engineer ''barrier line'' in front of Bastogne slowed the German advance and bought critical time, but the arrival of Combat Command B, 10th Armored Division, at Bastogne was crucial. As it moved forward, Middleton dispatched three armored teams to the north and east during the night of the eighteenth to cover the road junctions leading to Bastogne. A key fight took place at Longvilly, just a few miles east of Bastogne, where the remnants of the 9th Armored Division's Combat Command R and the 10th's Team Cherry tried to block the Germans. Three enemy divisions converged there, trapping the CCR force west of the town and annihilating it and then surrounding Team Cherry. But even as this occurred, the lead elements of the 101st Airborne Division passed through Bastogne to defensive positions along the villages and low hills just to the east of the town. Joining with the CCB's three armor teams and the two battalions of engineers from the barrier line, the 101st formed a crescent-shaped defense, blocking the five roads entering Bastogne from the north, east, and south.

The enemy responded quickly. The German commanders wanted to avoid being enmeshed in any costly sieges. So when Manteuffel saw a hole opening between the American defenses at St. Vith and Bastogne, he ordered his panzer divisions to bypass both towns and move immediately toward

their planned Meuse crossing sites some 30 miles to the northwest, leaving the infantry to reduce Bastogne's defenses. Although Middleton had planned to use the 82d Airborne Division to fill the gap between Bastogne and St. Vith, Hodges had been forced to divert it northwest of St. Vith to block the Sixth Panzer Army's advance. Thus only the few engineers and support troops defending the road junctions and crossings along the narrow Ourthe River west of Bastogne lay in the path of Manteuffel's panzers.

COMMAND DECISIONS, 19–20 DECEMBER

Wacht am Rhine's timetable had placed Dietrich's and Manteuffel's panzers at the Meuse four days after the attack began. The stubborn American defense made this impossible. The Sixth Panzer Army, the designated main effort, had been checked; its attacks to open the Hohe Venn's roads by direct assault and airborne envelopment had failed, and Kampfgruppe Peiper's narrow armored spearhead had been isolated. To the south the Fifth Panzer Army's northern corps had been blocked at St. Vith; its center corps had advanced nearly 25 miles into the American center but was still meeting resistance; and its southern corps had been unable to break the Bastogne roadblock. The southern flank was in no better straits. Neither the Seventh Army's feint toward the city of Luxembourg nor its efforts to cover Manteuffel's flank had gained much ground. Hitler's key requirement that an overwhelming force achieve a quick breakthrough had not occurred. Six divisions had held twenty, and now the American forces, either on or en route to the battlefield, had doubled. Nevertheless, the Sixth Panzer Army's II SS Panzer Corps had yet to be committed, and additional divisions and armor existed in the German High Command reserve. The unspoken belief among Hitler's generals now was that with luck and continued poor weather, the more limited objectives of their small solution might still be possible.

Eisenhower's actions had also undermined Hitler's assumption that the Allied response would come too late. When ''Ike'' committed two armored divisions to Middleton on the first day of fighting and the theater reserve on the next, a lightning German advance to the Meuse became nearly impossible. Meeting with his commanders at Verdun on 19 December, Eisenhower, who had received the latest Ultra intelligence on enemy objectives, outlined his overall operational response. Hodges' First Army would break the German advance; along the southern flank of the German penetration Patton's Third Army would attack north, assuming control of Middleton's VIII Corps from the First Army; and Middleton's Bastogne positions would now be the anvil for Third Army's hammer.

Patton, content that his staff had finalized operational planning, promised a full corps attack in seventy-two hours, to begin after a nearly 100-mile move. Devers' 6th Army Group would take up the slack, relieving two of Patton's corps of their frontage. In the north Montgomery had already begun moving the British 30 Corps to backstop the First Army and assume defensive positions behind the Meuse astride the crossings from Liege to Namur.

Eisenhower began his Verdun conference saying, ''The present situation is to be regarded as one of opportunity for us and not disaster.'' That opportunity, as his generals knew, hung not on their own operational plans but on the soldiers on the battlefield, defending the vital St. Vith and Bastogne road junctions, holding on to the Elsenborn ridge, and blocking the approaches to the city of Luxembourg, as well as on the soldiers in numerous ''blocks'' and positions unlocated on any command post map. These men knew nothing of Allied operational plans or even the extent of the German offensive, but in the next days, on their shoulders, victory or disaster rested.

One unavoidable decision on overall battlefield coordination remained. Not one to move a command post to the rear, General Bradley had kept his 12th Army Group headquarters in the city of Luxembourg, just south of the German attack. Maj. Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg's Ninth Air Force headquarters, which supported Bradley's armies, stayed there also, unwilling to sever its direct ties with the ground forces. But three German armies now separated Bradley's headquarters from both Hodges' First Army and Simpson's Ninth Army in the north, making it difficult for Bradley to supervise a defense in the north while coordinating an attack from the south. Nor would communications for the thousands of messages and orders needed to control and logistically support Bradley's two northern armies and Vandenberg's two northern air commands be guaranteed.

Eisenhower, therefore, divided the battlefield. At noon on 20 December ground command north of the line from Givet on the Meuse to the high ground roughly 5 miles south of St. Vith devolved to Montgomery's 21 Army Group, which temporarily assumed operational control of both the U.S. Ninth and First Armies. Shifting the ground command raised a furor, given the strained relations Montgomery had with senior American commanders. Montgomery had been successful in attacking and occupying ''ground of his own choosing'' and then drawing in enemy armored reserves where they could be destroyed by superior artillery and air power. He now intended to repeat these tactics, planning to hold his own counterattacks until the enemy's reserves had been spent or a decisive advantage gained. The American generals, however, favored an immediate counteroffensive to first halt and then turn back the German drive. Equally disconcerting to them was Montgomery's persistence in debating command and strategy, a frequent occurrence in all coalitions, but one that by virtue of his personal approach added to the strains within the Allied command.

The British 2d Tactical Air Force similarly took control of the IX and XXIX Tactical Air Commands from Vandenberg's Ninth Air Force. Because the British air commander, Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur ''Maori'' Coningham, had long established close personal relations with the concerned American air commanders, the shift of air commands passed uneventfully.

FIRST ARMY BATTLES, 20–27 DECEMBER

Eisenhower and Montgomery agreed that the First Army would establish a cohesive defensive line, yielding terrain if necessary. Montgomery also intended to create a corps-sized reserve for a counterattack, which he sought to keep from being committed during the defensive battle. The First Army's hasty defense had been one of hole-plugging, last stands, and counterattacks to buy time. Although successful, these tactics had created organizational havoc within Hodges' forces as divisional units had been committed piecemeal and badly jumbled. Complicating the situation even further was the fact that the First Army still held the north-south front, north of Monschau to Elsenborn, while fighting Dietrich's panzers along a nearly east-west axis in the Ardennes.

Blessed with excellent defensive ground and a limited lateral roadnet in front of V Corps positions, Gerow had been able to roll with the German punch and Hodges to feed in reserves to extend the First Army line westward. Much of the Sixth Panzer Army's strength was thus tied up in road jams of long columns of vehicles. But American success was still far from certain. The V Corps was holding four panzer divisions along the northern shoulder, an elbow-shaped 25-mile line, with only parts of four U.S. divisions.

To the west of the V Corps the 30th Infantry Division, now under Maj. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway's XVIII Airborne Corps, marched south to block Kampfgruppe Peiper at Malmedy and, along the Ambleve River, at Stavelot, Stoumont, and La Gleize. To the south of Peiper the XVIII's other units, the 82d Airborne and 3d Armored Divisions, moved forward to the area between the Salm and Ourthe Rivers, northwest of St. Vith, which was still in danger of being isolated. By 20 December the Peiper force was almost out of fuel and surrounded. During the night of the twenty-third Peiper and his men destroyed their equipment, abandoned their vehicles, and walked out to escape capture. Dietrich's spearhead was broken.

North of St. Vith the I SS Panzer Corps pushed west. Part of the LVIII Panzer Corps had already bypassed the defenders' southern flank. Standing in the way of Dietrich's panzers was a 6-mile line along the Salm River, manned by the 82d Airborne Division. Throughout the twenty-first German armor attacked St. Vith's northwestern perimeter and infantry hit the entire eastern circumference of the line. Although the afternoon assault was beaten back, the fighting was renewed after dark. To prevent being trapped from the rear, the 7th Armored Division began pulling out of its advanced positions around 2130. The other American units around the town conformed, folding into a tighter perimeter west of the town.

Ridgway wanted St. Vith's defenders to stay east of the Salm, but Montgomery ruled otherwise. The 7th Armored Division, its ammunition and fuel in short supply and perhaps two-thirds of its tanks destroyed, and the battered elements of the 9th Armored, 106th, and 28th Divisions could not hold the extended perimeter in the rolling and wooded terrain. Meanwhile, Dietrich's second wave of tanks entered the fray. The II SS Panzer Corps immediately threatened the Salm River line north and west of St. Vith, as did the LVIII Panzer Corps circling to the south, adding the 2d SS Panzer Division to its drive. Ordering the St. Vith defenders to withdraw through the 82d Airborne Division line to prevent another Schnee Eifel disaster, Montgomery signaled them that ''they come back with all honor.''

Mud threatened to trap much of the force, but nature intervened with a ''Russian High,'' a cold snap and snowstorm that turned the trails from slurry to hard ground. While the Germans seemed temporarily powerless to act, the St. Vith defenders on 23 December, in daylight, withdrew across the Salm to reform behind the XVIII Airborne Corps front. Ridgway estimated that the successful withdrawal added at least 100 tanks and two infantry regiments to his corps.

The St. Vith defense purchased five critical days, but the situation remained grave. Model's Army Group B now had twelve full divisions attacking along roughly 25 miles of the northern shoulder's east-west front. Hodges' army was holding with thirteen divisions, four of which had suffered heavy casualties and three of which were forming in reserve. Montgomery had designated Maj. Gen. J. Lawton ''Lightning Joe'' Collins' VII Corps as the First Army's counterattack force, positioning its incoming divisions northwest of Hodges' open flank, hoping to keep them out of the defensive battle. He intended both to blunt the enemy's assault and wear down its divisions by withdrawing the XVIII Airborne

Corps to a shorter, defendable line, thus knitting together the First Army's fragmented defense. Above all, before launching a major counterstroke, Montgomery wanted to cripple the German panzers with artillery and with constant air attacks against their lines of supply.

The Russian High that blanketed the battlefield brought the Allies one tremendous advantage—good flying weather. The week of inclement weather promised to Hitler by his meteorologists had run out—and with it the ability to move in daylight safe from air attack. The Allied air forces rose to the occasion. Night bombers of the Royal Air Force's Bomber Command had been attacking those rail yards supporting the German offensive since 17 December. In the five days of good weather following the Russian High, American day bombers entered the interdiction effort. As Allied fighter bombers patrolled the roads throughout the Ardennes and the Eifel, the Ninth Air Force's medium bombers attacked targets west of the Rhine and the Eighth Air Force's heavy bombers hit rail yards deeper into Germany. Flying an average of 3,000 sorties daily during good weather, the combined air forces dropped more than 31,000 tons of bombs during the first ten days of interdiction attacks.

The effects on the ground battle were dramatic. The sluggish movement of fuel and vehicles over the Ardennes' few roads had already slowed German operations. The added strain on resupply from the bombing and strafing now caused halts up and down the German line, making coordinated attacks more difficult. Still, panzer and infantry units continued to press forward.

From Christmas Eve to the twenty-seventh, battles raged along the First Army's entire front. The heaviest fighting swirled around the positions held by Ridgway's XVIII Airborne Corps and Collins' VII Corps, the latter having been piecemealed forward to extend the First Army line westward. While the XVIII Corps battled the Sixth Panzer Army's last attempts to achieve a northern breakthrough, the VII Corps' 3d Armored and 84th Infantry Divisions held the line's western end against the LVIII and XLVII Panzer Corps. These units had become Model's new main effort, swinging wide of Dietrich's stalled attack, and they now had elements about 5 miles from the Meuse. Upon finding the 2d Panzer Division out of gas at the German salient's tip, Collins on Christmas Day sent 2d Armored Division, with heavy air support, to encircle and destroy the enemy force.

The First Army's desperate defense between the Salm and Meuse Rivers had stopped the Sixth and Fifth Panzer Armies, including six panzer divisions. The fierce battles—at places as Baraque de Fraiture, Manhay, Hotton, and Marche—were epics of valor and determination. Hitler's drive for Antwerp was over.

THIRD ARMY BATTLES, 20–27 DECEMBER

The 20 December boundary shift transferred Middleton's VIII Corps and its Bastogne garrison to Patton's Third Army, which was now moving forces from as far away as 10 miles to attack positions south of the German salient. Bastogne had become an armed camp with four airborne regiments, seven battalions of artillery, a self-propelled tank destroyer battalion, and the surviving tanks, infantry, and engineers from two armored combat commands—all under the 101st Airborne Division's command.

Manteuffel had ordered the Panzer Lehr and the 2d Panzer Divisions to bypass Bastogne and speed toward the Meuse, thus isolating the defenders. As the 26th Volksgrenadier Division and the XLVII Paner Corps' artillery closed in for the kill on 22 December, the corps commander's emissary arrived at the 101st Division's command post, demanding surrender or threatening annihilation. The acting division commander, Brig. Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, replied ''Nuts,'' initially confounding the Germans but not Bastogne's defenders. The defense held.

For four days bitter fighting raged in a clockwise rotation around Bastogne's southern and western perimeter, further constricting the defense within the low hills and patches of woods surrounding the town. The infantry held ground, with the armor scurrying to seal penetrations or to support local counterattacks. Once the overcast weather had broke, the defenders received both air support and aerial resupply, making it imperative for Manteuffel to turn some of his precious armor back to quickly crush the American defense, a large deadly threat along his southern flank.

Meanwhile, as Bastogne held, Patton's Third Army units streamed northward. Maj. Gen. John B. Millikin's newly arrived III Corps headquarters took command of the 4th Armored and 26th and 80th Infantry Divisions, in a move quickly discovered and monitored by the Germans' effective radio intercept units. In response, Brandenberger's Seventh Army, charged with the crucial flank guard mission in Hitler's offensive, rushed its lagging infantry divisions forward to block the expected American counterattack.

Jumping off as promised on 22 December some 12 to 15 miles south of Bastogne, III Corps divisions achieved neither the surprise nor momentum that Bradley and Patton had hoped. No longer a lunge into an exposed flank, the attack became a frontal assault along a 30-mile front against infantry holding good defensive terrain. With Bastogne's garrison totally surrounded, only a quick Third Army breakthrough could prevent the brilliant holding action there from becoming a costly disaster. But how long Bastogne's defenders could hold out was a question mark.

To the east, as Millikin's III Corps moved against hardening enemy resistance along the Sure River, Maj. Gen. Manton S. Eddy's XII Corps attacked northward on a front almost as wide as the III Corps'. Taking control of the 4th Infantry and 10th Armored Divisions and elements of the 9th Armored Division, all units of Middleton's former southern wing, Eddy met greater difficulties in clearing the ridges southeast of Bastogne. Meanwhile, the 35th and 5th Infantry Divisions and the 6th Armored Division moved northward to strengthen the counterattacks. Millikin finally shifted the main effort to the west, where the 4th Armored Division was having more success. Following fierce village-by-village fighting in frigid temperatures, the 4th linked up with Bastogne's defenders at 1650 on 26 December, lifting the siege but setting the stage for even heavier fighting for the Bastogne sector.

NORDWIND IN ALSACE, 31 DECEMBER–5 JANUARY

By 21 December Hitler had decided on a new offensive, this time in the Alsace region, in effect selecting one of the options he had disapproved earlier in favor of Wacht am Rhine. With the Fifteenth Army's supporting thrust canceled due to Dietrich's failure to break the northern shoulder, and with no hope of attaining their original objectives, both Hitler and Rundstedt agreed that an attack on the southern Allied front might take advantage of Patton's shift north to the Ardennes, which Wehrmacht intelligence had identified as under way. The first operation, called Nordwind (''Northwind''), targeted the Saverne Gap, 20 miles northwest of Strasbourg, to split the Seventh Army's XV and VI Corps and retake the Alsace north of the Marne-Rhine Canal. If successful, a second operation, called Zahnartz (''Dentist''), would pursue objectives westward toward the area between Luneville and Metz and into the Third Army's southern flank. Lt. Gen. Hans von Obstfelder's First Army would launch the XIII SS Corps as the main effort down the Sarre River valley, while to the southeast four divisions from the XC and LXXXIX Corps would attack southwesterly down the Low Vosges mountain range through the old Maginot Line positions near Bitche. A two-division panzer reserve would be held to reinforce success, which Hitler believed would be in the Sarre River sector. Reichsfuehrer Heinrich Himmler's Army Group Oberrhein, virtually an independent field army reporting only to Hitler, was to pin the southern flank of the Seventh Army with holding attacks. The new offensive was planned for the thirty-first, New Year's Eve. However, its target, the U.S. Seventh Army, was neither unready nor unwarned.

Lt. Gen. Alexander M. Patch's Seventh Army, part of Devers' 6th Army Group, which also included the French First Army, had been among the theater's unsung heroes. After conducting assault landings on the coast of southern France in August 1944, the small army had chased a significantly larger force northward; but, much to the chagrin of his commanders, Patch had been ordered not to cross the Rhine, even though his divisions were among the first Allied units to reach its banks. In November the Seventh Army had been the Western Front's leading Allied ground gainer. Yet, when Patton's Third Army found its offensive foundering, Patch, again following orders, had sent a corps northward to attack the Siegfried Line's southern flank, an operational lever designed to assist Patton's attack.

On 19 December, at the Verdun conference, the 6th Army Group was again relegated to a supporting role. Eisenhower ordered Devers to assume the front of two of Patton's corps that were moving to the Ardennes, and then on the twenty-sixth he added insult to injury by telling the 6th Army Group commander to give up his Rhine gains by withdrawing to the Vosges foothills. The switch to the defense also scrapped Devers' planned attacks to reduce the Colmar Pocket, the German foothold stretching 50 miles along the Rhine's western banks south of Strasbourg. Held in check by two corps of General Jean de Lattre de Tassigny's French First Army, this area was the only German bridgehead in Devers' sector. But by Christmas Eisenhower saw a greater threat than the Colmar Pocket opening on his southern front.

Allied intelligence had confirmed that a new enemy offensive in the Alsace region was imminent. Eisenhower wanted the Seventh Army to meet it by withdrawing to shortened lines to create reserves, essentially ceding northern Alsace back to the Germans, including the city of Strasbourg. Not surprisingly, Devers, Patch, and de Lattre objected strongly to the order. In the end, rather than withdraw, Devers shifted forces to create a reserve to backstop the key enemy attack avenues leading into his front and ordered the preparation of three intermediate withwrawal lines forward of the defensive line designated by Eisenhower.

By New Year's Eve, with two U.S. divisions withdrawn from the Seventh Army and placed in theater reserve, the 6th Army Group's front resembled the weakened defense that had encouraged the German Ardennes offensive. Patch's six divisons covered a 126-mile front, much of it along poor defensive ground. Feeling that the Saree River valley just north of the Low Vosges would bear the brunt of any attack, Patch assigned Maj. Gen. Wade Haislip's XV Corps a 35-mile sector between Sarreguemines and

Bitche, with the 103d, 44th, and 100th Infantry Divisions holding from northwest to southeast, backed by the experienced French 2d Armored Division. Maj. Gen. Edward H. Brooks' VI Corps took up the balance of Patch's front from the Low Vosges southeast to Lauterbourg on the Rhine and then southward toward Strasbourg. Brooks' corps had the veteran 45th and 79th Infantry Divsions and the 14th Armored Division in reserve. Patch inserted Task Force Hudelson, a two-squadron cavalry force, reinforced with infantry from the uncommitted 14th Armored Division at the boundary joining the two American corps.

The deployment of three additional units—Task Force Linden (42d Infantry Division), Task Force Harris (63d Infantry Division), and Task Force Herren (70th Infantry Division)—demonstrated how far Devers and Patch would go to avoid yielding ground. Formed from the infantry regiments of three arriving divisions and led by their respective assistant division commanders, these units went straight to the Seventh Army front minus their still to arrive artillery, engineer, and support units that comprised a complete division. By late December Patch had given the bulk of Task Force Harris to Haislip's XV Corps and the other two to Brooks, who placed them along the Rhine between Lauterbourg and Strasbourg.

Despite knowledge of the impending Alsace offensive, the exact location and objectives were unclear. Troop buildups near Saarbruecken, east of the Rhine, and within the Colmar Pocket pointed to possible thrusts either southwestward down the Sarre River valley or northward from the Colmar region, predictions made by the Seventh Army's G–2 that proved to be remarkably accurate.

On New Year's Eve Patch told his corps commanders that the Germans would launch their major offensive early the next day. Actually, first combat began shortly before midnight all along the XV Corps front and along both the southeastern and southwestern approaches from Bitche toward the Low Vosges. The XIII SS Corps' two reinforced units, the 17th SS Panzergrenadier and 36th Volksgrenadier Divisions, attacked the 44th and 100th Division, whose prepared defense in depth included a regiment from Task Force Harris. The Germans made narrow inroads against the 44th's line near Rimling during fighting characterized by constant American counterattacks supported by French armor and Allied air attacks during clear weather. After four days of vicious fighting the XIII SS Corps' initial offensive had stalled.

The XC and LXXXIX Corps attacked near Bitche with four infantry divisions abreast. Advancing through the Low Vosges, they gained surprise by forgoing artillery preparations and by taking advantage of fog and thick forests to infiltrate Task Force Hudelson. As in the Losheim Gap, the defending mechanized cavalry held only a thin line of strongpoints; lateral mobility through the rough snowladen mountain roads was limited. The light mechanized forces were soon overrun or bypassed and isolated by the 559th, 257th, 361st, and 256th Volksgrenadier Divisions. The Germans gained about 10 miles during Nordwind's first four days, heading directly for the Saverne Gap that linked the XV and VI Corps.

Both American corps commanders responded quickly to the threat. Haislip's XV Corps plugged the northwestern exits to the Low Vosges with Task Force Harris, units of the 14th Armored and 100th Divisions, and a regiment from the 36th Infantry Division, which Eisenhower had released from theater reserve. Brooks' VI Corps did the same, stripping its Lauterbourg and Rhine fronts and throwing in Task Force Herren, combat engineers converted to infantry, and units of the 45th and 75th Infantry Divisions to plug holes or block routes out of the Low Vosges.

While units fought for twisted roads and mountain villages in subfreezing temperatures, Obstfelder's First Army committed the 6th SS Mountain Division to restart the advance on the Saverne Gap. In response, Patch shifted the 103d Infantry Division eastward from the XV Corps' northwestern wing to hold the southeastern shoulder of the Vosges defense. By 5 January the SS troopers managed to bull their way to the town of Wingen-sur-Moder, about 10 miles short of Saverne, but there they were stopped. With the Vosges' key terrain and passes still under American control and the German advance held in two salients, Nordwind had failed.

Meanwhile, the original SHAEF withdrawal plan, especially the abandonment of Strasbourg, had created an Allied crisis in confidence. Supporting Devers' decision not to withdraw, the Free French government of General Charles de Gaulle enlisted British Prime Minister Winston Churchill's support to amend Eisenhower's orders. Fortunately, Patch's successful defense temporarily shelved the SHAEF withdrawal plan, but Alsace was not to be spared further German attacks. Hitler's armored reserve and Himmler's Army Group Oberrhein had not yet entered the battle.

ERASING THE BULGE

North of the Alsace region the Allied commanders were concerned with reducing the enemy's Ardennes salient, now called the ''Bulge.'' From the beginning of Wacht am Rhein they had envisioned large-scale counterattacks. The decisions as to where and how the attacks would be launched, however, underscored their different perspectives. The theoretical solution was to attack the salient at its base. Patton had in fact planned to have the Third Army's right flank corps, the XII, attack further eastward toward Bitburg, Germany, along what he referred to as the ''honeymoon trail.'' Bradley, however, as the commander responsible for the southern attack, wanted to cover the shortest distance to relieve Hodges' beleaguered First Army units. Overruling Patton, he designated Houffalize, midway between Bastogne and St. Vith, as a primary objective. Middleton's reinforced VIII Corps, the westernmost force, would drive on Houffalize; the middle force, Millikin's III Corps, would remain on Middleton's right flank heading for St. Vith; and Eddy's XII Corps would serve as an eastern hinge. Bradley's choice made the best use of the existing roads; sending Millikin's IIII Corps along advantageous terrain corridors avoided the favorable defensive ground on the successive ridges east of Bastogne. Once linked with the First Army, the 12th Army Group's boundary would revert to its original northern line. Only then would Bradley send the First and Third Armies east into the Eifel toward Pruem and Bitburg in Germany. Bradley further solidified his plan by committing newly arriving reinforcements—the 11th Armored, 17th Airborne, and 87th Infantry Divisions—to the west of Bastogne for Middleton's VIII corps.

Montgomery had eyed Houffalize earlier, viewing the approaches to the town from the northwest as excellent for a corps-sized attack. His own extended defensive line on the northern shoulder of the bulge and the piecemeal entry of Collins' VII Corps into battle further west did not shake his original concept. Much like Bradley, he saw an interim solution as best. Concerned that American infantry losses in Gerow's V Corps had not been replaced, and with the same terrain and roadnet considerations that had jammed the German assault westward, Montgomery ruled out a direct attack to the south at the base of the bulge. As December waned, Rundstedt's remaining armored reserves were centered near St. Vith, and the roadnet there offered inadequate avenues to channel the four U.S. armored divisions into an attack. Unwilling to weaken his western flank now that his reserve had been committed, Montgomery seemed more prone to let the VII Corps attack from its present positions northwest of St. Vith. Eisenhower raised the issue of committing the British 30 Corps. But having deactivated units to rebuild the corps for use in his projected Rhineland offensive, Montgomery agreed to move it across the Meuse to assume Collins' vacated front, a transfer that would not be completely accomplished until 2 January. From there, the 30 Corps would conduct limited supporting attacks. Although Hodges, as First Army commander, would select the precise counterattack axis, he knew Montgomery's repeated preference for the VII Corps to conduct the main effort and also Bradley's preference for a quick linkup at Houffalize. Hodges' decision was thus predictable. The VII Corps would constitute the First Army's main effort, aimed at Houffalize. Ridgway's XVIII Airborne Corps would cover the VII's northeastern flank, and, like Millikin's III Corps, its advance would be pointed at St. Vith. The Germans would thus be attacked head on.

Timing the counterstrokes also raised difficulties. The American generals wanted the First Army to attack immediately, claiming the Germans had reached their high-water mark. Montgomery demurred, citing intelligence predictions of an imminent offensive by the II SS Panzer Corps—an assault he welcomed as it fit his concept of weakening enemy armor further rather than conducting costly attacks. Contrary to Montgomery's tactics, Eisenhower preferred that the First Army attack immediately to prevent the Germans from withdrawing their panzers and shifting them southward.

Patton's renewed attacks in late December caused the Third Army to learn firsthand how difficult the First Army battles had been. In the Third Army sector the relief of Bastogne had not changed the intensity of combat. As Manteuffel received panzer reinforcements, he threw them into the Bastogne salient before it could be widened and extended northward toward the First Army. Patton's Third Army now encountered panzers and divisions in numbers comparable to those that had been pressing against the northern shoulder for the previous 10 days. In the week after Bastogne's relief the number of German divisions facing the Third Army jumped from three to nine around Bastogne and from four to five in the III and XII Corps sector of the front.

The fighting during the 9-mile American drive from Bastogne to Houffalize became a series of bitter attacks and counterattacks in worsening weather. Patton quickly added the 17th Airborne, the 87th and 35th Infantry, and the 11th and 6th Armored Divisions to his attacking line, which stretched 25 miles from the Ourthe River to the Clerf. While the III Corps continued its grim attacks northeastward against the forested ridges of the Wiltz valley leading toward German escape routes eastward out of the salient, VIII Corps forces added some width to the Bastogne salient but gained no ground northward before New Year's Day. Both sides reinforced the sector with every available gun. In a nearly week-long artillery duel Patton's renewed attacks collided with Manteuffel's final efforts to eradicate the Bastogne bridgehead.

During the same week German attacks continued along the First Army line near the Elsenborn ridge and in the center of the

XVIII Airborne Corps line before a general quiet descended upon the northern front. In many areas the fields, forests, and roads were now covered with waist-high snowdrifts, further impeding the movement of both fighting men and their resupply vehicles.

Climaxing Wacht am Rhein's efforts, the Luftwaffe launched its one great appearance of the campaign during the early morning hours of New Year's Day. Over 1,000 aircraft took off before dawn to attack Allied airfields in Holland and Belgium, with the objective of eliminating the terrible scourge that the Allied air forces would again become once the skies cleared over the entire battle area. The Germans destroyed roughly 300 Allied machines, but their loss of more than 230 pilots was a major blow to the Luftwaffe, whose lack of trained aviators was even more critical than their fuel shortages.

Casualties mounted, bringing on a manpower shortage in both camps. Although the Germans continued to commit fresh divisions until late December, the Americans, with only three uncommitted divisions in theater, were forced to realign their entire front. Many units moved from one combat to another without rest or reinforcement. December's battles had cost the Americans more than 41,000 casualties, and with infantry replacements already critically short, antiaircraft and service units had to be stripped to provide riflemen for the line. Black soldiers were offered the opportunity to fight within black platoons assigned to many white battalions, a major break from previous Army policy.

Despite the shortage of replacements, both Patton's Third Army and Hodges' First Army attacked on 3 January. Collins' VII Corps in the north advanced toward the high ground northwest of Houffalize, with two armored divisions in the lead. Meeting stiff opposition from the LXVI Corps, VII Corps infantry soon replaced the tanks as difficult terrain, icy roads, and a tenacious defense using mines, obstacles, antitank ambushes, and armored counterattacks took their toll. The XVIII Airborne Corps moved its right flank south to cover Collins' advance, and in the far west the British 30 Corps pushed eastward. Under intense pressure Hitler's forces pulled back to a new line, based on the Ourthe River and Houffalize, with the bulk of the SS panzer divisions withdrawing from the battlefield. Poor weather restricted Allied flyers to intermittent close support for only three days in the nearly two weeks that VII Corps units fought their way toward their juncture with the Third Army.

South of the Bulge the Third Army intensified its attacks northward to meet the First Army. Still counting on Middleton's VIII Corps to break through, Patton sent Millikin's III Corps northeastward, hoping to enter the roadnet and follow the terrain corridors to link up with Ridgway's XVIII Airborne Corps attacking St. Vith. Despite having less than fifty-five tanks operational, the I SS Panzer Corps counterattacked the III Corps' 6th Armored Division in ferocious tank fights unseen since the fall campaign in Lorraine. While the III Corps' 90th Division infantrymen broke through to the heights overlooking the Wiltz valley, the VIII Corps to the west struggled against a determined force fighting a textbook withdrawal. By 15 January Noville, the scene of the original northern point of the Bastogne perimeter, was retaken. Five miles from Houffalize, resistance disappeared. Ordered to escape, the remaining Germans withdrew, and on the sixteenth the Third Army's 11th Armored Division linked up with the First Army's 2d Armored Division at Houffalize.

The next day, 17 January, control of the First Army reverted to Bradley's 12th Army Group. Almost immediately Bradley began what he had referred to in planning as a ''hurry-up'' offensive, another full-blooded drive claiming the Rhine as its ultimate objective while erasing the Bulge en route. On the twenty-third Ridgway's XVIII Airborne Corps, now the First Army's main effort, and the 7th Armored Division took St. Vith. This action was the last act of the campaign for the First Army. Hodges' men, looking out across the Losheim Gap at the Schnee Eifel and hills beyond, now prepared for new battles.

In the Third Army sector Eddy's XII Corps leapt the Sure River on 18 January and pushed north, hoping to revive Patton's plan for a deep envelopment of the German escape routes back across the Belgian-Luxembourg-German borders. Intending to pinch the escape routes via the German tactical bridges on the Our River, the 5th Division crossed the Sauer at night, its main body pushing northward to clear the long Skyline Drive ridge, where the 28th Division had faced the first assaults. By the campaign's official end on the twenty-fifth the V, XVIII, VIII, III, and XII Corps had a total of nine divisions holding most of the old front, although the original line east of the Our River had yet to be restored.

NORDWIND REVISITED, 5–25 JANUARY

In early 1945, as Operation Wacht am Rhein in the Ardennes started to collapse, Operation Nordwind in the Alsace was revived. On 5 January, after Nordwind's main effort had failed, Himmler's Army Group Oberrheim finally began its supporting thrusts against the southern flank of Brooks' VI Corps, with the XIV SS Corps launching a cross-Rhine attack north of Strasbourg. Two days later, south of the city, the Nineteenth Army launched Operation Sonnenwende (''Winter Solstice''), attacking north, astride the Rhone-Rhine Canal on the northern edge of the German-held Colmar Pocket. These actions opened a three-week battle, whose ferocity rivaled the Ardennes fighting in viciousness if not in scope and threatened the survival of the VI Corps.

Sonnenwende sparked a new crisis for the 6th Army Group, which had too few divisions to defend every threatened area. With Brooks' VI Corps now engaged on both flanks, along the Rhine at Gambsheim and to the northeast along the Low Vosges mountain exits, Devers transferred responsibility for Strasbourg to the French First Army, and de Lattre stretched his forces to cover both the city and the Belfort Gap 75 miles to the south.

But the real danger was just northeast of Strasbourg. There, the XIV SS Corps had punched out a 10-miles bridgehead around the town of Gambsheim, brushing off small counterattacks from Task Force Linden. Patch's Seventh Army, reinforced with the newly arrived 12th Armored Division, tried to drive the Germans from the Gambsheim area, a region laced with canals, streams, and lesser watercourses. To the south de Lattre's 3d Algerian Division defended Strasbourg, while the rest of the French First Army kept the Colmar Pocket tightly ringed. But the fate of Strasbourg and the northern Alsace hinged on the ability of the American VI Corps to secure its besieged flanks.

Having driven several wedges into the Seventh Army, the Germans launched another attack on 7 January. The German XXXIX Panzer Corps, with the 21st Panzer and the 25th Panzergrenadier Divisions, attacked the greatly weakened VI Corps center between the Vosges and Lauterbourg. Quickly gaining ground to the edge of the Haguenau Forest 20 miles north of Strasbourg, the German offensive rolled along the same routes used during the successful attacks of August 1870 under Field Marshal Helmuth von Moltke. Moltke's successors, however, made no breakthrough. In the two Alsatian towns of Hatten and Rittershoffen, Patch and Brooks threw in the Seventh Army's last reserve, the 14th Armored Division. Assisted by a mixture of other combat, combat support, and service troops, the division halted the Germans.

While the VI Corps fought for its life in the Haguenau Forest, the enemy renewed attacks on both flanks. During an intense battle between units of the 45th Division and the 6th SS Mountain Division in the Low Vosges, the Germans surrounded an American battalion that had refused to give ground. After a week's fighting by units attempting its relief, only two soldiers managed to escape to friendly lines.

Although gaining ground, the enemy had achieved no clear-cut success. Hitler nevertheless committed his last reserves on 16 January, including the 10th SS Panzer and the 7th Parachute Divisions. These forces finally steamrolled a path along the Rhine's west bank toward the XIV SS Corps' Gambsheim bridgehead, over-running one of the green 12th Armored Division's infantry battalions at Herrlisheim and destroying one of its tank battalions nearby. This final foray led Brooks to order a withdrawal on the twenty-first, one that took the Germans by surprise and was completed before the enemy could press his advantage.

Forming a new line along the Zorn, Moder, and Rothback Rivers north of the Marne-Rhine Canal, the VI Corps commander aligned his units into a cohesive defense with his badly damaged but still game armored divisions in reserve. Launching attacks during the night of 24–25 January, the Germans found their slight penetrations eliminated by vigorous counterattacks. Ceasing their assaults permanently, they might have found irony in the Seventh Army's latest acquisition from SHAEF reserves—the ''Battling Bastards of Bastogne,'' the 101st Airborne Division, which arrived on the Alsace front only to find the battle over.

Even before Nordwind had ended, the 6th Army Group commander was preparing to eliminate the Colmar Pocket in southern Alsace. Five French divisions and two American, the 3d Infantry and the rebuilt 28th Division, held eight German infantry divisions and an armored brigade in a rich farming area laced with rivers, streams, and a major canal but devoid of significant hills or ridges. Devers wanted to reduce this frozen, snow-covered pocket before thaws converted the ploughed ground to a quagmire. General de Lattre's French First Army would write finis to the Germans in the Colmar Pocket, but it would be a truly Allied attack.

To draw the German reserves southward, plans called for four divisions from the French I Corps to start the assault. This initial foray would set the stage for the French II Corps to launch the main effort in the north. The defending Nineteenth Army's eight divisions were low on equipment but well provided with artillery munitions, small arms, and mines, and fleshed out with whatever manpower and materiel that Himmler, the overall commander, could scrounge from the German interior. Bad weather, compartmentalized terrain, and fear of Himmler's SS secret police strengthened the German defense.

On 20 January, in the south, Lt. Gen. Emile Bethouart's French I Corps began its attack in a driving snowstorm. Although its gains were limited by armored-infantry counterattacks, the corps drew the Nineteenth Army's armor southward, along with the arriving 2d Mountain Division. Two days later, in the north, Maj. Gen. Amie de

Goislard de Monsabert's French II Corps commenced its attack, led by the U.S. 3d Division. Reinforced by one of the 63d Infantry Division's regiments, the 3d advanced over the first of several watercourses and cleared the Colmar Forest. It met resistance on the Ill River but continued to fight its way forward through enemy counterattacks, subsequently crossing the Colmar Canal and opening an avenue for the French 5th Armored Division. The Allies pushed further eastward in deepening snow and worsening weather, with the 28th and 75th Divisions from the Ardennes following. On the twenty-fifth Maj. Gen. Frank W. Milburn's XXI Corps joined the line. Assuming control of the 3d, 28th, and 75th Divisions, the 12th Armored Division, which was shifted from reserves, and the French 5th Armored Division, the corps launched the final thrust to the Vauban Canal and Rhone-Rhine Canal bridges at Neuf-Brisach. Although the campaign was officially over on 25 January, the American and French troops did not completely clear the Colmar Pocket until 9 February. However, its successful reduction marked the end of both the German presence on French territory and the Nineteenth Army. And with the fighting finally concluded in the Ardennes and Alsace, the Allies now readied their forces for the final offensive into Germany.

ANALYSIS

Hitler's last offensives—in December 1944 in the Ardennes region of Belgium and Luxembourg, and in January 1945 in the Alsace region of France—marked the beginning of the end for the Third Reich. With these final attacks, Hitler had hoped to destroy a large portion of the Allied ground force and to break up the Allied coalition. Neither objective came close to being achieved. Although perhaps the Allies' victory in the spring of 1945 was inevitable, no doubt exists that the costs incurred by the Germans in manpower, equipment, supplies, and morale during the Ardennes-Alsace battles were instrumental in bringing about a more rapid end to the war in Europe. Eisenhower had always believed that the German Army on the Western Front had to be destroyed west of the Rhine River to make a final offensive into Germany possible. When added to the tremendous contributions of the Soviet Army, which had been fighting the majority of Germany's armed forces since 1941, the Ardennes-Alsace victory set the stage for Germany's rapid collapse.

With little hope of staving off defeat, Germany gambled everything on achieving a surprise operational decision on the Western Front. In contrast, the Allied coalition pursued a more conservative strategy. Since the Normandy invasion Eisenhower's armies had neither the combat power necessary to mount decisive operations in more than one sector nor the reserves; more importantly, their logistical capability was insufficient to fully exploit any major successes. The resulting broadfront Allied advance steadily wore away the German defenses; but, as in the case of the Ardennes and Alsace fronts, the Allied lines had many weak points that could be exploited by a desperate opponent. Moreover, once Hitler's attacking legions had been stopped, the Allies lacked the combat power to overwhelm the German divisions defending their recently acquiring gains. In the Ardennes, terrain and worsening weather aided the Germans in holding off Allied counterattacks for an entire month, ultimately allowing them to withdraw a sizable portion of their initial assault force with perhaps one-third of their committed armor.

The battle in the Alsace appeared to be less dramatic than in the Ardennes, but was no less an Allied victory. Hitler spent his last reserves in Alsace—and with them the ability to regain the initiative anywhere. Like the Normandy Campaign, the Ardennes-Alsace struggle provided the necessary attrition for the mobile operations that would end the war. The carefully husbanded enemy reserves that the Allies expected to meet in their final offensive into Germany had been destroyed in December and January.

Some thirty-two U.S. divisions fought in the Ardennes, where the daily battle strength of U.S. Army forces averaged twenty-six divisions and 610,000 men. Alsace added eleven more divisions to the honors list, with an average battle strength of 230,000. Additionally, separate divisional elements as well as divisions arriving in sector at the end of the campaign granted participation credit to three more divisions. But the cost of victory was staggering. The final tally for the Ardennes alone totaled 41.315 casualties in December to bring the offensive to a halt and an additional 39,672 casualties in January to retake lost ground. The SHAFE casualty estimate presented to Eisenhower in February 1945 listed casualties for the First Army at 39,957; for the Third Army at 35,525; and for the British 30 Corps, which helped at the end, at 1,408. Defeating Hitler's final offensive in the Alsace was also costly; the Seventh Army recorded its January battle losses at 11,609. Sickness and cold weather also ravaged the fighting lines, with the First, Third, and Seventh Armies having cold injury hospital admissions of more than 17,000 during the entire campaign. No official German losses for the Ardennes have been computed, but they have been estimated at between 81,000 and 103,000. A recently published German scholarly source gave the following German casualty totals: Ardennes—67,200; Alsace (not including Colmar Pocket)—22,932. Most of the figures cited do not differentiate between permanent losses (killed and missing), wounded, and non-battle casualties.

Analysts of coalition warfare and Allied generalship may find much to criticize in the Ardennes-Alsace Campaign. Often commonplace disputes over command and strategy were encouraged and overblown by newspaper coverage, which reflected national biases. Predictably, Montgomery inspired much American ire both in revisiting command and strategy issues, which had been debated since Normandy, and in pursuing methodical defensive-offensive tactics. Devers and de Lattre, too, strained coalition amity during their successful retention of liberated French terrain. But in both cases the Allied command structure weathered the storm, and Eisenhower retained a unified command. Preservation of a unit Allied command was perhaps his greatest achievement. In the enemy camp the differences between Hilter and his generals over the objectives of the Ardennes offensive were marked, while the uncoordinated efforts of Obstfelder's First Army and Himmler's Army Group Oberrhein for the Alsace offensive were appaling.

The Ardennes-Alsace battlefield proved to be no general's playground, but rather a place where firepower and bravery meant more than plans or brilliant maneuver. Allied and German generals both consistently came up short in bringing their plans to satisfactory fruition. That American soldiers fought and won some of the most critical battles of World War II in the Ardennes and the Alsace is now an indisputable fact.

U.S. DIVISIONS IN THE ARDENNES-ALSACE CAMPAIGN

1st Infantry Division, 2d Infantry Division, 3d Infantry Division, 4th Infantry Division, 5th Infantry Division, 9th Infantry Division, 26th Infantry Division, 28th Infantry Division, 30th Infantry Division, 35th Infantry Division, 36th Infantry Division, 42d Infantry Division, 44th Infantry Division, 45th Infantry Division, 63d Infantry Division,* 70th Infantry Division, 75th Infantry Division, 76th Infantry Division, 78th Infantry Division, 79th Infantry Division, 80th Infantry Division, 83d Infantry Division, 84th Infantry Division, 87th Infantry Division, 90th Infantry Division, 94th Infantry Division, 95th Infantry Division, 99th Infantry Division, 100th Infantry Division, 103d Infantry Division, 106th Infantry Division.

2d Armored Division, 3d Armored Division, 4th Armored Division, 5th Armored Division, 6th Armored Division, 7th Armored Division, 8th Armored Division, 9th Armored Division, 10th Armored Division, 11th Armored Division, Armored Division, 12th Armored Division, 14th Armored Division.

17th Airborne Division, 82d Airborne Division, 101st Airborne Division.

ARDENNES-ALSACE 1944–1945

Further Readings

A number of official histories provide carefully documented accounts of operations during the Ardennes-Alsace Campaign. U.S. Army operations are covered in Hugh M. Cole, The Ardennes: Battle of the Bulge (1965); Charles B. MacDonald, The Last Offensive (1973); and Jeffrey J. Clarke and Robert Ross Smith, Riviera to the Rhine (1991), three volumes in the United States Army in World War II series. Air operations are detailed in Wesley F. Craven and James L. Cate, eds., Europe: Argument to V–E Day, January 1944 to May 1945 (1951), the third volume in the Army Air Forces in World War II series, and the British perspective and operations are covered in L. F. Ellis, Victory in the West: the Defeat of Germany (1968). Among the large number of books that describe the fighting in the Ardennes are Gerald Astor, A Blood-Dimmed Tide (1992), John S. D. Eisenhower, The Bitter Woods (1969), Charles B. MacDonald, A Time for Trumpets (1985), S. L. A. Marshall, The Eight Days of Bastogne (1946), Jean Paul Pallud, Battle of the Bulge Then and Now (1984), Danny S. Parker, Battle of the Bulge (1991), and Robert F. Phillips, To Save Bastogne (1983). At the small-unit level Charles MacDonald's Company Commander (1947) is still the standard classic. Fighting in the Alsace region has been sparsely covered, but Keith E. Bonn's When the Odds Were Even (1994) is valuable.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Shows).

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address my colleagues and the American people about a moment in American history that stands out in my family as one of the most crucial there ever was. It is one of those moments in our history where the larger story of the American experience becomes intertwined with the personal legacy of an American family.

The Battle of the Bulge began on December 16, 1944, and ended on January 25, 1945. This enemy offensive was staged to split our forces in half and cripple our supply lines. Of course there were 600,000 American troops participating in the Battle of the Bulge, as we have heard awhile ago. 810,000 Americans were casualties, of whom 19,000 were killed; 33,400 were wounded; and there were 2,000 who were either captured or listed as missing.

*Elements only

One of these 2,000, I want to talk about this morning. My father, Clifford Shows, was one of those captured as a prisoner of war. Today in Mosselle, Mississippi, my father is a veteran. He stands tall when the national anthem is played, enjoys his family and neighbors, and lives out a most American life. It is hard for me to talk about it.

We must remember the actions of my father and the thousands of others who fought then that we might be free now. This year is the 55th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge. Let us pause, let us remember, and let us be thankful. Please support H.J. Res. 65.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 65 which commends our World War II veterans who fought in the Battle of the Bulge. This is a great bill because it honors the determination and the courage of these veterans in stopping the last great Nazi counteroffensive of World War II.

History tells us that the fighting in Belgium sealed the victory for the allies in Europe. Without this victory, many additional months of fighting would have been necessary before Nazi Germany's surrender. Our troops overcame superior numbers of Nazi troops and harsh weather to repel and turn back this last great offensive of World War II.

Victory, however, came at a terrible price, with about 81,000 American casualties, 19,000 of which were killed. Each and every veteran of the Battle of the Bulge witnessed the horrors of war. One of those was my own father-in-law, Victor Gaytan, who today is a disabled veteran who lives with the wounds he suffered defending our freedom against that threat in Belgium that winter.

Today, my wife and I are honored to have him live with us. Yes, at 79 he walks a little slower, moves at times hesitantly and with great pain; but when you look into his eyes, there is no doubt about his role in saving our country and our way of life. He is a hero to us and was one of those great Americans that courageously turned back the last desperate attempt of the Nazis to stop Allied momentum toward Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can never sufficiently express our gratitude to these veterans, America's greatest generation. But this legislation is a proper and fitting way to honor them and their service to their country. With this legislation, we honor these American soldiers and we ensure that future generations of Americans remember the price of freedom in Europe and around the world during World War II. I strongly support this legislation and urge the House to unanimously pass this great bill.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, just to point out during markup, and this was extraordinary, at least four Members came forward to speak as the gentleman from Texas just pointed out, his father-in-law, the gentleman from Mississippi, his dad, and so many others. Few battles have touched more people than the Battle of the Bulge. The gentleman from Arizona's uncle also fought. He is a combat veteran himself, but his uncle fought at the Battle of the Bulge, was there.

And Joe McNulty, one of our key staffers on the majority side, he just came up and whispered to me that his father got the purple heart, was wounded in both legs. There are few battles that have touched more people and few battles that have done more to save freedom and liberty than the Battle of the Bulge. It is amazing how many people in this Chamber have relatives and close relatives and perhaps themselves actually fought in that very, very famous battle.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) for yielding me this time. I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 65. I want to pay special tribute to a man who was killed in that fight, Bob Kuehn of Rhinelander, Wisconsin. Bob Kuehn was raised in Rhinelander, Wisconsin. After graduating from high school, he attended St. Norbert College in De Pere, Wisconsin, where he was a member of the ROTC program. He graduated in June of 1944 and later that month was married to Gertrude Kuehn of Sturgeon Bay.

They traveled to Camp Fannin in Tyler, Texas; but he was called into Patton's Third Army, and he was killed December 17, 1944, leaving a 23-year-old widow back in Wisconsin. That widow was my mother. Fortunately, my mother was able to move on and attended school at the University of Wisconsin where she met my father, who also fought in World War II and earned the Distinguished Flying Cross for his service.

My father, of course, was fortunate to meet my mother, and my two sisters and I are fortunate enough to have them as parents. But Bob Kuehn has never been forgotten. I pay tribute to him and the thousands of other Americans who gave their lives to protect our freedoms.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we pay tribute to those who gave of their lives and served at the Battle of the Bulge and to every soldier, every man and woman who participated in the Great War to protect our freedoms, protect the independence of this Nation, and to promote freedom and democracy in the world. I did not plan to speak on this resolution, but I do so now in honor of all of those who have served, to remind this Congress that the grave sacrifices they made to win the war, we may be losing the peace.

Last week, they celebrated 50 years of communism in China, parades, tanks, missiles, floats, parties. What bothers me is with a $70 billion trade surplus they enjoy from Uncle Sam, they paid for that parade last week with our cash. Ronald Reagan's great fight was to make sure that communism did not spread, and, by God, I am not so sure we are living up to the great task and challenge and the example set by those who fought in the Battle of the Bulge; I am not so sure we are passively turning our back and taking for granted our great freedoms that they protected. I think we better look at it. They won the war. Let us not lose the peace. I am proud to support this resolution. I commend the authors.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 65, a resolution commending our veterans of the Battle of the Bulge. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this worthwhile measure.

This year marks the 55th anniversary of the German Ardennes offensive of December 1944, more commonly known as the Battle of the Bulge. In the weeks leading up to the Christmas of 1944, it appeared to the Western Allies that victory over the German army was near at hand. Many thought that one final push was all that was needed to force a total collapse of German resistance on the Western front.

What the Allied commanders were not aware of was the fact that the German dictator was planning one final, desperate offensive through the Ardennes Forest, in the hopes of splitting the Allied lines.

The German attack came as a total surprise, and achieved initial success. Poor weather prevented Allied air superiority from being brought to bear, and the German Panzers took full advantage of the respite. Yet, in the end, their offensive failed.

The offensive failed because American soldiers shook off their initial shock and fought with a stubborn tenacity to prevent a German breakthrough. The Allied lines gave way, hence the ''Bulge'' description, but refused to break. After several days, the weather cleared, and the overwhelming Allied advantage in tactical air power was finally brought to bear in a concentrated counterattack.

The resolution honors those courageous veterans who fought in the Battle of the Bulge, resulting in a tenacious defense, under horrible conditions, against an enemy with superior armored forces. Their success in halting the German Ardennes offensive preserved the Allied lines, and helped to maintain the offensive pressure on Germany.

The efforts of our veterans in the Battle of the Bulge, like those of all Americans who fought against tyranny in World War II, deserve our recognition and respect. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this measure, which memorializes the significant contributions of the veterans of the Bulge to the ultimate victory of freedom over tyranny during the Second World War.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 65

which commends United States Veterans for their heroism in the Battle of the Bulge during World War II. The resolution also reaffirms our bonds of friendship with our Allies we stood together with during that noble cause.

I commend the bill's sponsor, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and the Chairman and Ranking Members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. STUMP and Mr. EVANS for their support. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution.

I would like to take this time to pay tribute in particular to two of the 600,000 American troops who served in the German Ardennes offensive, known as the Battle of the Bulge. These two heroes who risked their lives to defend our freedom come from my home state of Connecticut.

One is Bob Dwyer of Vernon, Connecticut. After serving his country in World War II, he now continues to serve his nation in peacetime by working for the Veterans' Coalition in Connecticut. Mr. Dwyer plays a central role in this group which provides crucial services and assistance for veterans and advocates on their behalf.

Another hero is Gerald Twomey of Norwich, Connecticut. Mr. Twomey served in a World War II reconnaissance unit that had already fought in North Africa, Sicily, and Normandy before he made his way to this momentous battle. In an interview with Bob Hamilton of the New London Day last year, Mr. Twomey described his service in Africa and Italy as difficult but nothing like the organized resistance he and his comrades met in Ardennes. ''That was brutal,'' said Twomey. ''It was very, very cold weather, a lot of snow. It was tough. They kept bringing over replacements, and they were knocking them off as fast as they could bring them over . . . It was much worse than North Africa, much worse.''

Anyone who has studied the accounts of this battle is struck by the resilience and courage of our troops at the Battle of the Bulge. Their bravery withstood Hitler's last ditch offensive to prevent the Allies from closing in on Berlin. A passage from the book Citizen Soldiers by Stephen Ambrose serves as a testament to the courage of American fighting men in recovering from a withering German attack and summoning the strength to respond:

> From the Supreme Commander down to the lowliest private, men pulled up their socks and went forth to do their duty. It simplifies, but not much, to say that here, there, everywhere, from top to bottom, the men of the U.S. Army in northwest Europe shook themselves and made this a defining moment in their own lives, and the history of the Army. They didn't like retreating, they didn't like getting kicked around, and as individuals, squads, and companies as well as at Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force, they decided they were going to make the enemy pay.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to add except to once again thank these American heroes on behalf of my constituents in Connecticut and citizens across this nation.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the courageous Americans who fought during World War II, especially those who fought at the Battle of the Bulge.

The Battle of the Bulge, as you and my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, was a major German offensive in the Ardennes forest region of Belgium and Luxembourg that was fought from December 16, 1944 to January 25, 1945. Over 600,000 American troops participated in the Battle of the Bulge, sustaining 81,000 casualties.

I am proud of my many family members and constituents who served this country in the last world war. In so doing, I especially think about my cousin John Henry Woodson, Jr., who not only fought in World War II but was actually left for dead behind enemy lines. He was reported as missing in action for almost three weeks, before he found his way back to the American troops. Although he was fortunate to be among those who returned home, that terrible experience and others during the war left an indelible memory and mark on the rest of his life.

John served the Virgin Islands Community exceptionally for many years, first at the Department of Health and later as a public school science teacher and principal. He is remembered by the Virgin Islands through the Junior High School, on St. Croix, which bears his name.

Today, as we remember those veterans who fought at the Battle of the Bulge for their service and sacrifice, I lovingly remember my cousin Johnny, and the other Virgin Islanders who also served there.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois, the ranking member of the committee, for all of his assistance on this bill, as well as the gentleman from New Jersey who brought the bill to us in the committee.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 65, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF HURRICANE FLOYD

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 322) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in sympathy for the victims of Hurricane Floyd, which struck numerous communities along the East Coast between September 14 and 17, 1999.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 322

Whereas on September 16, 1999, Hurricane Floyd deposited up to 18 inches of rain on sections of North Carolina only days after the damaging rains of Hurricane Dennis;

Whereas Hurricane Floyd continued up the eastern seaboard, causing flooding and tornadoes in Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut;

Whereas Hurricane Floyd is responsible for 66 known deaths, including 48 confirmed dead in North Carolina alone, as well as 3 in New Jersey, 2 in New York, 6 in Pennsylvania, 4 in Virginia, 2 in Delaware, and 1 in Vermont;

Whereas hundreds of roads along the eastern seaboard remain closed as a result of damage caused by Hurricane Floyd;

Whereas waters contaminated by millions of gallons of bacteria, raw sewage, and animal waste have flowed into homes, businesses, and drinking water supplies due to septic, pipeline, and water treatment system damage caused by the flooding associated with Hurricane Floyd, a situation that poses considerable health risks for individuals and families in affected States;

Whereas areas in 10 States were declared Federal disaster areas as a result of Hurricane Floyd—Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia;

Whereas individuals registering for Federal assistance in States hit by Hurricane Floyd totalled 68,440 as of September 26, 1999, with 39,265 in North Carolina, 11,121 in New Jersey, 4,582 in New York, 3,222 in South Carolina, 3,153 in Virginia, 371 in Delaware, 6,479 in Pennsylvania, 173 in Connecticut, and 74 in Maryland;

Whereas thousands of individuals and families have been displaced from their homes and are now taking refuge in temporary housing or shelters;

Whereas over $2 million in temporary housing grants have been issued in New York and New Jersey and the residential loss estimates are over $80 million in North Carolina alone; and

Whereas the nature of this disaster deserves the immediate attention and support of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its deepest sympathies to everyone who suffered as a result of Hurricane Floyd; and

(2) pledges its support to continue to work on their behalf to restore normalcy to their lives and to renew their spirits by helping them recover, rebuild, and reconstruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In communities up and down the East Coast, including many in my own congressional district, Hurricane Floyd left a path of unprecedented destruction, hardship, and tragedy. It has been more than 3 weeks since the storm hit, and still thousands of families are unable to return to their homes. In communities throughout our area, downtowns have become ghost towns.

Several of the towns I represent have suffered through floods before, but past storms were nothing in comparison to what happened on the evening of September 16. In the small community of Bound Brook, New Jersey, flood waters as high as 12 feet turned the downtown

business area and surrounding neighborhoods into a raging sea of water. Residents had to be rescued by boats from trees as well as rooftops. Tragically, two people were unable to escape and died. In the neighboring community of Manville, the town literally became an island. The only way to get outside assistance into the flood-ravaged community was by helicopter.

In the days following the flooding, I toured the hardest hit communities and talked to the homeowners and businesses who had lost their life savings in a sudden surge of floodwater. We all need, Mr. Speaker, to extend a heartfelt thanks to the Red Cross, the rescue squads, the police departments, the fire departments, the National Guard, and the tens of thousands who volunteered their time to come to the aid of their neighbors in need.

In the midst of all the destruction, the flood victims found comfort in the compassion and generosity of strangers who held their hands, gave them a blanket or dry clothes to wear, cooked them a hot meal and gave them a roof over their heads. The road to recovery will be a long one for many of the flood's victims. Some may never be able to return to their homes. Others will have to wait for months before extensive repairs are made.

Today, we in Congress can do more than just express our deepest sympathies to the victims of Hurricane Floyd. We can pledge to do everything in our power to help them get back on their feet, rebuild and recover from their losses and restore their faith in the future.

Later this week, I will be joining with colleagues from across the East Coast in calling for the expansion of the current disaster aid program to address one significant unmet need. Our legislation would extend disaster aid grants to small businesses as well as to homeowners. Without this modest level of assistance, the heart of our communities, our small businesses, may never reopen.

□ 1115

We cannot allow Floyd or any other natural disaster to decimate a vitally important part of the United States, our small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I hope our colleagues will join us in supporting this effort to help businesses, families, and communities fully recover from the devastation of Hurricane Floyd.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding this time to me, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) for cosponsoring this and providing the leadership for this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, approximately 52,000 North Carolina citizens have called the FEMA telephone in-take line seeking assistance as a result of Hurricane Floyd. At the peak of the disaster more than 48,000 squeezed in make-shift shelters. Some 3 weeks after Hurricane Floyd struck, hundreds in North Carolina remained in temporary shelters. Emergency housing is needed. Home repair and replacement is a priority. Essential property has been lost. Many are out of jobs. Despair and hopelessness is setting in.

Imagine, if you will, Mr. Speaker, doing without the necessities all of us take for granted. Imagine fighting for a cot to sleep on in a strange shelter at night. Imagine waking in the morning without lights or running water, standing in line for food, clothing and drinking water. Imagine being lost in a tunnel with no end in sight. More than anything, the victims of Hurricane Floyd now need hope.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, life as you have known it being swept away by rapid and rushing waters, unprecedented, unanticipated, and unforgiving. When Hurricane Floyd hit North Carolina, towns became rivers, and rivers became towns. Infrastructures built over lifetimes was destroyed. Losses that currently reach into the millions of dollars have been documented, and the numbers are growing.

More than 650 roads were impassable due to the flooding, and at least 10 bridges are severely damaged, and many more are structurally damaged. At the height of the flooding, Interstate 95, the roadway to Disneyland, was shut down. At least 600 pipelines were damaged. Electricity losses are nearly $100 million and growing. Millions in revenue has been lost. 1.2 million persons lost power due to the storm. Drinking water and wastewater treatment systems sustained untold damage. Bacteria, nitrates and other pollutants have contaminated many wells. Septic tanks are nonfunctional and due to the high water table will not be functional for some time.

Agricultural losses compounding previous losses from the drought and economic downturns and other natural calamities have reached close to $1.5 billion, and the number is growing. Small-farm life is seriously threatened in North Carolina. We have millions of dollars in forestry losses, unknown losses to homes of thousands, unknown losses of jobs because thousands of businesses were flooded, many ruined, and thousands have lost income entirely.

Thirty-one North Carolina counties were declared disasters in the wake of Hurricane Floyd. Fourteen of my 20 counties suffered severe flooding. Small towns, unincorporated municipalities, medium-sized cities like Pinetops, Trenton, Dodge Place, Kinston, Tarboro, Rocky Mount, Wilson, Greenville were substantially flooded. In Princeville, a town founded at the end of the Civil War by newly freed slaves, every business, every church, nearly every home and school has been destroyed. Mr. Speaker, the entire town has been destroyed. Fish and shellfish losses are countless; and if things could not be worse, there are millions of gallons of raw sewage and animal wastes. Contaminated waters have flowed into our water system. Disease-carrying insects, bugs, and rodent activity is on the rise.

Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Floyd left in its wake the worst flooding in the history of the State of North Carolina. Yet despite all the misery, there are bright spots. Many of the schools that were closed, opened yesterday. Thousands of students who had not been in school since September 15 were able to return. Help has come from thousands, and I recognized some of them during my last night's special order.

The sun is rising, the rivers are cresting, and the water is receding. The devastation of Hurricane Floyd will one day become history. It will become a mere memory in the minds of those who are suffering now through it. Possessions will once again be collected. North Carolina will rebuild, restore, and recover; but it is imperative that more help is provided by our Federal Government.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, offers hope, and for that help I urge its adoption.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this resolution to the floor, thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her commitment and energy in providing much needed help, and to all our delegation and Members up and down the East Coast who are affected, I am here today to speak on behalf of the many victims of Hurricane Floyd in North Carolina and also tornado victims in Stanley and Anson County who are looking to us for help.

As a member of the North Carolina delegation, I am going to work hard to make sure their needs are met, but I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that one way we can assist the many people who are in distress in North Carolina is to not use the Federal Government to wipe out their local economy.

Mr. Speaker, the President went to eastern North Carolina recently and told farmers that he feels their pain, and he pledged his support in the wake of this disaster. However, as soon as he returned to Washington, we learned that he had instructed the Justice Department to do its best to wipe them all out with a Federal lawsuit. Mr. Speaker, the ultimate loser in this process will be the tobacco farmers, their families, workers and manufacturing facilities and others who work long, hard days to put food on the table and provide for their families. The fact that the administration has chosen to launch this action in the wake of a devastating natural disaster might be comical were it not so tragic.

Mr. Speaker, members of the North Carolina delegation and I have sent a letter and personally contacted the President asking him to reconsider his plan and drop this lawsuit against the very people we are here to express sympathy for today. I hope other Members of this body will join us in this effort to not penalize victims with an additional Federal lawsuit.

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

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the honorable gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time; and, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union must provide for the general welfare of the people, the people in the Carolinas who have been devastated. I recognize the pain of the people who live there, who are affected by it on television. I saw where the waters had washed up the graves, and caskets were floating down the rivers, and saw where the hogs were on top of roofs trying to preserve what little life there was among the cattle.

America is busy doing things around the world. America needs to focus her attention on North Carolina and swiftly and surely, that the people in the Carolinas who have been affected so in such a devastating way by Hurricane Floyd get the kind of help and relief that they need expeditiously. I am willing to help; I know that most Members of Congress are willing to help. They need shelter, and I think that the apparatus we have in place like FEMA and all of these other disaster agencies that are in existence at this time in this country need to focus its full attention on North Carolina and ensure that relief is posthaste on behalf of those American citizens that we are here to represent.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me time; and, being from North Carolina, I of course am very much aware of the need there, but I think everybody in this country has seen the horrible devastation that has taken place.

As my colleagues know, we have so far done a good job relative to the disaster-relief part of this effort. The Federal Government has stepped in; FEMA, they have done a good job; the State government has done a magnificent job in meeting the immediate needs of the people. But now we move into a separate phase in this recovery effort.

Recovery is different than the immediate relief because we are talking long term. People have got to have a place to live. They need their homes rebuilt. They need their jobs again. And all of this is going to take place with the help of a lot of people across America because Government will do their job; we in the North Carolina delegation will see that everything possible is done from the government side. But then we have also got to have the help of all the people in this country who are willing not only to step up with dollars, but to step up with volunteer time. Who will come into North Carolina and help these people have some hope again, have a home in which to live?

I mean, think about it. One may have a home that has been destroyed in this flood, and then it has to be condemned because of the hog waste and the human waste and the gasoline and everything else. So, one had a mortgage on that home, they had no insurance because maybe they lived in the 500-year flood plain. They did not think they needed insurance. And all of a sudden here they are, no home, no insurance, a mortgage to pay, nowhere to go, maybe no job.

So I implore all the people across America, please come help us as a volunteer in North Carolina to give these people hope and to rebuild.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding this time to me. I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all my colleagues to support House Resolution 322.

Over the past several weeks the people of northern New Jersey have learned what many victims of disaster have already learned, that rebuilding lives can be a long and painful process and that the Federal Government needs to be there to help them in their time of need.

My heart goes out to the people of my district and to North Carolina and around the country who have suffered so grievously given this natural disaster. From the Hackensack to the Saddle Brook to the Pasaic, the rains that spilled the waters of New Jersey's rivers onto our communities caused tremendous damage, heartache, and loss. Memories that were encased in family heirlooms and photographs and other priceless possessions were lost. In addition to the hundreds of thousands of dollars, millions of dollars in communities that were lost when the rains swept away literally a lifetime of savings and investment.

For the people of my district the effects of this disaster will continue to be felt for weeks, months, and years to come. I have been encouraged by the quick response of FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Within hours teams arrived in New Jersey to start the difficult process of assessing the full extent of the damage and providing assistance.

□ 1130

I also want to commend New Jersey's volunteers and those professionals, the police, fire, first-aid, emergency response personnel, phone, gas and electric company workers, local elected officials and all the volunteers who did such an outstanding job during the flooding and its aftermath to help their neighbors. These heroic men and women put their lives on the line many, many times, and made many, many sacrifices to help the people of our region.

But now that the winds and rains have subsided from Hurricane Floyd, the Federal Government must be there. People debate whether there is a role for government. Well, there surely is a role for the Federal Government in the case of a natural disaster no one could have predicted. And in New Jersey, where we are the second lowest in terms of returning dollars from Washington, we send our tax dollars to Washington and we are the 49th State, almost the lowest ranking, to get money back from Washington.

This is now when we need Congress' help. This is now when we need some of our Federal dollars back to us in New Jersey. I urge all my colleagues to support those efforts and to support House Resolution 322.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me time, and I congratulate him on offering this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, on September 16, Hurricane Floyd took an unexpected turn after ravaging North Carolina and Virginia and crashed into central and northern New Jersey. The State's capital county, Mercer County, along with eight others, were declared major disaster areas, and, as my colleagues know, such a declaration does trigger the release of Federal expertise and funds to help people recover from Hurricane Floyd.

To date, over 12,000 New Jersey residents have applied for assistance through FEMA. In the short term, we are looking for immediate relief for those who have been devastated, with loans and small grants; and, in the long term, we will be requesting FEMA's help for extensive mitigation projects to protect family and businesses in flood-prone areas such as in the City of Trenton and the Township of Hamilton.

I would just point out for the record, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of that hurricane, in the City of Trenton alone, 40 homes were completely devastated and 25 businesses completely flooded; and each of those people are looking for some help and some assistance.

When disaster strikes, as we all know, the U.S. Small Business Administration acts as the Federal Government's disaster bank. The SBA has

three types of low interest loans. Approximately 3.6 percent is the rate, for 30 years, available to qualified homeowners and non-farm businesses of all sizes. These loans include homeowner loans up to $200,000 to cover residential losses not fully compensated by insurance.

Homeowners and renters may also borrow up to $40,000 to repair/replace personal property such as clothing, property, and cars; nonfarm businesses of any size and nonprofit organizations may apply for up to $1.5 million to repair or to replace assets like inventory or machinery or equipment damaged by the disaster; and small businesses that suffer economic losses may apply for SBA's economic injury disaster loans.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the individual SBA loans, FEMA has a Hazard Mitigation Program to fund construction projects to protect either public or private property; and we will be pursuing that very aggressively as well.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one final point. When FEMA arrives on the scene, sometimes people feel that the cavalry has arrived and everything is going to be made whole. But FEMA is not a panacea. It provides a bridge, helps people get back on their feet, but the devastating losses that our friends throughout the country on the East Coast especially have experienced will not be fully compensated for, but we have to do the maximum effort to make sure they are back on their feet and their families are protected for the future through mitigation efforts.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE.)

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and my other North Carolina colleagues on both sides of the aisle for bringing this resolution to the floor. The flooding with Hurricanes Dennis and Floyd is unprecedented in the history of North Carolina. This disaster met or exceeded the 500-year floodplain for many communities, and 500 years is before settlers had even arrived here in our country.

While the economic losses have been enormous, it cannot touch upon the loss of life that so many fellow Tar Heels have suffered. Hurricane Floyd resulted in 48 confirmed fatalities, and this figure could still rise as search and rescue teams continue to reach isolated communities and flooded homes, cars, and businesses.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow once said that noble souls, through dust and heat, rise from disaster and defeat, the stronger.

Indeed, nature's actions have tested our patience, our souls, our will, but we should not break our resolve to recover from this horrific event. We will be stronger, now, more than ever, if we work with the sense of community.

After all, what are we here for? This is the People's House. Our first duty is to help the people of this country. If during this time of crisis, we cannot reach out to our countrymen and women, our children, our senior citizens, we do not have a future. Many of them do not even have today, if we do not unite together, reach across the aisle, not only in our expression of sympathy, but our expression of desire to help. That is our duty. That is our calling as the people who have been elected here to serve the people in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that every one of our colleagues join us in expressing our deepest sympathy to those individuals and families who have lost loved ones and lost property. I want to thank all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for standing together as we reach those who need help at life's most desperate hour.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution offered by my colleague from New Jersey. Throughout our history, Americans have always distinguished themselves and our Nation through their ability to persevere through trying times. This ability must be attributed in large measure to the faith that we have always had in our neighbors, in our fellow citizens, to help in times of need. The efforts of assistance, not only by those in government but also by those who simply cared, to the victims of Hurricane Floyd certainly stands in validation of this faith.

Having worked very closely with representatives of FEMA in New York State, New York State's Emergency Management Office and its extraordinary Director, Edward Jacoby, the Small Business Administration, and many of the fire departments, town supervisors and sheriff and police departments as we tried to clean up and understand the enormous devastation that hit my district, I know firsthand their selfless devotion and caring work to help people whose lives have been diminished by the fury of this hurricane.

Though lives have been lost and communities damaged and disrupted, the effort to recover and rebuild has generated a sense in many that better days will lie ahead.

So we rise today to reaffirm our fellowship to those affected by Hurricane Floyd. This House extends to these victims our sympathy and our continued commitment to assisting them as they work to rebuild their lives and their communities.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing this resolution to the floor, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and the other members of our delegation for working on it.

This expression of sympathy for the victims of this storm is an important symbol that expresses collectively many of our personal thoughts and prayers. And so many have shown genuine sympathy towards those injured and killed by the most destructive natural disaster to ever hit my home State of North Carolina.

Let me say from the outset, I am aware and sympathetic to those affected by the hurricane beyond the borders of North Carolina. My thoughts and prayers are also with you. But, folks, I have seen the suffering in my home State firsthand, and the word ''devastating'' just does not do it justice.

It is devastating when you lose your job. Those people in many cases have lost everything they own, everything they ever knew. They have lost more than their jobs. They have lost their possessions, their homes, their clothing, those sentimental items that we rarely think about until they are gone, wedding photographs, military awards, a child's first report card, love letters, and, for at least 48 families, a loved one. So much lost, washed away in the flooding not seen in our State in all of recorded history.

In some places entire towns, roads, infrastructure, schools, businesses will have to be rebuilt from scratch. Farmers have lost their crops and have suffered great to their barns, their homes and their equipment. These farmers were already toiling under the worst economic disaster prior to this flooding, and now they have been slammed by a storm.

The people who barely escaped the rushing floodwaters with their clothes on their back hailed from some of the poorest areas in the entire country. Some have said this storm will set back some parts of eastern North Carolina as much as 50 years.

No, ''devastating'' does not do this storm justice. Hurricane Floyd has been a catastrophe of the highest order.

But, folks, in every storm there is a silver lining. If this storm has proven anything, it has proven the determination, the resolve and the indomitable spirit of the people of North Carolina. Our people come by the name ''Tar Heels'' honestly, because they stand in the face of adversity, and today they are facing this adversity, but we need the help of this Congress and the people of America.

If something knocks us down, we get right back up to fight another day. And that's what is happening all over North Carolina. People are pulling themselves up by the bootstraps and putting their lives back together. Neighbors are helping neighbors. People all over North Carolina and around the country are

making donations, sending food and supplies and providing their letters and prayers of support.

I personally have felt great sadness at the suffering that has since Hurricane Floyd wreaked havoc on my state. However, I have also been inspired by the determination our people have shown as they struggle to survive. I have never been more proud to be a North Carolinian than I am today. Representing the hard-working, God-fearing and Floyd-surviving people of my district in Congress is one of the greatest honors of my life. The people of North Carolina will survive, as will all those that have been affected by this catastrophic storm. Please join me in expressing sympathy for the victims of Hurricane Floyd by passing this resolution unanimously. And then let us pledge to work together to pass a supplemental disaster relief package for the victims of Floyd that will help all the victims get back on their feet and that will bring honor and distinction on the United States Congress. And please keep the victims of this unprecedented disaster in your thoughts and prayers in the weeks ahead.

Mr. FRANK of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey as well as the gentlewoman from North Carolina for introducing this resolution.

I must say, as many of my colleagues from North Carolina and also from New Jersey and Virginia and elsewhere have said, that this is probably one of the worst natural disasters that we have seen, certainly in my State, and I cannot speak for New Jersey and Virginia. But when you have a gentleman from the State of Maryland who was a volunteer during America's help in Turkey with the earthquake, and he comes back and he goes down to eastern North Carolina and he is quoted in the paper as saying that it reminded him of the Third World, that maybe tells you better than what I can say just how bad things are in eastern North Carolina.

But I will tell you that the resolve of the people in North Carolina and the people of eastern North Carolina is such that when they have been devastated by this natural disaster, they have come together and they take care of their brothers and sisters, as the Bible says, and I can assure you that the outpouring of help, not just sympathy, but help that has come from people within the State of North Carolina, as well as from all over America, is just what America is about. When people are hurting and when people are in need, we as Americans come to each other's aid. That is what makes this country what it is today.

I want to also say that FEMA I think has done an excellent job. It is a tough job. When you have people that are frustrated and stressed and have lost so much, and they are anxious for help, I do want to say that I think FEMA has done an excellent job. Certainly they are overwhelmed by this disaster, but, again, they are doing their very best to help the American taxpayer and the citizens of eastern North Carolina, as well as Virginia and New Jersey.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when farmers and business owners and individuals have lost everything, then, as I said earlier today in a morning speech, I think sometimes that we need to reconsider foreign aid. We need to reconsider, that the American taxpayer, the American that has been hurt, should come first.

In closing, I know that this Congress will do everything within its power to help its neighbors in North Carolina, as well as New Jersey and Virginia.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if you live in a 5-year floodplain or a 10-year floodplain or even a 25-year floodplain, you can reasonably expect to have a flood every 5 years, every 10 years, every 25 years. But when you live in a 500-year floodplain, you cannot prepare for it. You do not buy insurance for a disaster that occurs every 500 years.

□ 1145

This is what has happened in North Carolina. People have been hit by an incident that can reasonably be expected never to occur again in our lifetimes, not again for 500 years. So we need the kind of response in this body to an incident and in a way that demonstrates that we are responding once every 500 years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank these colleagues for bringing this resolution to the floor, and talk about the resolution for a little bit.

The resolution is three pages long. Most of the first two pages talk about the devastation that has occurred. I want my colleagues to zero in on the last four lines of this resolution, because that is where we make our 500-year commitment to these people.

It says that we pledge to support to continue to work on the people's behalf to restore normalcy to their lives, and to renew their spirits by helping them to recover, rebuild, and reconstruct.

Now, we can express all the sympathy that we want to, and that is important in this context. But this is the four lines that we make our commitment in, and it would be a mistake for any of my colleagues to come and support this resolution simply out of a political motivation to get some brownie points if they are not serious about living up to the last four lines of the resolution.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this very important resolution. As many of my colleagues know, I have over 100 miles of coastline in my Florida district. This makes us very susceptible to hurricanes like Floyd.

I never thought I would say that we were lucky to have category 1 hurricane force winds, but we were. However, Hurricane Floyd did cause substantial damage to the coast of Florida, enough to warrant a presidential disaster declaration. My thoughts and prayers are with all of those who are now struggling with rebuilding their homes and businesses. I am confident, however, if that same community spirit in the midst of this disaster continues through this rebuilding, we will all end up with stronger and better communities.

I want to particularly commend FEMA and the State and local and volunteer emergency management organizations that did such an excellent job in aiding our communities during this disaster, and are continuing to aid us as we rebuild.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in supporting today's resolution, and commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for House Resolution 322, expressing sympathy for the victims of Hurricane Floyd.

We can all imagine how tragic and terrible and disheartening it must be to lose the very basics of life, to see your home and all your possessions lost because of uncontrollable acts of nature. In the wake of the havoc wreaked by Hurricane Floyd, however, there has been a silver lining. That is that people have been drawn together in a spirit of humanitarian concern as thousands of volunteers from churches and community organizations have come forward to offer assistance to those who are facing hurricane-related hardships. They have provided shelter and food and clothing, and most importantly, moral support during this time of crisis.

In my home county of Essex, we have had a serious problem with flooding and malfunctioning traffic lights which has endangered public safety. Fortunately, everyone pulled together with Federal and State support. We have been able to begin rebuilding and repairing the damage caused by Hurricane Floyd.

I am pleased that President Clinton responded favorably to the request by New Jersey and other States affected by the hurricane to be designated Federal disaster areas so we can obtain much needed relief from FEMA and other Federal agencies.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my sympathy to the victims of Hurricane Floyd all across the Atlantic East

Coast who have been displaced from their homes or who have lost loved ones. They remain in our thoughts and in our prayers, and we will continue to offer our full assistance as the task of rebuilding gets underway.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, my district, which is located in inland North Carolina, was spared this very, very dreadful disease which now plagues eastern North Carolina. But even though we were spared, every time I go home, groups come to me and say, we cannot do enough for those victims down east, and also in New Jersey, but they are talking primarily about North Carolina.

I called on an old law school friend of mine from Rocky Mount, which is also inland, Mr. Speaker, just to inquire as to how things are progressing. He said, you cannot imagine how bad it is until you come to see it. He said, the television portrayals really do not bring you up to speed.

I guess about the only bright spot, Mr. Speaker, has been the East Carolina University football team. They played South Carolina. They could not return to their home in Greenville because the campus was under water. North Carolina State, which is their arch rival, loaned their stadium to them. There were signs, I noticed, in the East Carolina contingency thanking State, which is quite a landmark, the way those two schools battled each other football-wise. But East Carolina won that game and defeated Miami.

An account in the largest newspaper in my district gave a detailed report of the game, but the focus was on the flood and the people from East Carolina who drove the back roads to get to Raleigh just to escape the flood.

The concluding line of the story was that, oh, incidentally, East Carolina won the football game. But it was incidental, because keeping things in perspective, the news that day was the flood and how those people gathered in that parking lot in Raleigh to hold hands, to laugh, and to cry.

I thank those in this body who are concerned about them, those who are empathizing and sympathizing with the people who have suffered through this disease that plagues North Carolina.

A friend said, Howard, they do not need loans, they need grants. I concur. I hope we can come forward quickly and come to the aid of those people who desperately need it.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for coming together with all of our colleagues from New York and New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina to bring this timely resolution to the floor.

This bipartisan measure represents the tragedy each of us have observed and experienced in our own congressional districts, and reflects the sorrow we feel for the thousands of individuals, families, businesses, and communities who continue to struggle in the wake of Hurricane Floyd.

Between September 14 and September 17, Hurricane Floyd struck countless communities along the East Coast, devastating homes and businesses. Responsible for at least 66 known deaths and millions of dollars in property and infrastructure damage, Hurricane Floyd is one of the most destructive natural disasters in the history of our Nation.

Accordingly, we have all joined together in introducing House Resolution 322, a resolution expressing the deepest sympathy for the victims of the hurricane, and pledging our support to continue to work on their behalf to restore normalcy to their lives and renew their spirits.

Mr. Speaker, the effects of Hurricane Floyd are continuing to have devastating affects on the State of New York. Numerous municipalities have sustained significant damage from flooding, power outages, and loss of vital public services. Rising waters forced individuals to leave their homes throughout our region, and particularly after the dam at Hyenga Lake burst, portions of the town of the Clarkstown in the State of New York were evacuated.

Presently the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Small Business Administration, New York State Emergency Management Office, are working together to provide our injured communities with information, supplies, funding, and peace of mind. We commend them for their vital assistance.

However, the true heroes in this disaster are the people and their will to prevail. Citizens throughout the New York counties of Orange, Rockland, and Westchester are working together to overcome this tragedy. It is amazing to see how our communities have rallied around each other to rebuild their broken communities.

Hurricane Floyd was one of the worst disasters in our Nation's history. The Congress has the duty to recognize the challenges people engulfed in this tragedy are facing, and we must work together, as they have, to ensure our Federal agencies have the necessary support they require to deal with the level of disaster.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank all who have expressed their sympathy, and want to reemphasize the point that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) made; that, one, to empathize is also to support, not just to sympathize. This has been a mammoth, an enormous disaster. There has been none, I am told, in the history of this magnitude for floods in the United States, and never this devastation in North Carolina. Therefore, the response has to be accordingly.

Americans are at their best in disasters. I can tell the Members, if there is any redeeming grace out of this horrific loss, it has to be the generosity of the American people, neighbors helping neighbors.

Equally challenging, however, will be our governments collectively coming together and making the kind of response that is necessary, not for people to recover, but, indeed, for people to rebuild and for communities to be restored.

Again, I urge the support of Members and call for a vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentlemen from North Carolina, Mr. WATT and Mr. COBLE, sympathy is not enough. The Congress must help. This was a grave disaster. The carcasses of dead animals are still afloat in North Carolina. It is time for Congress to act.

I want to commend FEMA for a fine job, State and local governments for all the good work they are doing, and all the charitable and civic organizations and all the people of America for reaching out to help.

But I want to make this statement to all of the impacted citizens who experienced this great disaster. After the crisis is over and the media packs its bags and they desert, and we do not see it on the news anymore, the people despair and think maybe they have been forgotten. This is the time for the resolution, because it says the Nation has not forgotten, and more importantly, the Congress of the United States has not forgotten, and will help all of those impacted upon by this great disaster.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS), and urge everybody in this body to vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution which expresses sympathy for the victims of Hurricane Floyd.

Hurricane Floyd dumped 20 inches of rain onto North Carolina alone. In fact, parts of North Carolina received nearly three feet of rain in September.

This resulted in the worst flooding in North Carolina history and the start of a recovery process that could take months, if not years, to complete.

In North Carolina, flood waters have destroyed or heavily damaged 3,000 homes and

forced 42,500 people to apply for state and federal assistance.

When the waters finally subside, Floyd is expected to be the most expensive natural disaster in North Carolina history, topping the $6 billion price tag from 1996's Hurricane Fran.

FEMA already has approved more than $4.3 million in direct aid to those affected by Floyd, and insurance companies are extending premium due dates an additional 60 days because so many are unable to return to their homes.

At least 1,500 people remain in shelters, spending nights huddled in sleeping bags and days monitoring media reports on the flooding. The American Red Cross has served hundreds of thousands of meals since evacuations for Floyd began, and the organization expects to remain in the region for months to come.

Panicked residents who have lost everything and have watched the media pack up and leave are afraid the Nation has lost interest in their problems.

This resolution is timely, Mr. Speaker, because it sends a message to the victims of Hurricane Floyd that the Nation has not forgotten them, and the Congress of the United States will make sure they get the aid and assistance necessary to rebuild their lives.

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

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), Members from the region, Members from both sides of the aisle, for coming here to express their heartfelt sympathy, but also for us to collectively focus on the job that remains ahead.

This flood has caused enormous dislocation in our communities. Our neighbors will need our help in the weeks and the months ahead, and this institution needs to retain a commitment to make certain that these folks get back to a life as normal as possible.

I am looking forward to working with our colleagues to assure that that is the end of this event, a successful conclusion that will have the Federal Government working in partnership with the State and local governments and volunteer agencies to make sure our neighbors get back on their feet.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as record floodwaters receded across New Jersey only weeks ago, the damage toll from Hurricane Floyd inched upward in our state. Surging floodwaters caused several hundred million dollars in property damage and claimed four lives.

As officials struggled to cope with thousands of refugees, families were left to deal with contaminated drinking water, highway closures and lingering phone and power outages.

Nine of the counties hardest hit by Floyd have been declared federal disaster areas—including Hunterdon, Middlesex, Mercer, and Somerset counties in my district.

I was able to see firsthand the damage that the hurricane caused. In Lambertville, I toured the Middle School that only days before had 2–3 feet of water flowing through it. Mud covered floors, floating school supplies, and overturned desks scattered the building. Officials there told me they expect the clean-up effort may cost up to $1.5 million.

In Branchburg, I watched as families shoveled mud from their basements—their belongings ruined and homes permanently damaged.

In my Congressional District, there was water everywhere, but none to drink, as flooding contaminated drinking-water sources. More than 200,000 residents throughout the state were urged to boil tap water before using it.

From the scenes of devastation, tales of heroic rescues emerged.

In this time of devastation it gives me some comfort to think on those men and women of New Jersey who thought first of their fellow citizens.

The inextinguishable spirit of the citizens of New Jersey has burned brightly in the days since this horrible disaster. And it will continue to burn as an example for our nation.

However, this spirit alone cannot restore the damage caused by Hurricane Floyd.

While the federal disaster declaration is a substantial step forward in helping central New Jerseyans start to put their lives back together, more immediate assistance is necessary.

In cosponsoring this Resolution, I have pledged my support to continue to work to restore normalcy to the lives of the victims of the hurricane and to renew their spirits by helping them recover, rebuild, and reconstruct. I urge my fellow colleagues to join me.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey suffered from some of the worst flooding in 200 years when Hurricane Floyd roared through Jew Jersey in September. Homes, corps, businesses and lives were destroyed.

Floyd is gone, and the flood waters have receded, but many New Jerseyans continue to suffer its effects. Lives were completely disrupted, and they continue to be. Our words here on the House floor have little impact on their suffering, yet they are important because we must ensure that America remembers the havoc Floyd wreaked on New Jerseyans, and the people of coastal North Carolina as well. Furthermore, we must continue to monitor the Federal government's response to this disaster and make sure none of our residents is overlooked.

I also want to take the opportunity to commend the countless men and women who contributed to relief efforts in New Jersey. Whether by wading into the waters to help rescue a stranded citizen, or by aiding with a contribution of time or money to help provide food and shelter for families, many of whom lost everything, New Jersey's volunteers have again demonstrated an admirable commitment to their fellow New Jerseyans, and to them I say, thank you.

To the people of my own district, in Morris, Essex, Somerset, Sussex and Passaic Counties, and elsewhere, and to the people of Bound Brook and Manville, and throughout New Jersey who have lost both their belongings and their faith, let me assure you that Congress has not, and will not forget you.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 322.

The question was taken.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1200

J.J. ''JAKE'' PICKLE FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 559) to designate the Federal building located at 300 East 8th Street in Austin, Texas, as the ''J.J. 'Jake' Pickle Federal Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 559

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal Building located at 300 East 8th Street in Austin, Texas, shall be known and designated as the ''J.J. 'Jake' Pickle Federal Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''J.J. 'Jake' Pickle Federal Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY).

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY), my good friend, for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Jake Pickle was a giant in this House. He was a personal friend of mine. He is so deserving of this honor. Some months ago, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) introduced his resolution. I not only supported it, but I moved it very quickly through our committee. We brought it to the floor. I supported it here on the floor. We passed it, and we sent it over to the Senate in May, I believe.

It was my hope that the Senate would have taken it up and would have acted upon it. That is my preference. But, unfortunately, the Senate has chosen not to act upon it, but rather to pass an identical Senate resolution sponsored by Senator GRAMM from Texas.

As recent as last night, we called the Senate again and asked if they would

please consider the House resolution, the Doggett resolution. We were informed, again, in no uncertain terms, that they simply would not bring it up.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a choice here today, a choice which is not of my making and a choice which I wish we did not have to face. The choice is are we going to take the identical Senate resolution and honor Jake Pickle, or are we not going to pass any such legislation? That is the real choice.

Because Jake Pickle was such an outstanding Member of this body, a great American, I think that we should move ahead. Jake is in his 80's now. He is not in the best of health. He certainly brought great credit to this country and to his State of Texas. Indeed, I have on my coffee table at home his book entitled ''Jake,'' and I recommend it to all Members because it gives extraordinary insight into a very important time in our history.

Mr. Speaker, Jake Pickle is very deserving. I want to see this building named in his honor. The only way we are going to do it is by passing the Senate resolution which is identical to the House resolution. For those reasons that I have stated, I would urge all Members and particularly my Democratic friends because, of course, Jake is and is proud of being a Democrat, so this is a Democratic resolution. And, indeed, I support it and would urge all Members to support it.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), author of the House resolution.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with our action today, I am pleased that Congress will have finally completed its consideration of the naming of the Federal building in Austin after my predecessor and friend, J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle. This honor is long, long overdue.

For all of those who come to central Texas by air, there is a good chance when they first touch ground, they will land on the J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle runway at our new Austin-Bergstrom International Airport. And if one is interested in higher education or in high technology, one will likely be aware that at the University of Texas we have a J.J. Pickle Research Center on the J.J. Pickle Research Campus from which great ideas and great spin-offs have had much to do with the success of the high-tech industry which has really fueled our progress in central Texas and certainly represents our central Texas economic future.

In a joint project, the City of Austin and the Austin Independent School District have construction under way on the J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle Elementary School, Library, Health Clinic and Recreation Center. They are located in the St. Johns neighborhood and will be opening in the fall of 2001 as, I think, a living symbol and substantive statement about our commitment to equal educational opportunity in central Texas.

To these Austin memorials it is appropriate that we add the J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle Federal Building. This is the place where, from the time of the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson, until his retirement in 1994, Congressman Pickle had his district office; and I am fortunate to have the very same rooms up on the 7th floor of the Federal building in Austin that we are naming today, a place from which most of the important operations of the Federal Government in central Texas are conducted.

Congressman Pickle is the only Congressman that I have really ever known during my life in Austin. He was elected when I was a senior at Austin High School, and he continued to serve until I was elected to succeed him in 1994.

And serve our community he certainly does and continues to do. It was with that service in mind that on February 12 of 1998 I introduced H.R. 3223, the bill that the bill before us today copies verbatim. Unfortunately, even I was surprised at the way this Republican Congress handles such matters. For months last year the Republican leadership permitted consideration of few, if any, bills if they had the misfortune of having a Democratic sponsor.

Finally, on July 14, 1998, with a bipartisan tribute, joined by Democrats and Republicans on this floor, we paid tribute to Congressman Pickle for his service and unanimously passed this bill through the House. My goal in filing H.R. 3223 early in 1998 was to have this bill signed into law by President Clinton in time for a ceremony in Austin, Texas, about October 11 of last year when Congressman Pickle happily celebrated his 85th birthday. My office was assured from the staff of the Senate sponsor of this measure, Senator GRAMM, that we would get this done; that the President would be able to sign it last year; and, of course, this was not done.

So on January 6, the first day of this session when I came down to swear my oath of office along with my colleagues, immediately after doing so, I refiled H.R. 3223 that the House had approved unanimously in 1998, and this year it was H.R. 118. Like most everything in this House this year, progress was painfully slow. But finally, finally on May 4 of this year, we had another bipartisan tribute which I hope Congressman Pickle enjoyed again, colleagues, Republican and Democrat, coming to tell some stories and to pay tribute to his excellent service. And the House again unanimously approved the bill.

On June 16 of this year, my office received a call indicating that the Senate was at last about to approve H.R. 118. So we turned on C–SPAN to watch the happy moment; and, indeed, we learned that at the last minute, apparently at the request of the sponsor of S. 559, that H.R. 118 would not be approved, but S. 559 would be.

Such action is highly unusual, even in this often too contentious Congress. During this year of 1999, three House naming bills of this type with Senate companions where both the House and Senate sponsor filed bills, three House bills have been sent over to the Senate first and each one of them is already law. The same has occurred with the naming bills that have come the other direction where the Senate acted more promptly than the House and the House paid courtesy to the Senate and approved those bills which have been signed into law along with these House naming bills that had no Senate sponsor originally, but were also signed into law.

The Pickle bill is thus the first and the only lone exception from the Lone Star State to the courtesy and the bipartisanship that is normally associated with such matters.

After more than a few unreturned phone calls to staff, I spoke personally with our senior Senator from Texas in August to courteously and respectfully request prompt approval of my House bill. About one month later a Senate staffer again assured my staff that we would get Senate approval of the House bill and that it would be done shortly. During the last month, however, we are back to largely the old unreturned phone call routine.

Now this morning's Republican Whip Notice for this very morning indicates that, like Senator GRAMM's original S. 559, they are designating 33 East 8th Street in Austin to be named for Congressman Pickle. If that address actually represents any place, it is part of a sidewalk in downtown Austin; and I think this error probably results from a Senate author who knows as little of Austin and Austinites, unfortunately, as that measure suggests. Mr. Speaker, I think that Congressman Pickle deserves far better from both the Senate and the House.

A number of strange arguments were advanced yesterday for the belated rush and enthusiasm to approve S. 559, the copycat version of the House bill. Yesterday's Congress Daily quoted a spokeswoman for the majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, as saying the House had to schedule S. 559 this week because it was a way to save time and avoid a House-Senate conference committee. Of course that was phony because there were no differences between the House bill and the copycat version from the Senate for a conference committee to adjust.

Then other stories were circulated, apparently Mr. Shuster heard one of them, suggesting that Congressman Pickle was in grave health. Well, I talked to him personally just after he returned from his morning jog, and I am pleased to report to the Members of the House this beloved former Member of our body is alive and kicking.

Indeed, our community finds Congressman Pickle still mighty hard to keep up with because of the fact that he is no longer a formal Member of Congress, and only a former Member has not slowed him down a bit. We appreciate his energy and vigor, and we

say thanks with the approval of this measure for what he has done.

I have tried to gain some understanding of why it is that we would go through the kind of unprofessional conduct associated with the way this bill has been considered. First I think in this do-little Congress approving naming bills and commemoration of the Leif Ericson Millennium Medal is about all that is getting done, so it is not surprising why Republicans would want to sponsor as many of these measures as possible.

Second, it is not unusual for Republicans to adopt good Democratic proposals. It is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, and who could help but be flattered by Senator GRAMM's enthusiasm for my proposal? Republicans, even in this Congress, rely on the wisdom of FDR, Truman and JFK; and it is hard to hear a quote from Mr. Nixon or Mr. Hoover.

But I think finally it is plain old arrogance. For one form of that arrogance we years ago coined a new word in Texas. It is called ''grammstanding,'' which usually describes the fine art of claiming credit in Texas for what you voted against in Washington.

But I think this silliness is not grammstanding. It is certainly not ''Profiles in Courage.'' I call it ''Profiles in Pettiness.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that it is inappropriate to characterize or cast reflections on the Senate or Members of the Senate either individually or collectively.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill for a great man, Jake Pickle, whose career stood above the kind of deceit and pettiness associated unnecessarily with the process that results in the approval of this very good bill. I urge the House to approve it.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 559 designates the Federal building in Austin, Texas, as the J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle Federal Building. One may recall this body passed H.R. 118, the House companion to S. 559, a few months ago. We are here today once again to honor our former colleague from Texas. Action on the Senate version will create a more equitable balance between the House and Senate versions of naming bills. Passage today will clear the measure for the President's signature.

Congressman Pickle began his long career in public service by serving 3½ years with the United States Navy in the Pacific during World War II. Following the war, Congressman Pickle returned to Austin, Texas, and held positions in the private and public sectors.

He served his political party ably as executive director of the Texas State Democratic Party. In 1963, he was elected to the United States House of Representatives in a special election to fill a vacant seat.

□ 1215

He was then reelected to the next 15 succeeding Congresses until his retirement on January 3, 1995.

During his tenure in Congress, Jake Pickle was a strong advocate for civil rights. He vigorously advocated and supported such legislation as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act. For over 30 years, Congressman Pickle continuously worked for equal opportunities for women and minorities. As chair of the Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight and the Subcommittee on Social Security, he helped shape the system of Medicare to assure that it fulfilled its intended purpose of bringing basic health care for those in need and timelessly fought for the future of Social Security.

Congressman Pickle was a dedicated public servant who remained close to his Texas constituents. This is fitting legislation that honors him. I support this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am personally disappointed that the leadership has chosen to make the naming of a Federal building in Texas, my home State, a partisan issue. There is something ironic about that, because I have known very few Members of this Congress in my service here that were more nonpartisan, that were more bipartisan than J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle.

But, nevertheless, I come to this floor for the primary purpose of saying thank you to my friend, our friend, Jake Pickle.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset that it takes a great deal for a Texas Aggie to come to this well of the House to compliment a University of Texas graduate. In this case, I will make an exception. No one deserves accolades better than our friend, J. J. ''Jake'' Pickle.

I love Jake Pickle. To me, he represents the very best of public service, truly committed to helping people for all the right reasons. He epitomizes the very best of public service, someone who has served his country in time of war, someone who continued to serve it in time of peace.

There are a lot of people today, Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the aisle claiming to be the saviors of the Social Security system. We will be debating that issue in the weeks and months ahead.

But in the 1980s, and particularly in the 1983 Social Security bill, Jake Pickle, through his leadership position on the Committee on Ways and Means, truly did help save the Social Security system. Millions of senior citizens, past, present, and future have been and will be the beneficiaries of Mr. Pickle's strong far-sighted leadership in that effort.

We could go on and on about all his many accomplishments, but it is not the accomplishments. It is the character of Jake Pickle that I most admire and love.

I think the Bible verse that says, ''This is the day the Lord hath given us, let us rejoice and be glad in it.'' is basically the verse that, to me, represents what Jake Pickle is all about.

When he walks in the room, he brings light and life into that room. He has brought light and life to all of us who have known him. I honor Mr. Pickle today along with my colleagues.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is sad to hear that there is a squabble going on about naming this building. Quite frankly, we should keep our eyes on the prize, and that is to make sure that we do name this Federal courthouse after the great Member that we shared some common goals with here, Jake Pickle. I hope that gets worked out.

I would just like to take to the floor to thank Jake Pickle, because I worked for years on trying to change the burden of proof in a civil tax case, and Jake Pickle carried on a strong mantra with the Committee on Ways and Means.

But in the final analysis, he became a pragmatic friend and supporter and ultimately played a key role in the ultimate passing of that in last year's reform bill, even though he was not here.

So I want to say thank you, Jake Pickle. Many of us here love Jake Pickle. I hope we get beyond the partisanship. Keep our eyes on the prize and name that courthouse after our great former Member.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise and support enthusiastically this legislation, S. 559, as a bill to designate the Federal building on 8th Street in Austin, Texas in honor of Jake Pickle.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) who has previously spoken now represents Jake's district. He has twice introduced similar legislation, and he has been a steadfast advocate and supporter of this designation. House Members extend their thanks and gratitude to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for his diligence in this effort.

Now, honoring Jake in this manner is particularly appropriate because, for 28 of his 31 years in Congress, Jake Pickle had his office in this Federal building on 8th Street in Austin.

Jake Pickle was extremely proud of his Texas heritage, a native of Texas, born in Big Spring in the northwest part of the State. He attended public schools and graduated from the University of Texas in 1938. He was a Federal worker during the Roosevelt administration and then entered the Navy during World War II, serving 3½ years in the Pacific.

Coming to Congress after a special election in 1963, and, of course, he then succeeded President Lyndon Johnson, that was LBJ's District, Jake wasted little time in establishing himself as a congressional leader. He joined only five other southern leaders in voting in favor of President Johnson's Civil Rights Act of 1964. Jake has acknowledged that the civil rights vote was a vote of which he is most proud.

A few months later, Jake Pickle again courageously voted for the Voting Rights Act and then worked for 30 years to ensure equal opportunity for minorities and women.

Jake's committee assignments, including chair of the Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight and chair of the Subcommittee on Social Security. He devoted his time and energies to the well-being of his constituents and developed a reputation for selfless work and tireless advocacy for his fellow Texans.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with Jake Pickle are happy that this bill is finally here and that he will receive the honor to which he is entitled. It is with great pride that I support the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) and urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Jake Pickle with this designation.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise as someone who had the great honor and privilege of serving with Congressman Pickle. He served with great distinction, with great commitment to this country, obviously outstanding service to the State of Texas.

But he was a national legislator and brought credit to himself and to our country and to this House as a Member. I am privileged and honored to be among his friends, his former colleagues, and supporters of this legislation.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding me this time and rise in strong support of this bill.

Jake Pickle was a great leader from Texas, served in this House with distinction for many years, and has been followed ably by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT). We have had this discussion many times. I must say that both Jake and his wife Beryl are two true great Texans.

There is a story, and if the gentleman will bear with me on this, there is a great story that is similar to how this bill is being handled, though. There was a dispute in the Democratic Party some years back when it was a split party, and there was an issue of dollars for Democrats, but not a nickel for Pickle because Jake was on the other side of the issue.

It is ironic that today we are considering the Senate bill offered by our senior Senator from Texas, a former Democrat, now a member of the Republican Party when really the bill we ought to be considering is the bill by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) who introduced it first, who is the successor of Mr. Pickle.

I think Jake and Beryl are probably sitting back in Austin watching this on C–SPAN and chuckling to themselves that, even after 30, 40 years of these types of disputes, the House of Representatives today can go back and have the same internecine and warfare that the Texas Democratic Party was capable of doing many years ago.

Jake is a great man. He was a great leader from Texas. This is a good bill, even if it is not the Doggett bill. We ought to pass it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I, too, lived in Austin. I was actually stationed at Bergstrom Air Force Base during the Vietnam period while my colleagues were in school there.

I, too, know Jake Pickle. There is no question that Jake Pickle is a gentleman and a scholar and was truly a credit to this great institution. But today I think that we should keep focus on what we are here about. We are here to name a building after a great man who was a great congressman and a credit to this Nation and to the great State of Texas.

So I urge my colleagues to proceed with this, and we will indeed facilitate naming this building for Congressman Jake Pickle.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, there is no more appropriate person to name a Federal building after than Jake Pickle. Jake has a long and distinguished connection with the city of Austin where this building will be located. Jake was president of the student body at the University of Texas. He went on to work many years in Austin in politics before coming to this Congress. Jake was, in fact, one of the most distinguished Members from our State in the last 30 years.

No person worked harder on making sure that the Social Security system would be strong and would survive well into the next century than Jake Pickle. No person worked harder on behalf of the high-tech industry of Austin authoring and fathering the semi-tech legislation that really created the new Silicon Valley in Texas.

No person served with greater humility, greater humor, and greater distinction than my friend Jake Pickle. I look forward to being with Jake and seeing the name go up on the building.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that action we take today is marred by process. But I do want to express my great appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) for recognizing the impasse that occurred when the other body refused to take up a House version of this legislation and made it clear that the only way to do it is to act on the Senate bill. That is just realism, and I appreciate his desire to, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) expressed himself so eloquently, his depth of appreciation for Jake Pickle for the service in this body, and it shows what a distinguished leader our committee chairman is and his willingness to act as we have always done on our committee, in a bipartisan manner.

The gentleman from Texas whom we honor with this building naming is a very unusual person, a great Member of this body, and a very unorthodox Member. He did not go along to get along. But he pursued his own beliefs and pursued them vigorously and advocated on this floor and in the Democratic Caucus what he believed in. He was a very rare article in the House of Representatives.

He always, as our colleagues from Texas have noted, always considered himself President Lyndon B. Johnson's congressman, and frequently would tell us stories about calls he had received, well I can recall this as a member of the staff at the time, calls from the President and later, after Lyndon Johnson's presidency, calls that he would receive from the former President, giving him advice on one or another action.

□ 1230

And Jake was also always very responsive to that advice.

He was a very close friend of my predecessor in Congress, John Blatnick, for whom I was administrative assistant, and I got to know Jake quite well. He served on the Committee on Public Works prior to going to the Committee on Ways and Means and we got to know each other very well. So well that after I was elected to Congress Jake Pickle always referred to me as John. I considered it a compliment. I never corrected him because I thought being associated with John Blatnick was just fine by me.

Naming this Federal building in Austin, I think, will be just as enduring a compliment to this great public servant, and I am really delighted we are

taking the action today, finally, to give Jake Pickle the recognition he so richly deserves.

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for yielding me this time and allowing me to say a few words about Jake Pickle.

I have known Jake literally all my political life, I guess for over 25 years, having served in the Texas legislature since 1973 up until coming to Congress, and Jake was always the Congressman for Austin, Texas.

Having served with Jake from 1993 until he retired, I cannot think of any other Member that deserves this honor of having a courthouse named after him more than Jake, because Jake was such a great Member. He served on the Committee on Ways and Means and he served his community well.

I know in the past, when we have talked about Jake Pickle, I talked about his book, ''Jake,'' and it is a great compilation of stories of his service in Congress. And I was proud a few years ago, for Father's Day, that my daughter, who was at the University of Texas at that time, went over and bought the book and asked Jake to just sign it for me.

Again, I want to congratulate not only the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY), but also the House for doing this for Jake Pickle.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support this bill. This measure designates a federal building in Austin, Texas as the J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle Federal Building. This edifice will truly stand as a striking and fitting monument to Jake Pickle's long and proud legacy of service to Texas.

J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle is a Texas icon whose shadow looms large across the territory from the Rio Grande to the Texas Panhandle. His presence is still runs deep throughout my home State of Texas.

J.J. Pickle is one of the last of the Great Society's old guard of Lyndon Johnson's administration. ''Jake,'' as his friends affectionately call him, put himself through college during the Depression, worked for President Roosevelt's National Youth Administration, served in the Pacific during World War II, founded a Central Texas radio station right after the war, and represented Texas' Tenth Congressional District from 1963 to 1995. He's a Yellow Dog Democrat who never forgot his West Texas roots, and a superb raconteur.

The following anecdote, as told by Mr. Pickle, reveals his strength of character:

Even today, it's hard to believe that just thirty years ago people of color couldn't patronize many of the restaurants, hotels, public rest rooms, or water fountains in America. In retrospect, it's almost inconceivable that those conditions existed just a generation ago. I believe that in 1964 a strong Civil Rights Bill could have passed only under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson.

Nobody else knew how to manipulate Congress so effectively, or hammer through legislation by sheer force of will. And because Johnson was from Texas, he could look fellow Southerners in the eye and say, ''I know what it will take for you to support this.'' He understood the risk.

A week after the vote, I was visiting with President Johnson and Jack Valenti at the White House. Jack commented that he was glad to see me vote for the bill.

I told Valenti it was a hard vote, and then added with feeling, ''I'm sure glad to get that one over with!'' President Johnson was listening and he said, ''Jake, that was a tough vote. But you'll be in Congress for another twenty years (I surprised everybody—it was thirty-one years!) ''and you'll probably have a civil rights vote every year from now on. We've just started civil rights reform, and we're two hundred years behind. We got a long way to catch up. So don't think for a second that you've got this vote behind you!''

As, usual, President Johnson was right. And the fight continues.

Elected to the Eighty-eight Congress by special election, December 21, 1963, JJ Pickle served his constituents for 30 years in the House of Representatives after being reelected to fifteen succeeding Congresses. He was a leader in the fight for civil rights issues and equal opportunity for women and minorities. During his tenure, J.J. Pickle became chairman of both the Ways and Means Oversight and Social Security Subcommittee. It is my pleasure to support this legislation to designate the federal building located at 300 East 8th Street in Austin, Texas as the J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle Federal Building.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support S. 559, a resolution naming the federal building in Austin, Texas after my fellow Texan and friend, retired Congressman J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle.

From his election to the House of Representatives in 1962 to his retirement in 1995, Congressman Pickle was the ideal public servant. I know firsthand how hard Congressman Pickle worked on behalf of his constituency in Central Texas. For over thirty years, Congressman Pickle had pivotal roles in legislation from civil rights to the protection of the environment. Naming the federal building in Austin after Congressman Pickle is an appropriate symbol of our admiration, our respect, and our appreciation for his true public service to us all. It's an honor to take this opportunity recognize a man of great integrity and valor, Congressman J.J. ''Jake'' Pickle.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 559.

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. COOKSEY. 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 House Resolution 322 and Senate 559, the measures just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to the provisions of 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. 1663, by the yeas and nays; H.J. Res. 65, by the yeas and nays; H. Res. 322, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR MEMORIAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1663, 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 Arizona (Mr. STUMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1663, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie	Bonior	Condit
Ackerman	Bono	Conyers
Aderholt	Borski	Cook
Allen	Boswell	Cooksey
Andrews	Boucher	Costello
Archer	Boyd	Cox
Armey	Brady (PA)	Coyne
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Cramer
Baird	Brown (FL)	Crane
Baker	Brown (OH)	Crowley
Baldacci	Bryant	Cubin
Baldwin	Burr	Cummings
Ballenger	Burton	Cunningham
Barcia	Buyer	Danner
Barr	Callahan	Davis (FL)
Barrett (NE)	Calvert	Davis (IL)
Barrett (WI)	Camp	Davis (VA)
Bartlett	Campbell	Deal
Barton	Canady	DeFazio
Bass	Cannon	DeGette
Bateman	Capps	Delahunt
Becerra	Capuano	DeLauro
Bentsen	Cardin	DeLay
Bereuter	Carson	DeMint
Berkley	Castle	Deutsch
Berman	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Biggert	Chambliss	Dickey
Bilbray	Chenoweth-Hage	Dicks
Bilirakis	Clay	Dingell
Bishop	Clayton	Dixon
Blagojevich	Clement	Doggett
Bliley	Clyburn	Dooley
Blunt	Coble	Doolittle
Boehlert	Coburn	Doyle
Boehner	Collins	Dreier
Bonilla	Combest	Duncan

Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Berry
Blumenauer
Hill (MT)
LaHood
Mascara
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Scarborough

□ 1255

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

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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to recognize National Medal of Honor sites in California, Indiana, and South Carolina.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). 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 will be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair had postponed further proceedings.

COMMENDING VETERANS OF THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 65, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 65, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Berry
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Hill (MT)
Jefferson
LaHood
Mascara
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Scarborough

□ 1303

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall votes 474 and 475. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 474, and ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 475.

SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF HURRICANE FLOYD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 322.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 322, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—417

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie
Bereuter
Blumenauer
DeLay
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
LaHood
Manzullo
Mascara
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Rangel
Royce
Scarborough

□ 1311

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1315

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2606, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 307 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 307

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 307 is the standard rule waiving points of

order for the conference report to accompany H.R. 2606, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule waives points of order against the conference agreement and its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

I support this rule, and I support the underlying conference report as well. There are many important programs which are being funded in this conference report, and because there are no country earmarks, the President and the Secretary of State are afforded great flexibility to conduct foreign policy as they see fit in this area.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN). I think he has done an extraordinary job, as has the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). They have done a lot of hard work on this important conference report, and I urge both the adoption of the rule by our colleagues, as well as passage of the conference report.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2606, a bill that makes appropriations for foreign aid and export assistance in fiscal year 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, foreign aid is part of the price we pay to be the political and the moral leader of this world, and, just as it is our duty as individuals to help others less fortunate than we are, it is our duty as a Nation to help those countries which are struggling. There are more direct benefits. Foreign aid creates jobs here in the United States, increases exports and opens markets overseas for American businesses.

A report several years ago by the Washington polling firm of Belden & Russonello concluded that Americans strongly support humanitarian assistance to developing countries, which is part of foreign aid. In one poll, the average American thinks that almost one-third of the Federal budget is spent on foreign aid. However, in reality, less than 1 percent of the Federal budget goes to foreign aid. The evidence suggests that the more people think about foreign aid, the more likely they are to support it.

There are good provisions in this conference report. It provides a $65 million increase for the Child Survival and Disease Programs Funds. This includes a $5 million increase for UNICEF, which is so important to helping children throughout the world.

The report also contains favorable language for microenterprise development, which has proven to be a cost effective way to help people become economically self-reliant.

Unfortunately, the overall funding levels for the bill are insufficient to support America's leadership role in the world, and the bill cuts the administration's request for foreign aid programs by about 13 percent. This has been consistent over the past 10 years. Our foreign aid, especially on development assistance, continues to go down. As a matter of fact, it has been cut 50 percent in the last 10 years.

The Peace Corps is cut by $35 million below the administration's request, which will cause the reduction of 1,000 volunteers in the next 2 years. As a returned Peace Corps volunteer myself, I am disappointed in the funding level of this important people-to-people aid program which enjoys broad support among American citizens.

There are no funds to implement the Wye River agreement, which is a tremendous agreement between our President, Jordan, and Israel in the Middle East. The President is considering a veto of the bill largely on the grounds of inadequate funding.

But, despite my concerns about the bill, I am willing to support this rule, which is the standard rule for conference reports, and it will allow for further debate of the bill.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as with so many other of the appropriations bills this year, we are hearing opposition from our good friends on the other side of the aisle because of the fact that they wish that more money was being spent. There is no doubt that proposals to spend money in myriad ways will be heard, and will continue to be heard, some of which, I am sure, make a lot of sense.

We made a decision on this side of the aisle, and I think it is important to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), and the leadership, the Republican leadership, the Speaker, the majority leader, the whip, the conference chairmen, the entire leadership. They made a decision, on our side of the aisle we made a decision, that we will not in these appropriations bills tap, we will not get into the Social Security trust fund. And we are sticking to that decision. So we are going to see a lot of opposition based on the fact we are not spending enough money on these appropriations bills.

This is the foreign aid bill. It is a very important bill. But we believe we are doing a good job, and we are doing the job within the existing resources that we have, while not tapping into, not going into, the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on the resolution bringing the conference report to the floor. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is ready, the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), to explain the details of this legislation in great depth.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is an expert and our ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his leadership internationally and domestically on behalf of people in need, especially our children.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), very clearly has pointed out some of the good things that are in this bill, and as I rise to talk about the rule, I am really rising in opposition to the bill.

My colleague, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), deserves credit for how he balanced the allocation that he had in the bill, and, again, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) pointed out some of the positive initiatives that are in the bill. But the bill does not measure up even in the slightest way to our leadership role in the world.

I think it really is a disservice to the debate on the foreign aid bill to say that if we honor our commitments throughout the world, that that money will be taken out of Social Security. The fact is when these allocations were made, the foreign aid allocation was given very little priority.

This bill is not only about cooperation between the United States and other countries. This bill is about our assistance for our own trade. We have financed in this bill the Ex-Im Bank, OPIC, as well as the Trade Development Administration, which assists in promoting U.S. exports abroad. So the allocation, as small as it is, is not even all about assistance overseas; it is about promoting U.S. products. In order for those products to be sold, we have to develop markets for them. So it is in our interest to cooperate with countries to help develop their economies.

It is necessary for us in our foreign policy, which is an essential part of what we do here in the Congress, to honor the pillars of our foreign policy, to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to promote democratic freedoms so that the world is a more peaceful place as we deal with democracies rather than authoritarian regimes who might invade their neighbors or oppress their people, and, again, to promote our economy by promoting U.S. exports abroad.

All of those goals are served very well, in addition to the broader issue of our national security, by our investments in this bill. These are investments that will pay off for us. We would not have to be so involved in sending our young people off and putting them in harm's way abroad if we were more successful in promoting the

pillars of our foreign policy through funding this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I hope that our colleagues will not say that the Social Security trust fund is at risk because we want to honor our commitments abroad.

Let me just show you this chart, Mr. Speaker. In it you see this big yellow pie. That is the national budget. This sliver here, this little blue, less than 1 percent of the national budget, less than 1 percent, 0.68 percent of the national budget, is spent on international cooperation.

We are a great country. I come from a city where our patron saint is St. Francis. The song of St. Francis is the anthem of our community, and that is praying to the Lord to make us a channel of God's peace. Where there is darkness, may we bring light; where there is hatred, may we bring love; where there is despair, may we bring hope.

We cannot solve all of the problems of the world, but we can bring hope to people, and that is what we try to do in this bill. This is a small price for us to pay to prevent putting our young men in harm's way and to honor the commitment of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have been fond of quoting President Kennedy on this bill, because everybody in the world who was alive at the time and those who study history know of his clarion call to the American people, the citizens of America, ''Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.'' But the very next line in that inaugural address, which I heard myself as a student here so many years ago, the very next line says, ''To the citizens of the world, I say ask not what America can do for you, but what we can do working together for the freedom of mankind.''

That is what this bill strives to do. We cannot have that freedom, promote democratic values, stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and build our economy by promoting our exports on the cheap.

So I would hope that our colleagues would oppose the bill when it comes up. I have no objection to the rule. I urge our colleagues to vote no. Let us come back with a good bill we can have consensus on, that is worthy of a country as great as ours.

□ 1330

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, and congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Miami, Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for his superb handling of this issue and the very important input that he has had in structuring this and working closely with the distinguished Cardinal Callahan in helping to move this measure forward.

There is, obviously, some controversy around it. But frankly, it is a measure which falls right in line with our commitment to fund our national priorities, and to do so under the very tight spending constraints with which we are forced to live.

At the same time we are doing that, the conference report utilizes our scarce resources to ensure our successful and very important leadership abroad. A previous speaker mentioned the fact that we are committed to recognizing the importance of global trade. That is something that is underscored here.

Another issue that is very important is for us to, obviously, address the spread of communicable diseases in the developing world, and especially among children. Legislation we are going to be dealing with later today also focuses on children. This conference report itself provides $715 million for child survival and disease programs that are highly effective in fighting diseases out there, such as tuberculosis, malaria, and yellow fever.

We can all agree that the drug abuse issue is no longer simply a domestic concern, it is a global concern. The bill of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) addresses that by providing $285 million to fight international drug traffickers. We recognize in doing so that wiping out that scourge of drugs must be a top priority for all nations throughout the world.

The conference report also is very, very key to dealing with that continued challenge we face in the Middle East. This report maintains our commitment to Israel and Egypt, as laid out in the Camp David accords. Nearly half of the funding is devoted to peace in the Middle East, so this vital region will continue down the path towards democracy and prosperity and stability.

So I urge my colleagues to join in support of this rule and the very important conference report.

The easy issue which is often demagogued around here is to oppose foreign assistance. It is something that frankly I have done in years past. I have done it because in many instances we were spending much more than we should. But the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and other members of his subcommittee and the conference itself have dealt with these spending constraints which have been imposed on us appropriately, and they have established priorities. The priority for us is to maintain our Nation's leadership position in the world.

We all recognize that the United States of America is the world's only complete superpower militarily, economically, and geopolitically. Responsibility goes with that, so providing this assistance is really a very, very small part of that.

It is important to note that much of this assistance benefits the United States of America directly in dollars that are expended here. So I urge support of the rule, support of the conference report, and look forward to what probably will be a reasonably close vote, but I think we will be successful.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), a member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding time to me, and I thank my colleagues.

I do want to add my appreciation to the cooperative efforts of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for their knowledgeable leadership.

Right out of the box, I want to thank them for the $180 million increase in support of fighting worldwide AIDS, and in particular, the emphasis on Africa. I want to note the work of my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK). She and myself and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) went on an AIDS mission to Africa. We know this is not enough, but we are very grateful for the step that has been made.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have no concern with the rule, but unfortunately, I cannot support this final legislation. Let me say that I think the chart that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) had is very telling. It shows the sliver or the mere amount of monies we expend as a country for foreign aid. It does not, however, show that when we poll Americans, they frankly think it is higher, and would accept higher, because they understand the responsibilities that come with world leadership.

So here are my concerns in this bill. First of all, we made a commitment in supporting and encouraging the Israelis and Palestinians to get together on the peace accord, in the Wye accord, to significantly work and fund that accord. The bill provides no funding, to my knowledge, to support the Wye accord. This funding is essential to support the renewed dedication of the Israelis and Palestinians to implement the Wye agreement and achieve an historic permanent status agreement over the next year. We must ensure that the framework of peace is stabilized by the resources. So I would hope that we would reach that point.

I am also concerned about the cuts to development assistance and economic support fund, the multilateral development banks and debt reduction. The $87 million cut from debt relief programs for poor countries will damage the ability of the United States to contribute to the HIPC trust fund, which already is in jeopardy or may not be the best.

Last week or 2 weeks ago, with a number of my colleagues, I joined the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and others to challenge the IMF

for their hypocritical structure of debt relief for undeveloped nations. If we want to give them a fish, as opposed to giving them the opportunity to rebuild themselves, then we will continue to have poverty. Undeveloped nations want us to teach them how to fish, rather than give them a fish. All this so-called debt reduction and helping them with their debt relief keeps them needing fish, as opposed to relieving them of the burdens by providing more infrastructure and support that would help bring down their debt.

The Heavily-Indebted Poor Countries initiative is supported by a wide range of religious and charitable groups, and was recently agreed to by the G–7 in Cologne, and mentioned by our president. We must help bring down the debt of these developing nations so that they can take the lead on social issues in their countries like HIV-AIDS, like education, like health care, like housing.

I supported vigorously the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which provides an opportunity for trade to be used as a tool to economic advancements, but cannot have the intended effect unless the debt burden of these countries is adequately addressed.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is a trade bill. I support it. The African Growth and Opportunity Act will change how America does business with Africa. African countries want an equal trading relationship, but we at the same time must deal with the enormous amount of debt they must service.

I have in that provision, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a sense of Congress for corporations to develop an AIDS fund to compliment what we are doing in the Federal Government. But I can tell the Members that if we do not have debt relief, we are going to see these countries go down, down, down into a hole of no return.

I would ask that we send this bill back and have it fixed, though I support the family planning efforts, and get us a real foreign operations bill. I thank Members for their work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern regarding the Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference Report. This legislation simply does not provide enough funding to carry out an effective foreign policy. It cuts American assistance to those who most urgently need it throughout the world and ignores some of our most pressing foreign policy priorities.

Since the mid-1980's the resources devoted to our foreign assistance programs have steadily declined. Some of these decreases have been prudent reductions as we examined our international and multilateral commitments. However, these massive cuts in funding currently are threatening America's ability to maintain a leadership role in a rapidly changing world.

The Wye accord between Israel and the Palestinians was a significant diplomatic effort on behalf of our country. The credibility of our country should not be put in a compromising position by this Congress. The bill provides no funding to support the Wye accord.

This funding is essential to support the renewed dedication of the Israelis and Palestinians to implement Wye and achieve a historic permanent status agreement over the next year. This is not the time for the United States to renege on its commitments in support of a historic opportunity for peace in the Middle East.

Implementation of the Wye agreement resumed immediately, with the first round of prisoner released, followed by the next stage of Israeli redeployments in the West Bank, and the assumption of permanent status negotiations. The Israelis and Palestinians have committed to achieve a framework agreement on the most difficult permanent status issues by February 2000 and a final permanent status agreement by later that year. I strongly oppose the lack of funding for the Wye agreement in this measure or any efforts that would impede progress in Middle East peace.

I am concerned about the cuts to Development Assistance and Economic Support Fund, the Multilateral Development Banks and debt reduction. The $87 million cut from Debt Relief programs for poor countries will damage the ability of the United States to contribute to the HIPC Trust Fund, which is an essential component of current debt reduction programs as well as of the Cologne debt initiative. This massive reduction equates to a 72% cut from the Debt Relief programs. The developing nations of the world have developed strategies and plans to alleviate some of the debt burden of poorer countries. The expanded Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative is supported by a wide range of religious and charitable organizations, and was agreed to by the G–7 in Cologne. It is critical that the United States demonstrate its leadership by providing the necessary funding support for the first year of this initiative, which enjoys bipartisan and international support.

The debt issue is one that cannot be ignored as the United States establishes a more mature trade relationship with Sub Saharan Africa. The African Growth and Opportunity Act provides an opportunity for trade to be used as a tool to economic advancement but cannot have the intended effect unless the debt burden in these countries is adequately addressed. African Growth and Opportunity will change how America does business with Africa. It seeks to enhance US-Africa policy to increased trade, investment, self-help and serious engagement. It seeks to move away from the paternalism which in the past characterized American dealing with Africa by encouraging strategies to improve economic performance and requiring high level interactions between the U.S. and African governments on trade and investment issues. The debt burden must be addressed.

Payments on unsustainable debt have left many poorer countries facing the tough decisions of making debt payments or delaying necessary social, health, education or other programs designed to improve quality of living. Humanity is less than ninety nine days short of the year 2000. Yet, poorer countries are still faced with 80 percent illiteracy rates, lack of food security, diseases affecting their children that are nonexistent in developed countries, and other malaise that should be eliminated.

Debt reduction must be fully funded. The Congress must not ignore the historic opportunity presented by the Cologne debt reduction initiative to reduce the unmanageable debt burdens of the poorest countries, the majority of which are in Africa. By not funding this initiative, which is supported by a wide range of faith based and other private sector organizations, the Congress will ensure not only that the U.S. does not contribute its fair share, but also that the worldwide initiative does not succeed.

I must oppose the $212 million or 31% cut from democratization and economic recovery programs in Latin America, Africa and Asia. This reduction in the Economic Support Fund would significantly constrain the United States' ability to respond to a host of threats and new crises around the world.

These cuts would force the reduction of programs intended to increase political stability and democratization in Africa; support democracy efforts in Guatemala, Peru and Ecuador, and bolster democratic and economic reform in Asia, as well as sustain implementation of the Belfast Good Friday Accord. Cuts to these accounts will not permit the United States to provide sufficient funds for numerous priorities in Africa. I am concerned that as we applaud democracy, we are not willing to support it. I am concerned that during their critical transition periods, we may not be able to support emerging democracies like Nigeria.

At a time when natural disasters and man-made conflicts are causing unprecedented damage throughout the world, Congress has cut the International Disaster Assistance and Voluntary Peacekeeping requests by over 25 percent. This dramatic reduction in funding for Voluntary Peacekeeping operations would decrease funds available for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe mission Bosnia and Croatia, significantly reduce assistance for the African Crisis Response Initiative and African regional peacekeeping operations, such as ECOMOG, and eliminate funding for Haiti.

Such a substantial reduction would raise international concern that the United States may not support its fair share of the international police force that will help to implement the Kosovo peace settlement, for which new resources will be needed. The conference initiative cuts funding for international peace by 41%. Adequate funding its critical for support of regional peacekeeping activities such as ECOMOG that has helped to maintain stability and avert the kind of humanitarian disasters that require much greater expenditure of resources.

The severe cuts in the conference bill to provide assistance to the NIS will make it impossible to implement the Enhanced Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI). The primary objective of the ETRI is to reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of rogue states. The bill effectively provides no resources to continue ETRI and reduces U.S. ability to prevent and terminate international security threats in Russia and the NIS.

I thank my colleagues for increased funding to combat HIV/AIDS. Of 5.8 million adults and children newly infected with HIV during 1998, 4 million live in sub-Saharan Africa. AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa is a growing disaster. UNAIDS has declared HIV/AIDS in Africa an ''epidemic out of control''.

Each and everyday, more than 16,000 additional people become HIV positive, and most live in sub-Saharan Africa where in South Africa alone, 1500 people become HIV+ each

day. Among children under 15, the proportion is 9 out of 10. To date 82% of all AIDS deaths have been in the region and at least 95% of all AIDS orphans have been in Africa. It is estimated that by the year 2010 AIDS will orphan more than 40 million children, with 95% in sub-Saharan Africa.

Additional funds to combat HIV/AIDS are always welcome and I urge my colleagues to acknowledge this threat to mankind by addressing the international crisis.

I thank my colleagues for funding the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), a vital program, which provides valuable voluntary family planning and other services in over 160 countries.

I oppose the use of U.S. funds to lobby for or against abortion. U.S. funds should not be used in such a political debate. Governments should address those issues independently of U.S. appropriated monies.

In closing, I must urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 2606. Low funding levels translate to bad policy choices. At such funding levels, there will be no choice other than to keep considering supplemental appropriation request and budget amendments.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations who has done superb work on this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is always a difficult bill. It requires some difficult negotiations. But for the past 5 years, with my handling of this bill, we have worked in a very bipartisan manner to satisfy or to attempt to satisfy the needs of both sides of the aisle.

I think this year is certainly no different, because not one Member on the other side at any point in this debate has ever come to me and said, ''Sonny, I think there is something wrong in your bill.'' They did not say, ''You left out Colombia, because we put Colombia's needs in there. They did not say, ''You left out Africa,'' because we responded to those who were interested in Africa. We did not leave out Israel, we did not leave out Jordan, we did not leave out many of the foreign countries that so many of the Members are interested in, because we worked in a bipartisan spirit to draft a bill.

So the only problem we have here is this insatiable desire on the part of the President to give away American taxpayer money. They talk about revenue enhancement programs. I think the President calls it offsetting receipts. In Alabama we call it taxes, but the President says he wants some offsetting receipts, so let me suggest one. Maybe we could charge every foreign dignitary that comes into the White House $1 million, because every foreign dignitary who walks into the White House comes out with a commitment from anywhere from $1 million to $50 million. Maybe we ought to consider that.

Maybe we ought to limit the ability of the President and the Vice President and the First Lady to travel. Number one, his trip to Africa cost the taxpayers $47 million because he took so many people with him. But that is not our problem. Our problems are the commitments that he makes.

Every time the President meets with a foreign dignitary, they have a toast, which is appropriate. But every time they make a toast, the President of the United States says, here is my commitment to you. I am going to give you some more money. Then they run over here and say, this is an obligation of the United States. How can we possibly not fulfill our obligations?

Mr. Speaker, this does not mean it is an obligation of the United States when the President of the United States raises his glass of wine to some foreign leader and says, I am going to send you $50 million. We do not have the money.

The gentlewoman from California and I have worked so very well together. She told me not to mention social security. I am not going to say, even though it is a reality, if we give the President $2 billion more that he is asking for, it is going to impact social security.

I apologize to the gentlewoman from California for saying that, and I will not say it anymore until the bill comes up. But let me tell the Members, in this bill no one, no one in this debate, no one in the Committee on Rules, no one on the floor of the House, no one by telephone call has called me and said, ''Sonny, you did not treat Lebanon right, you did not treat Armenia right, you did not treat Georgia right, you did not treat Africa right,'' because we worked in a bipartisan fashion to make absolutely certain that we did have a bipartisan bill.

So we have a bipartisan bill, and it is $2 billion less than the President requested at this point. He just came last week and asked for another $100 million for another of his pet projects. In addition to that, he wants $2 billion more to give to Israel and to Jordan and to the Palestinian authority because of the Wye agreement.

He is going to need some additional money, he says, for Kosovo, even though we responded to the wishes of this House on Kosovo by saying, we are not going to participate in reconstruction in Kosovo unless the European community puts up 85 percent of the money.

We have done everything they asked. We have responded to all of our subcommittee members, our full committee members, and to every Member in this House who has come to me and said, we think you ought to do something. We have done every responsible thing we can do except satisfy this insatiable appetite for money that President Clinton has that he wants to hand out as he makes his travels, as I would do if I were in his position, during this last year and a half of his presidency. He wants to travel around the world. He wants more money to hand out.

We do not have more money. The only way to get more money is through new taxes, through possibly jeopardizing social security or breaking the budget caps. I urge Members to bring this bill up, vote for this rule, and let us indeed debate this. If it fails and the President wants to veto it, let him veto it.

I talked to the President the other night. I promise the Members, I think I had him convinced that I was right, that this is as much as he is going to get. The President said, ''Well, Sonny, maybe you are right. Maybe you are right. But,'' he says, ''I need to talk with my people.'' I said, ''I will tell you what, Mr. President, I will let you go at this point if you will invite me in the same room when you talk to your people, to let me tell them what I have just told you about the merits of this bill. And the President said, ''Well, maybe you are right. I will do that.''

But unfortunately, at 9 o'clock that night, Sandy Berger called back and said they did not think it was wise for me to get into the same room with Madeleine Albright, with Sandy Berger, and Bill Clinton, because they knew that logically, and I say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), they knew that logically I was correct, and that if indeed I were able to get them all in the room, no one could convince the President otherwise of the merits of this bill at this particular time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate very much the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

I rise on the rule, and I am speaking in opposition to the outrageous underlying bill, although there are many positive initiatives, like increasing funding for security at our embassies abroad.

□ 1345

There is zero funding for the important Wye agreement, the Middle East peace agreement. I must say that I applaud the conferees for their bipartisan agreement to restore funding for the United Nations Family Planning Assistance and for the bipartisan agreement to strip out any antichoice riders. These are two important policy initiatives that are precedent setting that will be part of the underlying bill that returns to this House.

Mr. Speaker, next week, our world reaches 6 billion in population and the decisions that we make on UNFPA and on other policy decisions will determine whether this number quickly doubles or whether we move more slowly.

Funding UNFPA will save lives, maternal health, child health, and I applaud the conferees for their bipartisan support of putting UNFPA in and taking Mexico City out.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Maloney) for yielding to me. She raised the issue about the Wye agreement, and I am pleased to note we have just received a letter from AIPAC dated October 5, and it was sent to the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN).

It reads, ''Chairman CALLAHAN, we are writing to express our support for the conference report on H.R. 2606, the fiscal year 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill which contains funding for Israel's regular aid package, including provisions for early disbursal, offshore procurement and refugee settlement. The Middle East peace process is moving forward. Both Israel and the Palestinians are committed to resolving issues between them within a year. It is important that Congress support Israel as this process moves ahead. And we therefore also hope and urge that Congress find a way to fund assistance to the Wye River signatories before the end of this year.''

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has assured us that he will be working in the conference to try to obtain sufficient funding for the Wye River agreement. This is a very complicated measure, but it covers many of our concerns, and I want to commend the gentleman for working out a very difficult foreign operations measure, and it deserves the support of our entire House.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to reiterate something very important that the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) said. The gentleman pointed out that obviously there could always be more requests for more money. But he explained what was done within the resources available, not doing three things which we refuse to do. Raise taxes. We refuse to raise taxes. Bust the balanced budget. We refuse to bust the balanced budget. Or go into the Social Security Trust Fund. We refuse to go into the Social Security Trust Fund.

So not doing those three things, we are doing a good job of funding the Government's needs, including the very important programs that our friends on the other side of the aisle have pointed out.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is very important work that the subcommittee has brought forward in the context of this conference report. We need to get it passed.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard on this bill. Unfortunately, although it is a difficult bill, there are many reasons to oppose it. We have had the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) indicate some of them.

Some will oppose it because of the Mexico City provisions. Some will oppose it because of various foreign aid proposals in here. I am going to oppose it because it took out the language which the House voted, in which it stopped money from going to keep the School of the Americas program.

In 1980, four U.S. churchwomen were brutally murdered in El Salvador. One of them was a good friend of mine, Sister Dorothy Kazel from Cleveland. In 1989, six Jesuit priests were massacred in El Salvador. Archbishop Oscar Romero and Bishop Juan Gerardi of Guatemala were assassinated. Almost 100 of the El Mozote community in El Salvador were massacred. In 1992, nine students and a professor were killed in Peru. In 1997, 30 peasants in the Colombian village of Mapiripan were massacred.

Mr. Speaker, these people were innocent civilians and missionaries working for peace and justice, and they were brutally killed by officers who received their training from the United States Government at the School of the Americas, and the rule of the House should have stayed. We should have eliminated those funds, and no one who cares about peace and justice should vote for the rule or the bill.

Furthermore, another reason to oppose this bill, American tax dollars have been used to blow up water systems, sewer systems, bridges, railroad trains, buses, tractors, hospitals, libraries, schools and homes, killing and maiming countless innocent women and children. In Yugoslavia, Serbia was wrong to wage war on the Kosovar Albanians. NATO was wrong to bomb Belgrade, and we are wrong to further punish Serbia by making them a terrorist nation which stops any opportunity for democratic opposition to grow to Milosevic. If we want to get rid of Milosevic and give the Serbian people an opportunity to grow a democracy, do not make it a terrorist nation.

This Congress has messed up the policy in Iraq by not forcing the administration to come to an accounting on that, and we are going to do the same thing in Serbia by letting this legislation pass which puts them as a terrorist nation. It is time that we stand up for what is right and for a future where we really can have peace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 2000 foreign operations bill, but I do want to indicate support in the way this legislation affects U.S. policy towards Armenia and India.

First, I want to express my appreciation to the conferees, particularly the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for their continued attention to Armenia, Nagorno Karabagh, and the entire South Caucasus region.

This year's legislation provides somewhat more assistance to Armenia than we provided in the last fiscal year, $89.67 million or 12.2 percent of the total of $735 million for the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. The conference report also specified that 15 percent of the funds available for the South Caucasus region be used for confidence-building measures and other activities related to regional conflicts including efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict.

The House version of the legislation contains several report language provisions that would contribute greatly to peace and stability in the South Caucasus region. The administration should follow through on the policy directives contained in the House report which are now incorporated in the conference report. The House report specifically directs the Agency for International Development to expedite delivery of $20 million to the victims of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict. The people of Nagorno Karabagh suffered during their war of independence with Azerbaijan, and their need for help continues to be significant. They should not be discriminated against in terms of receiving humanitarian assistance simply on the basis of where they live.

The administration should also heed the House report language regarding the peace process for Nagorno Karabagh, stating that assistance to the governments of the region should be proportional to their willingness to cooperate with the Minsk Group. And finally, I want to applaud the conferees from both bodies who have maintained section 907 of the Freedom Support Act.

Turning to India, I want to thank the conferees and particularly the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. PELOSI), the ranking member, for not adopting a provision in the Senate version of the legislation singling out India as one of a handful of nations that would have to receive special congressional approval before the allocation of foreign aid. Section 521 of the Senate bill talked about special notification requirements for countries such as Colombia, Haiti, Liberia, Pakistan, and also included India in this list; but the House conference report does not, and I want to thank the conferees for making that change.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this moment actually praise the gentleman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who came up and says he is going to oppose this bill. And I am praising him because at least he is going to oppose this bill for a concept and a reasonable concept that I think the American people could understand, and that is we are spending money on something that he has some concerns about. But at least the gentleman from Cleveland is standing up and saying that the bill is spending money that he does not want spent.

In a time to where we are struggling to try to make sure we do not continue the crime of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund, at a time that we are trying to finally address the national debt, at a time to where we are finally trying to bring some fiscal credibility and live within a budget, at least the gentleman is coming forward and saying, ''I am opposing this bill because it is spending money.''

But there are speaker after speaker after speaker who will oppose this rule and then justify it because we are not spending enough money all over the world. The gentleman from Ohio at least is consistent at saying let us protect Social Security and stop spending here. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of this committee, has come forward with a proposal that is moderate and reasonable. Let me say this to the gentleman and to the ranking member, thank you for taking the abortion issue out of this debate. It is something that a lot of us really hate every year.

But now to oppose this bill and oppose this rule because we are not spending enough American money overseas is absolutely absurd. And some of my colleagues may not think the American people understand it, but it is their money. Can we not have a foreign aid policy that does not require us to take from our grandparents' Social Security or take from our children's future to be able to be an international leader? Do we have to buy our way into our standard as the world's superpower?

Is this something that comes with a slip of paper and a little bill that says, Excuse me, American taxpayer, if you want to claim to be the greatest Nation in the world, you have to buy it year by year by sending your money out of Social Security or your money out of your children's savings account to another country that then God knows what happens to this money?

Everybody knows that. Some may not believe that the American people understand foreign aid. And I think they respect a reasonable aid for a reasonable amount of time. But I think the American people are saying enough is enough. The time has come that we allow the world to grow up and start paying some of their bills and quit looking to Washington and quit looking to the United States to be the sugar daddy to pay for everything. We may be Uncle Sam, but we are not Mom and Dad to the world. But we are Mom and Dad to our children and our grandchildren, and we are the children of our parents who want our Social Security Trust Fund to be left alone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask those who stand up to oppose this bill, I ask them to stand up and point up, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) did, where they want the money taken out of this bill. But do not stand up and talk about how we need to spend more money overseas and then stand up tomorrow and talk about what are we going to do to protect the Social Security Trust Fund.

There is an obligation here that when we come to oppose something that we also provide the answers. If we are not spending enough money where my colleagues want to spend it in this bill, show us where we take it out of somewhere else to move it over. I ask that we all have the fiscal responsibility that goes along with the privilege of being a representative of the House of Representatives.

If Members want to spend the money, tell us where it is going to go, which committee it is going to come out of, whose trust fund it is going to come out of, and will the seniors or the children of America be asked to pay for a debt that we are incurring overseas because we do not have enough guts to tell the rest the world enough is enough. We are going to take care of our own first.

□ 1400

Charity starts in America. Commitments start in America. Then and only then, after we have paid for our domestic commitments to our seniors and our children, will we be talking about making any new commitments to the rest of the world.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I really do not think that the Chamber needs to be lectured by the Republican majority about fiscal responsibility. They cannot even come up with a budget. We still have not passed a budget. Every budget they come up with raids the Social Security Trust Fund.

They came up with an irresponsible huge tax break for the wealthy, which would have destroyed the Social Security tax fund, which would have dipped into the Social Security tax fund. Then they get up on the floor and attempt to portray themselves as the party of fiscal responsibility. They have busted the budget caps.

They have just been devious about it and have gone around it by declaring the census an emergency when we all know that this country has had a census for hundreds and hundreds of years. That was a way they could bust the budget caps and go around it. Perhaps by the same nonsense, we could declare foreign aid an emergency.

So let us not be lectured by the Republicans about fiscal responsibility because the tax break for the rich that the President was courageous enough to veto would have killed Social Security for us, for our children, and for our grandchildren for many, many years to come.

Now, I am a big supporter of foreign aid, and I am embarrassed by this bill. I am embarrassed by it because there is an isolationism bent in the Republican Party where, every year, we provide less and less monies for foreign aid.

Now, we can all get up and give a great speech about how we need the money for home and we need to build housing and build schools, and we need all that. But the United States is also the leader of the world. We used to say the leader of the free world when we had the Soviet. Now we say the leader of the world.

Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle, the minute the Soviet Union collapsed, most of them saw no further need for the responsible foreign aid. The fact of the matter is, no one made us the leaders of the world. We chose to pick up and take the mantle.

With leadership comes responsibility, and we do not have enough money to fulfill our foreign aid obligations in this bill. I have gone around to foreign capitals and seen our embassies and seen our hard-working Americans do the best they can with what they have had, and I am embarrassed by it. Because there is not enough money to have embassies and to have fully staffed embassies and to have the types of programs that the United States as the leader of the free world needs.

This bill is $1 billion less than last year. It is $2 billion less than what the President asked for. It has no money for the Wye Accords. We talk about a fight with the Soviet Union. We won the Cold War. Now we are going to throw it all away.

Developmental funds for Africa are cut. All these emerging Nations, we say we want them to have democracy and free market economy; and then we do not put our money where our mouth is where a little bit of money would just go a long, long way.

Foreign aid, 75 to 80 percent of the foreign aid that we give comes back to the United States in terms of purchasing American goods and services. So it stimulates our economy, and it is good as well.

Now, this is such a terrible bill that the Republican leadership prepared for days and days and weeks and weeks have been putting this bill on and pulling it back. They do not have the votes to pass this bill. I say we should let them go back to the drawing boards, come up with a responsible bill that we can be proud of so America can lead again.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out just a few things. The essence really of the debate today is whether, as the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), the previous speaker, pointed out, more money which, except for one speaker on the other side of the aisle, insufficient amount of money is the reason for their opposition to the bill. That is a legitimate discrepancy. We refused to go into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Now, with regard to what the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) just stated, U.S. embassies and consulates, they are in another appropriations bill in the State Department; Commerce, State, Justice, that bill, not in this one.

Now, it is important to point out again, and I reiterate it, we made a decision, the leadership, and we are standing firm behind our leadership on this. We are not going to go into the Social Security Trust Fund. We are not going to do it. We made that decision. We are sticking to it. Obviously, it subjects us to pressure. We see argument after argument after argument that they want more and more and more money.

Many of the programs that they talk about are probably good programs. But we are going to stick to our commitment. We are not going to go into the Social Security Trust Fund. We are not going to do it.

This is a good work product. We want to bring it to the floor. This rule does so. We deserve to get into the details of the debate. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), our chairman, the prime author of this legislation is ready to provide the details and go into the details of this debate in depth.

But we need to pass this rule in order to get that debate. It is a procedural rule. It is a standard procedural rule, bringing forth the negotiation between the House and Senate known as the conference report that is finalized for foreign aid.

So we are ready to go, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily oppose the rule before us, but today I am forced to cast a very difficult vote against the conference report to the Fiscal Year 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

It is unfortunate that strong supporters, like myself, of foreign assistance to countries such as Israel, Columbia, Armenia, India, and Egypt are being placed in a position where it is necessary to vote against assistance for those priority countries.

This legislation also has important contributions to UNFPA and other international programs, which I fully support and have urged my colleagues to support. In fact, I thank the conferees and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for fulfilling the will of the authorizers and the intent of the House by including funding for UNFPA, which I offered as an amendment earlier this year. However, a no vote on this bill is a vote in favor of a strong U.S. foreign policy and a vibrant foreign assistance program.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers in this report are clear. They speak for themselves. This legislation is nearly $2 billion below the President's request for foreign assistance. Almost every major account is underfunded.

The conference report does not include the $87 million for debt relief initiatives for the poorest countries, and it cuts $200 million from economic development and democracy-building programs in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, to name just two important initiatives which will be hampered by this report.

Additionally, this legislation has no money, not one single dollar, to fulfill our commitment to the Wye agreement to the Middle East Peace Process. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and APAC, and I am sorry to disagreewith my Chairman, but as the gentleman has stated there is no Wye funding in this bill at this time, and it ought to be there.

Mr. Speaker, the President has made his position crystal clear; increase funding for foreign assistance and include the Wye funding or he will veto the legislation. I know it. My colleagues know it. The Republican leadership knows it. Yet, here we are, with legislation that fails to fund U.S. foreign policy priorities and threatens stability in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is bad for America, it is bad for the Middle East peace process, and it is just plain bad policy. I urge my colleagues to live up to our commitments, support the President and vote against this antiforeign aid bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in vigorous opposition to this rule and to this bill. I would like to alert the Members of this chamber of something they may not have heard; and that is, buried in this bill is yet another one of the insidious repeated antienvironmental riders that have so infected our appropriations process.

Because hidden in this bill is an amendment that would prevent the United States of America from engaging, engaging in a discussion with the developing world on how to get them to start help dealing with the problem of climate change.

There is no reason in this bill or any other bill to shackle our ability to discuss with other Nations of the world how we are going to move forward and how we are going to deal with climate change. This has been infecting other bills. We should stop it right here.

In the last few days, we have debated other antienvironmental riders. This is one dealing with perhaps the most insidious environmental problem that we have. Because, while 15 of the hottest years in human history have been in the last 15 years, while the temperature has risen so that we are having droughts in the Midwest and places of Antarctica breaking up and places in the Tundra changing. While we are doing this, the majority puts in another antienvironmental rider that tells us we should do nothing about this problem.

Well, the one thing I can be sure of about climate change is that we cannot lead in the position of the ostrich. We cannot lead the world in solving this problem by sticking our heads in the sand and allowing other places of anatomy to be out and exposed to the wind. We have got to start leading to a solution of climate change.

If we kill this rule today, and it might be a close vote, so I hope Members may consider this, if my colleagues want to stand up against an antienvironmental rider, cast a no vote on this rule. Let us show some leadership.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I assume that the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) was referring to the Kyoto Treaty, which has to be, pursuant to our constitutional system of advice and consent of the Senate, has to be given consent by the Senate. So that is an issue obviously that is of great importance and is a decision that the Senate will have to make.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time with regard to the rule. It is a procedural rule. This is a procedural rule. We seek to bring the conference report to the floor. That is why we have to pass the rule first.

Once we pass the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the prime author of the conference report who has provided a tremendous amount of leadership, as well as hard work on this issue, is ready.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is ready to delve into the details. He has pointed out how any and all requests that were made of him by our distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle, he did his utmost to comply with. Yet, we are seeing now systematic opposition generally because our friends on the other side of the aisle want more money. But they want more money for everything.

So what we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to bring forth, get to the debate on this foreign aid conference report. But in order to get to the debate on the foreign aid conference report, we have to pass the procedural

rule to do so. That is what we would like to do.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I do not have a problem with this rule. I do not think many people over here do either. I am not going to ask for a roll call on the rule. I think the rule is in good shape. It is the proper order for a conference committee to have a rule like this.

I will oppose the bill when the bill comes up for a vote. The reason why I oppose the bill is that I do not really have a problem with what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has done and his staff. I think they spent money they were given. They made the proper choices as to the allocation and some of the earmarks, especially relative to child survival funds and basic education.

The problem that I have had in the last 10 years with the foreign budget or the foreign appropriation budget is, and I testified before the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is that there are so many areas of this foreign aid budget that are lacking.

We have cut the development assistance fund by 50 percent in the last 10 years. If there is one thing that the American people have said, when we invest money overseas, invest it in a way in which people can start to take care of themselves and be self-sufficient. But the very thing that they want we have cut by 50 percent.

We have cut Peace Corps this year. We have cut a lot of programs relative to humanitarian aid of which we could be a leader, and we have been the leader for years. There are so many things to do in this world and our own country that we have the ability to do it.

One does not have to be a rocket scientist to figure out how to feed people, how to give medicines to people, how to immunize people. We have eradicated smallpox in the world. With just a little bit more money, we could start to eradicate polio and TB and those kinds of diseases that are easy. This is not a hard thing to do.

We know logistically how to get food to people. We know how to immunize people. We know how to feed people. At the same time, we should not be giving it from government to government. We should be giving it through our NGOs, the nonprofit organizations, the CARES, and the World Visions, and the Catholic Relief Services, and the Oxfams, and all of the great NGOs in the world, because we get good value for our dollar.

□ 1415

Another thing. This is a practical thing that produces jobs. For every dollar we invest overseas, we get $2.37 back. We do not lose money on this deal; we gain, and yet year after year it gets more and more frustrating that we continue to cut back on these funds that are so invaluable to our own workers and that would help the world so much.

We do have a responsibility. It is interesting that when we ask Americans how much they think of the Federal budget we spend on foreign aid, every poll will show that the American people believe that we spend somewhere between 18 and 22 percent of our total budget on foreign aid. And the fact is that is wrong. We spend less than 1 percent of our total budget on foreign aid, and it is going down.

The area that I care so much about, humanitarian aid, is less than one-half of 1 percent. Maybe someday we should separate political and diplomatic aid from humanitarian aid and really fund it and solve some of these problems like polio and TB. We know how to lick this. We know how to feed people, and yet we do not do it.

I know the leadership has taken a position on this of no more money for these programs. But they are wrong, and we disagree with them, and that is why so many of us are going to vote against the bill. So I say the rule is okay, vote for the rule, but when this bill or this conference report comes up, vote against it.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We heard multiple speakers on the other side of the aisle with regard to the issue, and all but two said that their opposition to this foreign aid bill was because there was not enough money. I just want to be clear that even though we on this side of the aisle are standing firm behind our leadership in not raising taxes, in not busting the balanced budget, in not going into the Social Security Trust Fund, despite that, on this bill for foreign aid we have $12.617, that is almost $13 billion. That is almost $13,000 million for foreign aid.

I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his extraordinary job. I think this has been a very good example of the underlying difference that separates the two sides of the aisle. With only two exceptions, every single speaker on the other side of the aisle got up and opposed this legislation because there is not enough money in it. And so there is a fundamental difference, but a very good job has been done by our side, our leadership, the chairman of the subcommittee, and so I support not only this rule but the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is important, we need to get it passed, and that is why at this point I support the rule and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 764, CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 321 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 321

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 764) to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 321 is an open rule providing for the consideration of the Child Abuse Protection and Enforcement Act, also known as the CAPE Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided

and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. And as the sponsor of this legislation, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, especially the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, for all of their work on the bill and their efforts to move this legislation forward.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration and against certain provisions of the bill. The bill will be open for amendment at any point, and under this open rule any Member who seeks to improve upon the legislation may offer any germane amendment. However, priority recognition will be given to those Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Additionally, the rule offers an opportunity to change the bill through the customary motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, to ensure timely and orderly consideration of the bill, the rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes and reduce voting time to 5 minutes as long as the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

As the sponsor of this legislation, I am pleased that the House will have the opportunity to fully debate this important issue surrounding the tragedy of child abuse under a fair and open process.

It is hard for most of us to fathom a rage so blinding that it could compel an adult to attack a helpless child, much less their own child. It may shock my colleagues to realize that every 3 minutes a child will be reported abused or neglected. And, sadly, that is just in my own State of Ohio. Nationwide, the crisis of child abuse is even more staggering. An estimated one million violent crimes involving child victims are reported to police annually. And on top of that, another 1.1 million cases of child abuse are substantiated by child protection agencies annually.

This is a national crisis, and as leaders, we have the responsibility to take a stand and fight back against the cruelty that robs children of their innocence and produces troubled and violent adults.

As a former prosecutor and judge, I have seen firsthand the manifestation of child abuse in the criminal behavior of adults. Breaking this cycle of violence in our society begins with child abuse prevention.

But the most compelling case for child abuse prevention is not found in these troubled adults but in the eyes of children who live in constant fear. Children should be focused on school, little league, piano lessons, not reeling from punches or cowering from the adults who should be embracing them.

The CAPE Act focuses on two critically important fronts: child abuse prevention and improved treatment of the victims of child abuse.

The bill has a host of bipartisan cosponsors and has been endorsed by a wide variety of groups from every ideological background, including the National Child Abuse Coalition, Prevent Child Abuse America, National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, and the Family Research Council.

The CAPE Act would make three changes to current law: first, the bill expands a Department of Justice grant program that helps States provide equipment and personnel training for closed-circuit television and video taping of children's testimony in child abuse cases. Under the CAPE Act, these grants could be used to provide child protective workers and child welfare workers access to criminal conviction information and orders of protection based on claims of domestic or child abuse. Or the grants could be used to improve law enforcement access to custody orders, visitation orders, protective orders, or guardianship orders.

Second, the CAPE Act expands the use of the Byrne law enforcement grants to improve the enforcement of child abuse and neglect laws, and, more importantly, child abuse prevention.

Finally, the bill allows additional dollars from the Crime Victims Fund to be used for child abuse assistance programs, increasing the earmark from $10 million to $20 million. This increase reflects a growth in contributions to the fund since the set-aside for victims of child abuse was first established.

Mr. Speaker, all of these changes will funnel more resources to the State and local level, where the individuals who are on the front lines in the fight against child abuse are best equipped to help our children. And I know my colleagues will be pleased to know that the CAPE Act draws on existing resources instead of creating a new Federal program that requires more taxpayer financing.

The CAPE Act has bipartisan support and was favorably reported by the Committee on the Judiciary without controversy or amendment. So while we do not expect numerous amendments to be offered today, this issue is simply far too important to deny a full and fair debate. That is why the Committee on Rules has reported this open rule, which I hope my colleagues will support.

I look forward to today's debate, which I hope will not only be a prelude to the passage of legislation that gives hope to millions of children, but also an effort to raise awareness about the horrors of child abuse and the steps we can take to end it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the rule for H.R. 764 is an open rule, and I am pleased to support its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, every year, millions of children are the victims of child abuse or are witnesses to terrible violence. The repercussions of this violence is often felt for the rest of that child's life. Study after study suggests that children who are victims of child abuse or neglect are far more likely to run afoul of the law either as adolescents or adults. Statistics show that most people who are abusers were abused as children themselves.

Even as the crime in some areas is going down, experts tell us the number of crimes against children is going up. This bill is an important effort aimed at child abuse treatment and prevention. It was passed just a few days ago by a voice vote in the Committee on the Judiciary and is now here on the floor for consideration by the full House.

□ 1430

Several important amendments have been identified, and I look forward to the thoughtful debate concerning this most important issue.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in participating in today's debate and strengthening the voice of millions of children who live each day with terror and in pain.

Raising awareness is the first step toward ending the living nightmare of child abuse. The next step is providing the resources to eradicate this scourge on our society. Today, happily, we can do both.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this fair and open rule and the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JENKINS. 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. 764.

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

There was no objection.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS). Pursuant to House Resolution 321 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares

the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 764.

□ 1432

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 764) to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes, with Mr. HANSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of H.R. 764, the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act.

The bill was introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and has 54 cosponsors and bipartisan support. The Crime Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary held a legislative hearing on the bill on May 12, 1999; and last week, the full Committee on the Judiciary ordered the bill favorably reported by a voice vote.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the funds available for the investigation of child abuse crimes and programs designed to prevent child abuse and other domestic violence. It will do this by amending existing grant programs that provide funds to States for crime-related purposes so that funds can also be used to provide child protective workers and child welfare workers access to criminal conviction information and orders of protection.

These workers often do not have access to criminal history records and information and may be unaware that when they place a child in foster care or return a child to a parent, that they are placing the child in the custody of a person with a criminal history. Allowing these Federal funds to provide child protective and child welfare workers with access to State records will help alleviate this problem.

This bill would accomplish this purpose by doing two things. First, section 2 of the bill would amend a small Justice Department grant program that currently helps States provide equipment and personnel training for closed circuit television and videotaping of the testimony of children in criminal child abuse cases.

H.R. 764 would permit the Department to make grants for an additional purpose, namely, to provide child protective workers and child welfare workers in public and private agencies access to criminal conviction information and orders of protection based on the claim of domestic or child abuse or to improve law enforcement access to judicial custody orders, visitation orders, protective orders, and guardianship orders.

Section 3 of the bill would modify the federal crime control assistance program known as the Byrne Grant Program. This program authorizes the Federal Government to award both block grants and discretionary grants for specified activities. Block grants are allocated to the State on the basis of population and are to be used for personnel, equipment, training, technical assistance, and information systems to improve criminal justice systems. The discretionary program funds are distributed to non-federal public and private organizations undertaking projects that educate criminal justice personnel or that provide technical assistance to State and local governments.

The Byrne Grant statute specifies 26 permissible uses for these funds. This bill proposes to amend the Byrne Grant program to add an additional permissible use for these funds, namely, ''to enforce child abuse and neglect laws and programs designed to prevent child abuse and neglect.''

Third, Section 4 of the bill would amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984. This law was passed to assist States in directly compensating and providing support services for victims and families of victims of violent crimes. Funding for this purpose comes from the Federal Crime Victims Fund, into which are deposited criminal fines, penalty assessments, and forfeited appearance bonds of persons convicted of crimes against the United States. In fiscal year 1998, $363 million was deposited into this fund for distribution in FY 1999.

There are two principal programs established under the act. The victims' compensation program provides funds to States which have in place their own programs to compensate victims of crime. The Federal funds are used by States to reimburse victims of violent crimes or their survivors for non-reimbursable medical costs, lost wages and support, and funeral expenses arising from a crime-related injury or death.

The victims' assistance program also provides grants to States which are then authorized to distribute the funds to support public and nonprofit agencies that provide direct services to victims of crime, such as 24-hour crisis hotlines for victims of sexual assault and shelters for victims of spousal abuse.

Under current law, the first $10 million of the funds deposited in the fund each year are to be expended by the Secretary of Health and Human Services for grants relating to child abuse prevention and treatment. Of the remaining funds, 48.5 percent are to be used for grants to State crime victims' compensation programs, 48.5 percent for victims' assistance programs, and 3 percent for grants for demonstration projects and training in technical assistance services to be eligible for crime assistance programs.

H.R. 764 would increase the earmark for child abuse and domestic assistance programs from $10 million to $20 million. Doubling this earmark would, therefore, result in a $10 million reduction in the funds that would otherwise be available for grants to victims' compensation programs and victims' assistance programs.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that much more needs to be done to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect across the country. It is a very serious problem, and Congress has an important role to play by assisting the States to do all they can to reduce the incidence of such abuse. It is vitally important for child care and protective agencies working in concert with law enforcement to have access to criminal history information. Getting timely and complete information to these agencies will save lives.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for her work in making this bill possible and for working with the Crime Subcommittee to improve it.

Later today, I will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to address the two concerns that I have with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate for the RECORD:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 1, 1999.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 764, the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Grabowicz, who can be reached at 226–2860.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE, OCTOBER 1, 1999

H.R. 764: CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT, AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON SEPTEMBER 28, 1999

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 764 would not result in any significant cost to the federal government. Because enactment of H.R. 764 could affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply to the bill. However, CBO estimates that any impact on direct spending would not be significant. H.R. 764 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Under current law, the first $10 million available for spending from the Crime Victims Fund is earmarked for grants for child abuse victims; H.R. 764 would increase this allotment to $20 million. The bill also would permit recipients of certain grants from the Department of Justice to use those funds for various child protection programs. Because these provisions would reallocate federal

funds among similar activities, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 764 would not significantly change the net direct spending from the Crime Victims Fund or the net discretionary spending from the affected grant programs.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz, who can be reached at 226–2860. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues very much for the very hard work that they have put in for this legislation. I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), the very difficult job of focusing on something so sensitive to be able to help us bring to the floor the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, this is a good day for many of us.

Mr. Chairman, so many of us have had a tragic story to talk about in our State as it relates to child abuse. I can call off the names of so many children in the State of Texas. As a convening chairperson of the Congressional Children's Caucus, one of the issues we have debated here in the United States Congress is the access of our children to mental health services.

Many times our children are in need of counseling because they have suffered abuse in their homes. We are well aware of the very famous case in Colorado, JonBenet. Her murder is still unsolved, but we know that she met a very tragic death; and, as well, we know that the perpetrator is still at large.

In addition, we are quite familiar with a case that I saw just last evening, the case of little Collin in Florida, where time after time those who are responsible for protecting her life, taking her away from an abusive father, failed to see the abuse in the home until ultimately, out of anger of the parent, little Collin was killed.

The problem of child abuse and neglect is disturbing and far-reaching. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in a report issued in April of this year, indicated that there were over 950,000 documented cases of child abuse and neglect in 1997.

Further, in an earlier report, HHS indicated that while the number of child abuse and neglect cases has increased since 1986, the actual number of cases investigated by State agencies has remained about the same. As a result, the proportion of cases investigated has decreased from 44 percent in 1986 to 28 percent in 1993.

Mr. Chairman, this is a failure on our part. This is again not holding to our responsibility to be the protectors of our children. The failure to adequately address the problem of child abuse and neglect is costly in many ways. First and foremost, there is a human tragedy related to the victimized child.

How many of us, Mr. Chairman, have cried at the television and newspaper reports of the abused and sometimes mutilated bodies of dead and/or badly injured children? Obviously, abused and neglected children carry physical and emotional scars with them forever affecting every aspect of their life.

Might I note that many times murderers who are murderers as adults, when we begin to look into their background, it has been determined, although the murder is of course no less horrible, that they were abused as children in their childhood.

In addition, the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse estimated in 1993 that the annual cost of child welfare health care and out-of-home care for abused and neglected children totaled $9 billion. I must add that this is a conservative estimate in light of the fact that it does not include every related cost, such as long-term physical and mental impairment, emergency room care, lost productivity, special education services, and costs to adjudicate child abuse cases.

That is why the Congressional Children's Caucus has focused on greater mental health access to children so that maybe in counseling some of those who have been heretofore afraid of talking about being abused will be able to tell an adult about their abuse.

Yet another cause of child abuse is in the area of increased criminal activity. According to a 1992 U.S. Department of Justice report entitled the Cycle of Violence, 68 percent of youth arrested had a prior history of abuse and neglect. The study also indicated that childhood abuse increased the odds of future delinquency and, as I said earlier, in adult criminality by approximately 40 percent.

On the positive side, we know how to address this problem. The National Child Abuse Coalition reports that family support programs and parental education have demonstrated that prevention efforts work. And as we have seen in the other areas, such as drug treatment programs, community-based programs, supporting families can be implemented to prevent child abuse for far less than the dollars it now costs to treat and manage a child abused and neglected.

The legislation being considered today is a step in the right direction. I congratulate the proponents. This bill provides increased grant authority for services to abused or neglected children. It also provides an increase in the existing set-aside for child abuse and neglect services from the Crime Victims Fund, in which I hope that we will not cap it so that we will not be able to get those funds.

The McCollum amendment provides for a formula which will tie the increased set-aside for child abuse and neglect services to the overall increase in the Crime Victims Fund. I support the amendment.

I will offer an amendment to specify that this bill also covers children's sexual abuse, as noted by the evidence that suggests that JonBenet was sexually abused. It is clear that prevention and early treatment for child abuse and neglect victims benefits everyone. This bill represents a positive step in that direction and, as a result, I support H.R. 764, as amended, offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) and as amended by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Pryce) the author of this bill.

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, this morning, in coordination with today's House consideration of the CAPE Act, I and a number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle toured the D.C.'s Children Advocacy Center, otherwise known as Safe Shores.

For those who are not familiar with the children's advocacy centers like Safe Shores, they provide child abuse victims with a child-friendly environment where they can seek initial treatment and examination under one roof in one visit.

□ 1445

This is far superior to the more traditional method which subjected children to a cold bureaucratic maze of probing and prodding that often have the unintended consequences of re-victimizing them.

Mr. Chairman, like most children's advocacy centers, Safe Shores has a toy room which is where the cruel reality of child abuse really comes to life. I think we would all agree that toys should represent happy times in children's lives, but at Safe Shores they are merely temporary distractions from the nightmare inflicted upon them by adults who should be loving them. It is for those children at Safe Shores and all abused children around our Nation that I introduced the CAPE act and why we must pass it today.

The CAPE Act focuses on two critically important aspects of child abuse, prevention and improved treatment of child abuse victims. Moreover, the bill recognizes that it is those on the front lines in our communities who are in the best position to make a difference for our children, the child protection workers, the police, the judges, the court-appointed special advocates, the doctors and nurses, the foster families, and the volunteers, just to name a few.

In a nutshell, this bill takes three important steps to help children, and they have already been described by the gentleman from Florida (Mr.

MCCOLLUM), so I will not go into the technical aspects; but suffice it to say that all the money for this bill comes from forfeited assets, forfeited bail bonds, fines paid to the Government, not taxpayers' dollars.

So, without tapping the U.S. Treasury, the bill will increase the amount of funds which can be used for such things as training child abuse investigators, training child protection workers, and the development of children's advocacy centers like the one I toured this morning in Washington and the one which is evolving at Children's Hospital in my own hometown of Columbus, Ohio.

In fact, I am very proud that Children's Hospital soon will be embarking on a brand new state-of-the-art children's advocacy center on its campus in Columbus, building on its 10 years of experience and success in its existing location inside the hospital.

Also, this bill gives State and local officials the flexibility to use existing grants to provide child protection agencies access to criminal history records. This will help ensure that abused and neglected children are placed in safe foster and adoptive homes as expeditiously as possible so that they do not languish any longer than necessary in bureaucratic limbo.

The bill will make a difference in the lives of children without any additional cost to the taxpayer. It removes federally imposed straight-jackets on Federal funds and gives local folks the flexibility to invest in our children as they know best how to.

Quite appropriately, Deborah Sendek, Director of Columbus Children's Advocacy Center at Children's Hospital is with me today in Washington, for she is on the front lines in the fight to protect our children. It is heroes like this that the bill is designed to empower in their tireless efforts to bring care and comfort to our children to make sure that they are protected from their abusers.

In closing, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for all their perseverance in helping me bring the CAPE Act from the Committee on the Judiciary, to the House floor. I also want to express my gratitude to the original cosponsors of this bill, the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), who is a devoted foster parent and a tireless champion of the CAPE Act, to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), and last but not least, to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), my fellow colleague from the Buckeye State, who has so much experience in this issue.

Finally, I want to tip my hat to all the child advocates around the Nation in our communities, some of whom are here today, for all they do to nurture and treat victims of child abuse.

Mr. Chairman, abused children do not have high-priced lobbyists in Washington, nor are they a powerful voting block; but they are counting on us to act on their behalf, and the CAPE Act is for them. I urge adoption of this CAPE Act.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), the original Democratic cosponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), and all the other persons that were original sponsors and cosponsors on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I will not repeat what has been said by the other presenters as to what the CAPE Act will do. What I want to speak to is why the CAPE Act is so necessary.

I served for 8 years as the prosecutor from Cuyahoga County, Ohio. In Cuyahoga County I had 180 assistants, and many of them were responsible for prosecuting child abuse cases. One of the things that I realized as prosecutor was the need to specially train prosecutors who worked in that area. They needed to be able to speak to a young child witness; they needed to be able to understand and see when that child was drawing back and understand the behavioral manifestations from child abuse. They needed to be able to speak with a child-protection worker and have a worker who was as well trained as they were. They needed police officers who were also specially trained in dealing with child abuse victims.

Ultimately, we made a determination that we had to come up with an organization or interagency group that could handle these types of cases, and that is why what the CAPE Act will be able to do is so very important. Many of the child protection workers who work throughout this country need additional training. Many of them come right out of school into child protection work. Many of them find that because of the type of job that they are involved in, burnout comes quickly; and there are very few opportunities for reward or encouragement. Through providing dollars through the Byrne grant for training, we will be able to say to these child-protection workers, You are important to us. You are important to us not only because of who you are, but who you work with.

They will be working with young people, young abuse victims and providing dollars for their training is of particular importance. We were able to, through the work that we did and ads at the advocacy center that we visited today, to see that there were joint interviews being done with a one-way mirror so that in the course of being interviewed or handled as a young person or a child victim, they were not abused over and over again by so many interviews. That takes special technique, that takes great experience, and the funds that we are proposing from the Byrne grant will also be able to be used for training in that area.

It is very important also to understand that the work that forms the basis of the child-protection workers' work becomes the basis or foundation of the prosecutor's case as we go to trial; and very often we find ourselves in Cuyahoga County not being able to win some of our cases because early work done in those cases was not appropriately done, and it was not because the people working in the area were not able to do the job. It was because they were overwhelmed or maybe not specially trained in the area of child abuse and child sexual and physical abuse.

So these dollars are good, could be used for that training area. I want to salute all the child-protection workers, police officers, prosecutors who work out in this area and tell them that we really need them to continue to work hard, and by working to pass the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, we are saying to them, we know you're important, and you're important enough for us to set aside an allocation specifically in the Byrne grant funds for you to be trained and you to be saluted for the work that you do.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who are here and in support of this legislation.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) who is our majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I too want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) for bringing this very important piece of legislation to the floor, and I particularly want to thank the two gentlewomen from Ohio for all the hard work in putting this together; but I particularly want to thank one of my staff members, Autumn Hannah, whose tireless work and her work in raising the visibility of the abused and neglected children in this country has been so exemplary, and we greatly appreciate all her hard work.

Mr. Chairman, abuse against children is one of the unpardonable sins we must all work to end in this country. The Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act takes a big step towards making America safer for all of our most vulnerable youngsters. There is no topic more important and no issue more pressing than the welfare of our Nation's children. But for far too long the tragedy of abuse has been swept under the rug. The result is that the culture of abuse continues because we, as a Nation, have at times been afraid to admit our own failings.

It is time for the silence to end. It is time for the years of relative inactivity to be turned into humane action. After all, the health of a society is easily reflected in how it treats its most vulnerable.

Today, too many of our young ones are having their innocence stripped

away. Two years ago there were three million cases of child abuse and neglect in this country. Today, as I speak, there are at least a half a million American kids in foster care because it is not safe enough for them to live with their own families.

These numbers are as staggering as they are hard to comprehend. The sheer sadness that poisons so many little lives must move us all to action. There are many ways that we can help, though the task is complicated. At the Federal level we have to help lift our children out of despair while simultaneously giving more flexibility to States to deal with their own local concerns. In other words, we must take action and get out of the way and not interfere with the good work that is already taking place.

Nationally, billions upon billions of dollars have been spent on child welfare programs, but this is not just a question of dollars and cents because it would be worth every dime if money was the solution to ending abuse and neglect. But money is not the solution, and a one-size-fits all Federal program often allows too many children to fall through the cracks.

Such failure directly translates into trouble for our communities in the future as children with a bad formation predictably make bad choices in life. No one is surprised to learn that there is a correlation between adolescent crime and child abuse, but this is a cycle of trouble that we can beat. CAPE is the first step towards that goal.

This legislation allows State and local officials to take advantage of existing Byrne law enforcement grants for child prevention work. It also allows localities to use the identification technology act to provide criminal history records to child protection agencies. These measures simply make use of resources that already exist while cutting out wasteful repetitive action from different agencies and different levels of government.

Along with these steps, CAPE also increases the set-aside for child abuse services and the crime victim fund, all of which comes from nontaxpayer dollars. In short, this bill expands services, cuts red tape, and works within already existing programs. It is good for government at the Federal level, better for State governments and most importantly, it is great for victims of abuse that it seeks to protect.

Just one example of the good work CAPE assists is the court-appointed special advocate, a group of volunteers who provide millions of hours to have courtroom support for abused children. In Texas alone, these programs save the Federal Government an estimated $80 million a year at least, all while maximizing support services for children and minimizing their time in foster care, but this is just one program of so many. The point is that there are no shortage of ways and no lack of ideas in the fight to prevent child abuse and neglect; there is only a lack of involvement.

Mr. Chairman, too many Americans sit on their hands idly while others raise their hands in silence; but in most cases, Mr. Chairman, people simply do not know how they can make a difference in the lives of children. One easy way is to support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me and I want to thank her for all her hard work in this area and the sponsors of this legislation, I thank them too. As lawmakers and human beings we have an obligation to care, to care that every 12 minutes in my home State of Maryland one child is reported abused or neglected.

□ 1500

To care that currently 50 out of 1,000 children are reported maltreated, and to care that 2,000 children die each year as a result of abuse or neglect. But our higher duty is to transfer this care into prevention. H.R. 764 does this by providing for increased funding for prevention training, child advocacy and treatment, and increased access by protective service workers to criminal conviction records.

The Children's Defense Fund logo, written by a child, states quite succinctly: ''Dear Lord, be good to me; the sea is so wide and my boat is so small.''

Mr. Chairman, if we do not demonstrate that we care, this child and all others abused and neglected across this land will drift away in their small boats and eventually sink and die.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 764, the Child Abuse Prevention Act. And I thank the sponsor of this important legislation, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE); and the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM); for bringing the measure before us today; and the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE); the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES); and our distinguished whip for supporting this measure.

The U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect reports that 2,000 children die each year as a result of abuse or neglect. Moreover, it has been reported by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that there has been a 1.7 percent increase over the prior year of substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect. As we begin to enter the next century, it is imperative that we make certain that we take care of our Nation's children. Our future as a Nation and as a caring people depend on that.

History will not look kindly upon a society that chose to ignore the plight of its children over issues of politics, wealth, or new technology. Accordingly, it is imperative that Congress provide our local communities and our States the tools needed to end child abuse and neglect.

This measure, H.R. 764, will permit the Department of Justice to provide the kind of grants to States for the enforcement of laws to prevent child abuse and will provide technical assistance to local law enforcement to help in that battle.

Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to fully support this important measure.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, they say that home is where the heart is, but where is the home of a child whose heart beats rapidly in fear that he will be beaten black and blue because dad has had a bad day at work today? What about the child who avoids his drunk mother for fear that he may irritate her?

Because of the alarming statistics of child abuse today, at least 500,000 children in the United States are making foster care, group shelters, and other institutions their permanent homes. As responsible legislators, it is imperative that we work to ensure safety for all of our children. We must do everything within our power to foster healthy environments where children can learn, can play, and can prepare to be the future of our country.

With statistics on child abuse ever increasing, it is evident that CAPE, the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, is very needed. This legislation will help to improve conditions faced by at-risk children by expanding technology and enabling child protecting agencies to access criminal history records.

I challenge our colleagues to commit themselves to finding a solution for child abuse and take the first step by voting to pass the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act.

I congratulate our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), for her leadership in sponsoring this bill that was also a legislative priority for our mutual friend, former Congresswoman Sue Molinari. I especially want to acknowledge the hard work of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), who has made fighting child abuse a key legislative priority for all of us through our Shine the Light on the Children in the Darkness project.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I first of all want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who chairs the Children's Caucus, for yielding me time. I also want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), who will be offering a floor manager's amendment to this bill, who chairs the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary who helped this bill through. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) on one side, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) on one side, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). Boy, if this is not a good example of bipartisan cooperation on an issue that is so very important.

Mr. Chairman, I rise obviously in strong support of the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, the CAPE Act, introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), to be amended by a floor manager's amendment. It expands the Byrne grants to allow the States flexibility in programs for child abuse protection services and also for programs to prevent the incidence of child abuse.

Just citing some of the statistics, the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse reports that in 1994, over 3 million children were reported to child protective service agencies for child abuse and neglect. This is in the United States, and the numbers continue to increase. Currently about 47 out of every 1,000 children are reported as victims of child mistreatment, and overall child abuse reporting levels have increased 63 percent between 1985 and 1994.

Well, based on these numbers, more than 3 children die each day as a result of child abuse or neglect or a combination of neglectful and physically abusive parenting, and approximately 45 percent of these deaths occur to children known to child protective service agencies as current or prior clients.

Prevention, early intervention, and protection are the three components of child abuse programs that the Interdisciplinary Report on At-Risk Children and Families recommended. Prevention efforts build on the resources presented in local communities by encouraging residents to participate in awareness programs. Special outreach components are recommended to ensure early intervention by establishing at-risk behaviors for educators and parents. The third component, protection services, focuses on protecting the child while keeping the family together by providing in-home services. These three principles, so needed, are all examples of grant funded programs increased by H.R. 764.

This bill, the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, expands a key element of preventing child abuse and neglect by providing access to services that address specific needs of local communities. Services must be responsive to the range of ongoing and changing needs of both children and families. The bill allows individual States and communities to develop and update their programs to meet these changing needs.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude with something that I think exemplifies it all. It was once stated that if you touch a rock, you touch the past, and if you touch a flower, you touch the present, and if you touch a child, you touch the future.

This bill is critically important. I urge my colleagues to support this urgently needed legislation.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, and I give my great appreciation to those who have brought this act to the floor of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman MCCOLLUM), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

I do so because I believe a society is measured in large part by how it treats the young and the most vulnerable. This bill seeks to help communities to help themselves by giving them the tools to stop and prevent child abuse.

The bill would give local and State officials the flexibility to use the Byrne Law Enforcement Act for Child Abuse Prevention, and increase the earmark for child abuse victims out of the crime victims fund.

These simple steps are not earth shattering, but they could actually be life saving. By giving our States and local communities increased resources, we decrease the chances of losing our children to the predators of child abuse. Now, that is an investment worth making, and that is legislation I am proud to support.

I urge my colleagues to support the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member and all of those who are associated with this very important piece of legislation, and like to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for her amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a mother of five and a grandmother of four and a former teacher, I know the importance of bringing up children in healthy environments that protect them from abuse and neglect. According to the Children's Defense Fund, in my home State of California every minute a child is reported as being abused or neglected. That translates to 60 children being abused and neglected during the 1 hour of debate that has been allotted for this bill. That is why it is evident that we need H.R. 764. The CAPE Act would allow additional grant monies to enhance services related to child abuse and neglect cases. Also it would expand the definition of abuse under existing law to include the taking of a child in violation of a court order.

These are just but two, Mr. Chairman, of the great provisions of this CAPE Act. I am indeed happy to be standing here in a bipartisan effort to pass such an important bill.

As a member of the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus and the Co-Vice Chair of the Women's Caucus, I urge all of my colleagues to join us in voting ''yes'' to H.R. 764. We need to do more to prevent abuse and neglect and protect our children, which are, of course, our future.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING).

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, my association with the sponsor of this bill goes back to the last Congress when Susan Molinari, Congresswoman Molinari from New York, introduced a similar piece of legislation, and I was a cosponsor of it.

I am very pleased this time to be a cosponsor, along with our good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE). The need here is really great, and this bill, while it does not spend a lot of extra money, I think we are going to get a lot more bang for our buck if we pass this bill.

Each day there are 9,000 reports of child abuse in America. That totals out to over 3 million cases in a year. Since 1987, the total number of reports of child abuse nationwide have gone up 47 percent. Of the cases of abuse, 54 percent result in a fatality, and over 18,000 children were permanently disabled as a result of physical abuse. Finally, those who are abused as children, when they become adults, are more apt to abuse their own children.

This is a problem in our society of enormous magnitude. It gets at the very basis of the next generation and future generations, and is something that we must do all that we can to address.

I think this is an excellent piece of legislation, and we should overwhelmingly pass it.

□ 1515

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, childhood is the time of life that should be treasured and protected. The truth is, many children are robbed of their innocence or even worse at the hands of abuse.

Even while our overall national crime statistics have declined dramatically, child abuse continues to rise. The U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect reports that 2000

children die each year as a result of abuse and neglect. In the State of Florida alone, a child is reported abused or neglected every 3 minutes. With these statistics, it is clear our Nation needs to do more to protect our children from abuse. We need to do everything we can to prevent it from happening in the first place.

Child abuse and prevention not only help protect the child, it also helps protect society in the long run, since statistics show that abused children are more likely to commit future acts of child abuse and domestic violence.

Last year the Volunteers for Children Act, a bill that I sponsored, was signed into law by the President. Volunteers for children will help protect children in after-school activities from being in the care of people with dangerous criminal records. This is an important step, but it is certainly not enough. We must attack child abuse at every opportunity, by investigating reported abuse thoroughly, by ensuring that children are not returned to abusive environments they have been taken out of, and by making penalties for convicted abusers much tougher.

Furthermore, we must ensure that children have safe places to go whenever they are in danger. As such, we need to continue empowering those on the State and local level in their efforts to prevent child abuse and treat victims.

That is what the CAPE Act is designed to do, to give local and State officials the flexibility to use law enforcement grants for child abuse prevention. It would increase the earmark, currently $10 million for child abuse victims, out of the Crime Victims Fund. This funding can be used by the States for important things such as training child protective service workers; training court-appointed special advocates; and child advocacy centers, which are one-stop child-friendly places where all parts of an abused child examination and treatment are brought together under one roof.

Among others, the CAPE Act is supported by the National Child Abuse Coalition, which includes the Children's Defense Fund and the Child Welfare League, Prevent Child Abuse America, the Christian Coalition, the Family Research Council, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

I urge my colleagues to join these groups in supporting the bill. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), and I thank again the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), for being part of this great legislation.

I urge adoption by the Members.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me, and those who have sponsored this critically important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to address one of the most ugly, horrific crimes and experiences that can befall children, physical and sexual abuse. Before coming to Congress I spent more than 23 years of my life working as a psychologist in the mental health field helping to heal and counsel people who were the victims of child abuse and other terrible experiences.

I can tell Members that as ugly as it is, child abuse cannot be wished away. It is something we have to face square on, and the bill we are addressing today will help us do precisely that.

Earlier today I spoke with folks back in my own district, back in Vancouver, Washington. They told me some very frightening and troubling statistics. Referrals for child abuse were actually up in 1998 by 2 percent from the previous year. In one year we had over 3,957 referrals. Those are not just numbers, those are children whose lives have been harmed and damaged, and who will perhaps pass that harm on to others if we do not help them and intervene early on.

Some might say, what is the big deal, it is just a 1 or 2 percent increase? But this is happening in the best of economic times. We know that child abuse goes up when economic times go bad, but if we are having this many cases in good times, we have to act now to stop that before it gets worse.

My home State actually does a very good job of trying to prevent child abuse. I have visited many of the treatment centers myself. They do an outstanding job. They make use of scarce resources, and they put together innovative and effective programs to combat the problem, but they need help. They need additional resources and they need H.R. 764.

The legislation before us today puts more resources in the hands of the folks who need them most. This bill will expand the grant authority to provide funds to enhance services related to child abuse prevention programs. It will help fund the prevention and early intervention programs that have been shown to work, and it will help communities make sure those who commit these horrible crimes are prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

We need to provide more opportunities to prevent, to investigate, and to prosecute child abuse and neglect cases. We need this bill, and I urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), and particularly my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), for their leadership in this legislation. I have had numerous discussions with her particularly about this important legislation.

The U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect reports that 2,000 children die each year as a result of abuse or neglect. In my home State of Ohio alone, a child is reported abused or neglected every 3 minutes of every day. With these statistics, it is clear our Nation needs to do more to protect our children from abuse and prevent it from happening in the first place.

That is why this legislation is so important, because it focuses in on prevention. Child abuse prevention is true crime prevention, and all of us, I am sure, support that concept.

We needed to recognize that on the State and local level, the child protective workers, the police, prosecutes, judges, doctors, the nurses, are in the best position to prevent child abuse and find ways to treat those who have been abused.

We need to empower those on the State and local level in their efforts to prevent child abuse and treat victims. That is what the CAPE Act is designed to do. The bill would give State and local officials flexibility to use Byrne law enforcement grants for child abuse prevention, to increase the earmark currently at $10 million for education out of the crime victims fund, and the best news of all is, it does not cost taxpayers' dollars because it comes from forfeited assets, forfeited bail bonds and fines paid by the government.

This funding can be used by the States for important things such as training child protective service workers, training court-appointed special advocates, and child advocacy centers. Child advocacy centers help provide treatment and examination for abused children in a way which will not revictimize the child.

We are fortunate in this country to have the assets necessary to carry out this important function. This act is supported by the National Child Abuse Coalition, Prevent Child Abuse America, the Christian Coalition, the Family Research Council, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I first of all would like to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her efforts on this bill, and also the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), for their good work on this legislation as well.

Mr. Chairman, in another life prior to entering politics, I used to work as a probation officer, and worked with juvenile delinquents. I worked in a youth home as an attendant there and also as a caseworker, and had some experience as an adoption caseworker. In that work, I had the occasion to witness situations in homes that cried out for attention.

Over the years, we have watched as governments at all levels have done

relatively little to address this need. This need is quite extensive. Over 1 million cases of child abuse were committed in 1997. A child is abused or neglected in Michigan every 5 minutes, every 5 minutes, and about 300 cases are reported a day. That is according to a nonprofit group called Michigan's Children's Trust Fund.

Sixty-eight percent of youths arrested had a prior history of abuse and neglect, 68 percent. So what we have here is a vicious cycle of abuse, neglect, crime, violence, more abuse and neglect from generation to generation.

Lest we think of this as statistics, let me cite an example that was recently reported in the press, in the Detroit papers, and in other papers throughout Michigan about a mother who beat her 10-year-old and 13-year-old with an electrical cord and burned them with an iron. I know these are graphic pictures that I am creating for Members here, but it is what happens. The children escaped the house, they wandered the city, it was dark, at night, looking for their friend's house somewhere near what they said was Tiger Stadium. They were found cold and scared in the middle of the night; scarred, certainly physically, but more importantly, mentally for the rest of their lives. This is what happens on a regular basis.

So Mr. Chairman, I just rise in support of this bill. I rise in support of the efforts of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) on this bill. She has done an excellent job. She knows this issue from the perspective of one elected local law enforcement officer and other activities in her community.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill because it will start to address the issues of child abuse and neglect. It will take a positive, preventive step in addressing this issue. Groups like Covenant House, which have 15 shelters throughout this country, and other groups in my district, child welfare agencies, will hopefully receive the support they need to continue their good work and to expand it so we can get at the root of these problems, and address them in a humane way so we can break the cycle and we can develop the love that is needed for our children to succeed.

In conclusion, I just want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for all of their efforts, and my colleague from Florida, as well as my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, there is a Jesuit expression that says, let us have the children for the first 7 years, and then the world can have them. What that means is that when children in their earliest years are loved and nurtured, and when they are instilled with values and self-confidence, then they will have the strength and resilience that they need to face life's challenges and to resist its evils.

The opposite is most certainly true. When children are battered, when children are neglected, when children are sexually or psychologically mistreated and abused, they become weak, they become infirm, they become troubled. It is fitting that I follow the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), because I, too, was a caseworker with abused children.

Over the years as I worked with these children, and many of these children appear in my life 20 years later, calling me at home, we find these children, so many of them, not only just in the child welfare system as battered, but we find them in the juvenile justice system as delinquents, we find them in the mental health system as psychopathic or maladjusted, we find them in the drug and alcohol system as addicts, we find them in the domestic violence systems of batterers of their own spouses, and often, too often, batterers of their own children. Then we find them ultimately in the criminal justice system in our jails.

This legislation, introduced by my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, is not only compassionate, and it is the right thing to do for the innocent and helpless children of the country, but it is also the right thing to do, because this $10 million or $20 million will become multiplied many times over, for each child that is protected from abuse will be one less child in one of these other social service systems that is not only costly to American society, but causes so much more additional pain.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not take the opportunity to thank my staff for all the support and work they did with me in trying to get the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act passed.

I would like to thank my staff on the record, Dan Weinheimer and other members of my staff.

□ 1530

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

I think that was an extremely important statement, and I do appreciate the work of the staff on all of the committees and all of the Members' staff, and let me simply say we have heard a phrase used in another effort: a mind is a terrible thing to waste. I would paraphrase it to say that a child is a terrible person to lose or to waste their lives or to see that child abused.

So I want to applaud the proponents of this legislation; I am delighted to join and be a cosponsor of it, and I hope that we can quickly move this legislation to see not one other life snuffed out. Not only another child's life snuffed out because we have been neglectful in providing the resources that we need to detect child abuse and prevent child abuse.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, what I think our legislative role is day in and day out here is to provide ways to preserve and protect our great quality of life and freedom for our children and our grandchildren. We are the greatest free Nation in the history of the world. It is all about children. And in this case, we are talking about protecting them not only in that broad sense but in the very specific sense against child abuse, one of the worst things that can happen in this Nation to anyone.

And so I am pleased that the authors have brought this bill forward today. I am proud to have been a part of the team that has brought it out in the committee and subcommittee, and I look forward to the passage of this bill.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the statistics on the abuse of our most precious resource—our children—is heartbreaking. We must protect our children from those who would abuse their trusting souls and prey on their innocence. It is a moral obligation that binds us together, regardless of race, religion, gender, or party affiliation.

Today, the House can reiterate its commitment to our children by passing the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act.

As we know, our states are each different, with different needs and different resources—what works for Florida's children may not work for Maine's. This Bill encourages each state's creativity to deal with the unique needs of their children by offering greater flexibility with federal funds.

The bill also doubles to $20 million a year the amount of money from the Crime Victims Fund that can be earmarked for child abuse victims. This fund is not taxpayer money, but money from the pockets of criminals—poetic justice, you might say. Finally, this bill increases access to criminal records by child protective services, making it easier for those who work to protect our children to do their jobs.

No one entity can fight child abuse alone. Working together, as partners, states and Congress can make a difference.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 764, the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, I am proud to rise in strong support of its passage. I am also equally proud of my colleagues Congresswomen PRYCE and JONES of Ohio for their leadership in bringing this bill forward. I applaud them for their efforts and on behalf of children across this country thank them and all of the cosponsors of this bill.

The abuse, and I include neglect, of children is a most heinous crime, for all of the obvious reasons. Adults are supposed to protect and nurture children, and provide a suitable and supportive environment for their optimal development. It is a sacred trust, and one that must be upheld at all costs. H.R. 764 will help us to do this better.

I also find that it is the most insidious of crimes, because in many of the problems that plague our country—domestic abuse, teen

pregnancy, drugs addiction, youth violence and delinquency, as well as many adult crimes—one will find that child abuse is generally a root cause.

The national statistics on child abuse are also very alarming. Many of my colleagues will recount these disturbing facts as we debate H.R. 764 today. Even in my own district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, we have seen an unacceptable increase in the numbers of children affected. And we know, that as in every other district, not every case is found or reported. This fact, as well as, the fact that it is a crime that has far and long reaching consequences that can affect even subsequent generations of our children, makes our responsibility and response to this issue even more critical.

The Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, through making resources available to those individuals who work every day to prevent child abuse and protect our children, makes a vital and most important contribution, not only to each and every child that is saved, but also to the future of this nation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 764 is not an investment we ought to make. It is one we must make. Our children deserve and need us to do everything within our power to protect them and to ensure the kind of safe and nurturing environment that will allow them to develop their fullest potential.

I strongly support H.R. 764 and I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 764, the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act.

Providing for the safety and well-being of our children is one of society's most sacred obligations. Our children represent the future. But child abuse takes away their future. It cruelly takes away their hope and promise of realizing their talents and dreams. Child abuse denies our children a life of happiness and fulfillment by inflicting emotional and psychological scars that persist for the rest of their lives.

This important piece of legislation will confront child abuse head on. It will protect our children, and assist those vulnerable children who've been the victims of abuse. One of the aims of this legislation is to prevent child abuse before it happens. Because law enforcement is best conducted at the local level, law enforcement officials in communities across America will be given the flexibility and resources to combat the incidence of child abuse.

This legislation also will increase the funding for the Crime Victims Fund. These are not taxpayer dollars, but revenues from forfeited assets and fines paid to the government. This funding can be used by the states for critical services such as training child protection workers and supporting child advocacy centers.

I recently had a very tragic case of child abuse in my district. Three-year old Ashley Taggart from Lancaster, Ohio was abducted and abused. After an excruciating ordeal, she was returned to safety. Though we cannot take this experience away, we can try to give Ashley a chance to lead a normal life.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is for Ashley, and for the thousands of children like her across America. It is for the safety and well-being of all our children who deserve the best that life can give them.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation introduced by my colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman PRYCE.

This body has long worked to promote policies which seek to protect our children, guided by common sense, and by the general idea that a child's environment and experiences may have an influence on the type of person he or she will turn out to be.

Extensive research on child development issues in recent years has made it increasingly evident that the relationship between the nature of a child's upbringing and the mental and emotional health of that child undoubtedly exists. Though there is still much for us to learn, we know that the link is there, and this knowledge alone should be enough to strengthen our resolve to enact policies which shelter our children from harmful behavior and influences. I believe the work of this Congress attests to an active recognition of the importance of promoting such policies. In June, I was encouraged to see the House approve unanimously as an amendment to the juvenile justice legislation my bill on child hostages, which strengthens the penalties against those individuals who take a child hostage. The House consideration of H.R. 764 today, I think, further demonstrates the strength of this body's commitment to our children, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 764 is as follows:

H.R. 764

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act''.

SEC. 2. IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESS TO CERTAIN COURT AND LAW ENFORCEMENT RECORDS TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE.

(a) DESCRIPTION OF GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 1402 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796aa–1) is amended by adding before the period at the end the following: ''or to provide child protective workers and child welfare workers (in public and private agencies, who, in the course of their official duties, are engaged in the assessment of risk and other actions related to the protection of children, including placement of children in foster care) access to criminal conviction information and orders of protection based on a claim of domestic or child abuse, or to improve law enforcement access to judicial custody orders, visitation orders, protection orders, guardianship orders, stay away orders, or other similar judicial orders''.

(b) APPLICATION TO RECEIVE GRANTS.—Section 1403 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3796aa–2) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''or to provide child protective workers and child welfare workers (in public and private agencies, who, in the course of their official duties, are engaged in the assessment of risk and other actions related to the protection of children, including placement of children in foster care) access to criminal conviction information and orders of protection based on a claim of domestic or child abuse, or to improve law enforcement access to judicial custody orders, visitation orders, protection orders, guardianship orders, stay away orders, or other similar judicial orders''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or to provide child protective workers and child welfare workers (in public and private agencies, who, in the course of their official duties, are engaged in the assessment of risk and other actions related to the protection of children, including placement of children in foster care) access to criminal conviction information and orders of protection based on a claim of domestic or child abuse, or to improve law enforcement access to judicial custody orders, visitation orders, protection orders, guardianship orders, stay away orders, or other similar judicial orders''.

(c) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 1404(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3796aa–3(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting after ''to receive a grant'' the following: ''for closed circuit televising of testimony of children who are victims of abuse''.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1409(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3796aa–8(2)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or the taking of a child in violation of a court order''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Part N of title I of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3796aa) is amended in the heading to read as follows:

''PART N—GRANTS FOR CLOSED-CIRCUIT TELEVISING OF TESTIMONY OF CHILDREN WHO ARE VICTIMS OF ABUSE AND FOR IMPROVING ACCESS TO COURT AND LAW ENFORCEMENT RECORDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREVENTING CHILD ABUSE''.

SEC. 3. USE OF FUNDS UNDER BYRNE GRANT PROGRAM FOR CHILD PROTECTION.

Section 501(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (25);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (26) and adding ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(27) enforcing child abuse and neglect laws and programs designed to prevent child abuse and neglect.''.

SEC. 4. INCREASE IN SET ASIDE FOR CHILD ABUSE VICTIMS UNDER THE VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT OF 1984.

Section 1402(d)(2) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000''.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MCCOLLUM:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act''.

SEC. 2. GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 102(b) of the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601(b)) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (15), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (16) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding after paragraph (16) the following:

''(17) the capability of the criminal justice system to deliver timely, accurate, and complete criminal history record information to child welfare agencies, organizations, and programs that are engaged in the assessment of risk and other activities related to the protection of children, including placement of children in foster care.''.

SEC. 3. USE OF FUNDS UNDER BYRNE GRANT PROGRAM FOR CHILD PROTECTION.

Section 501(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (25);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (26) and adding ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(27) enforcing child abuse and neglect laws and promoting programs designed to prevent child abuse and neglect.''.

SEC. 4. CONDITIONAL ADJUSTMENT IN SET ASIDE FOR CHILD ABUSE VICTIMS UNDER THE VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT OF 1984.

Section 1402(d)(2) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(2) the next $10,000,000'' and inserting ''(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the next $10,000,000''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) For any fiscal year for which the amount deposited in the Fund is greater than the amount deposited in the Fund for fiscal year 1998, the $10,000,000 referred to in subparagraph (A) plus an amount equal to 50 percent of the increase in the amount from fiscal year 1998 shall be available for grants under section 1404A.

''(ii) Amounts available under this subparagraph for any fiscal year shall not exceed $20,000,000.''.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment today in the nature of a substitute to this bill to address two aspects that I have concerns with.

First, H.R. 764 would authorize the Bureau of Justice Assistance to use a small grant program that helps purchase equipment so that children testifying in abuse cases can do so via closed circuit television to also fund the purposes stated in Section 2 of this bill. I am told there is just not enough money in this program to fund the CAPE Act. The funds for that program are consumed annually for their original purpose, and I do not believe we should dilute them.

My amendment would authorize funding under the Crime Identification Technology Act, a bill enacted last year to improve the operation of the criminal justice system by upgrading criminal justice and general justice record systems. I supported the passage of that bill in the House last year, and I believe it is a perfect fit for the purposes behind the bill before us today.

Secondly, H.R. 764 would also amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, which created the Crime Victims Fund. The fund is financed through the collection of criminal fines, penalty assessments, and forfeited appearance bonds of persons convicted of crimes against the United States. In fiscal 1998, $363 million was deposited into the fund for distribution during this fiscal year. The fund provides money to States to compensate crime victims directly, and it provides other grants to States which are then distributed to public and nonprofit agencies that provide direct services to crime victims. Under current law, the first $10 million deposited in the fund each year is to be expended by the Secretary of Health and Human Services for grants relating to child abuse prevention and treatment.

This bill, the one before us today, would increase the earmark for child abuse and domestic assistance program from $10 million to $20 million. Doubling this earmark would result in a $10 million reduction in funds that would otherwise be available for grants to the victims compensation programs and the victims assistance programs.

Victims' rights groups oppose doubling the earmark. In fact, they are not enamored with the earmark to begin with. My amendment offers an alternative to the straight doubling of the earmark. It would leave the current earmark at $10 million in place except in any fiscal year when the amount of money deposited in the fund exceeds what was deposited for fiscal year 1998, $363 million. When more than that amount of money is deposited, half of the extra money would be allocated for child abuse prevention and treatment, but the total amount available in any fiscal year would not exceed $20 million.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding it is likely that this fund will be well in excess of the $363 million figure over the next couple of years, so I think there will be more than an adequate amount of money to fund the programs that are in this bill. I believe my amendment to H.R. 764 balances the interests of all stakeholders and I urge all of my colleagues to support this.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

Mr. Chairman, I just want to add my support for the McCollum amendment and to indicate that the value of adding dollars to prevent child abuse among many other things is a key part of the effort that we are trying to do today.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MCCOLLUM:

On Page 1, line 15 after ''protection of children,'' insert ''including protection against child sexual abuse,''.

On page 2, line 11, after ''neglect laws'' insert, ''including laws protecting against child sexual abuse,''.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me again thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) for his leadership on the substitute and let me also thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for this legislation that I had the pleasure of cosponsoring.

The focus of the amendment that I am offering is to emphasize the heinousness and the tragedy of child sexual abuse. So my amendment offers to clarify that child abuse includes child sexual abuse, and this will add to the information that the child abuse workers will be able to secure and to be able to investigate in order to determine whether there has been child sexual abuse.

Let me emphasize why this is an important distinction, because most often when we think of child abuse we think of the physical abuse that may be noticeable. The knocked head, the bruised arm, the broken arm, the broken leg, the burn on the body, physical things that can be seen by a school counselor, a teacher, a friend or a pastor.

But sometimes children suffer in the quietness and the horror of sexual abuse that cannot be detected by looking at a child fully clothed, and the idea is to ensure that in this new legislation we have a circumstance where this is on the minds of those child abuse investigators should they not also inquire, look, examine, and determine whether the child has been sexually abused.

Let me cite the numbers of sexually abused children. The numbers are going up. In 1990, there were 127,000 children abused sexually. In 1991, it goes up, 129,425. When we go to 1992, sexual abuse goes 130,000, 14 percent. 1993, 139,000. Each year the number of children sexually abused increases. When we look at close to 3 million children who are reported abused, we find that 12 percent of them suffered sexual abuse.

Mr. Chairman, might I offer to those who are able to, I guess, tolerate hearing about the horrificness, the heinousness about what happens when a child

is sexually abused by citing the report on the autopsy of JonBenet Ramsey, a case that still stands as one of the singular cases of terrible child abuse and, of course, an unsolved murder of a child.

What the autopsy says is that this particular child was found to have been whacked. Her head was whacked against something, and then she was still alive and strangled. The autopsy goes on to note there are two injuries in that autopsy that could have killed her. One is a strangulation, the other is the assorted brain injuries. It is not clear in what sequence. Meyer found an abrasion on the girl's hymen, which other experts said could indicate a sexual assault. The size of the girl's hymen, which Meyer measured at 1 centimeter by 1 centimeter, should have more significance. ''The thing that concerns me is that the hymenal opening is measured at 1 centimeter, which is too large,'' said Kirschner, a child abuse specialist, ''but if in fact that was the real measurement, that is twice the diameter that it should be. Usually a hymen in a young child like this should be 4 millimeters.''

And so there was discussion, horrible discussion about whether or not JonBenet Ramsey was sexually abused. ''There is blood and contusions in the vagina and the hymen has been torn.''

Yes, descriptive, horrific, but every day our children face this kind of assault. So I think it is extremely important that this language emphasizes the protection of our children as the legislation already does; but it emphasizes a real focus on sexually abused children along with other abuse. It does not in any way diminish the importance of other abuse, but realizes that children can suffer in silence with child abuse, and it cannot easily be detected.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that my colleagues would support this amendment because it again states to our child abuse investigators: be thorough in your work, do not be limited in your work, and realize that our children suffer in silence when they are sexually abused and you need to inquire and draw from them the information that will protect and save the lives of American children.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I would like to offer to this bill. In its present form, this bill has a tremendous impact on the current abuse and neglect system by enhancing the services available. This amendment I am offering would give child protective and child welfare workers additional access to criminal records that would include convictions for sexual abuse.

According to the statistics on abuse, 12 percent of the abuse is sexual abuse. Any discussion of child abuse is incomplete without including the growing problem of child sexual abuse and exploitation.

Child sexual abuse is any sex act performed by an adult or an older child. This includes actual physical abuse such as touching a child's genital area or molestation, and it also includes sexual assault, self-exposure (flashing), voyeurism, and exposing children to pornography.

Sexual abuse is often committed by a family member. Incest is the most common form of child sexual abuse. However, anyone can commit sexual abuse against a child. It is often perpetrated by adults that have been entrusted with caring for a child—a family friend, babysitter, a teacher, day care worker, or even religious leaders. Even a child can commit sexual abuse against another child.

The purpose of my amendment is to specify the importance of sexual abuse as a crime that should be recognized by child welfare and child protection workers when investigating incidences of child abuse.

It gives protection and child welfare workers access to the conviction records and orders of protection based on sexual abuse, in addition to domestic and child abuse. A history of sexual abuse, whether it is against a child or an adult, is significant information.

Sexual abuse against children is a harsh reality that is very common. At least one out of five adult women and one out of ten adult men report having been sexually abused as children. These cases may represent the untold stories of many children, now adults, who suffered in silence due to sexual abuse.

Now, we have mechanisms in place to investigate incidences of child abuse. However, in some cases, certain information about an alleged abuser's past may not be available. This bill remedies that situation by making criminal records for sexual abuse available.

In Texas, there were more than 111,000 investigations of child abuse and neglect by the Child Protective Services in Texas. Of those cases, 7,650 were sexual abuse.

In one infamous case, the death of JonBenet Ramsey, sexual assault may have been a factor in her death. The autopsy was released this summer and was inconclusive as to whether the child had been sexually assaulted. However, it was clear to the investigators that in a case such as this, an inquiry had to be made concerning possible sexual assault.

This change only adds the term ''sexual abuse'' to the bill in an attempt to give child protection and child welfare workers another factor to consider when assessing the risk related to the protection of children.

I ask my Colleagues to support this technical amendment to this bill. It is uncontroversial and it would further enhance the ability of the abuse and neglect system to combat child abuse. Thank you.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. I do not oppose this amendment, but I want to point out to the gentlewoman that the term ''child abuse'' is already defined in two different sections of the Federal Criminal Code, and in both cases the term is defined to include both physical violence and sexual abuse.

In 18 USC Section 1169, the statute that requires doctors, teachers, and childcare workers to report any suspected case of child abuse that takes place in Indian country the term ''child'' and ''abuse'' are defined to include any case where the child is bruised, bleeding, malnourished, burned, has broken bones and other physical injuries, and also includes cases where is the child is sexual assaulted, molested, or otherwise subjected to exploitation of a sexual matter.

In 18 USC 3509, the term ''child abuse'' is defined to mean the physical or mental injury, sexual abuse, exploitation, or negligent treatment of a child.

So I believe the term is very clearly in law defined to include sexual abuse, but I think the gentlewoman's purpose here as she stated it is to make it clear that anyone reading the words that we publish today in this legislation, especially those who are caseworkers on matters of child abuse, will look further and make sure they look for sexual abuse as well. And to that end I compliment her for it and I support her amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, and commend my friends the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and many others for their work in bringing this important issue to the floor today.

This is an important bill in the fight to end the cycle of violence in America's homes. In my State of New York, my home State of New York, a child is reported abused or neglected every 2 minutes. Two thousand children die each year as a result of abuse or neglect.

To make matters even worse, many of these young people will grow up to abuse their children and the cycle will continue. That is why this bill is so important. It will put needed resources in places to help those children who need help the most. It will stress prevention which is very, very important in breaking the cycle of violence. It will double the funding used to train child protective service workers and court-appointed special advocates. A very important component of this bill allows grant money to be used to purchase equipment, allowing abused children to testify in court through closed circuit television.

□ 1545

This creates the least intimidating situation for children who are already under enormous pressure to tell their stories.

We currently have a network of one-stop, child-friendly places where all services are housed under one roof.

These Child Advocacy Centers perform life-saving work, but they need more money. According to Christine Crowder of the Child Advocacy Center in Manhattan, in the district that I represent, this bill helps children on a very basic level. It will provide a coordination of services, which is key to helping victims of child abuse.

When a child abuse case is being assessed, it is important for the social

workers and other advocates, police officers, to know about all protective orders, restraining orders, visitation orders, and guardianship orders. That is why this one-stop Child Advocacy Center is so important and the funding is so desperately needed.

I congratulate all the Members of Congress who have been working on this legislation, and I congratulate them for focusing our efforts to prevent and combat child abuse.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise to support this legislation that seeks to address the issue of child abuse and prevent it and treat it. It is a terrible problem in our society. More than anything, I want the House and the Speaker to understand the value of community-based child abuse prevention efforts, like that which exists in my hometown of Spokane, Washington.

In the mid-1980s, a group of us decided that, in order to address this growing problem, something needed to be done to have a safe place for children who are potentially abused children to go until their parents or guardians or custodians could have a chance to get the variable social services that might be available, whether it is job loss advice or alcohol abuse advice or other assistance.

So we started a group called the Vanessa Behan Crisis Nursery. It is a nonprofit charitable organization that exists today without any government funds. It is all community supported and assisted, from labor unions to community leaders, to business leaders, to social service assistance, to Junior League of Spokane and many, many others who have banded together to contribute clothing, have bought a house and converted it through the assistance of contractors and labor union tradesmen and made this house a home for children who are potentially abused children. To this day, they do not take any State or Federal money.

So my point to the Speaker and the House is that it can be done outside of the auspices of government, but there is also a challenge that the Vanessa Behan Crisis Nursery has, and its wonderful director Sue Manford in trying to have phase two of the crisis nursery be constructed, terribly expensive, terribly difficult to get more money to try to assist in this program. But it is a valuable program.

My hope would be that, as we discuss the issue of child abuse and child abuse prevention, that we think about the nonprofit charity, I believe community-based and supported operations that can go such a long way to helping solve this problem of child abuse and protection of children without the bureaucracy and the strings that are attached many, many times to government money.

So I would hope that my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and others, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) especially would think carefully about making money available to community-based organizations for proper purposes and with accountability but without so many strings attached and so much Federal or State control over what happens to the money once it gets there.

Accountability is a good thing. It has to be. But at least the crisis nursery thus far has rejected Federal funds application or State funds application for just that reason. It is burdensome and creates more problems sometimes than it is worth.

But I really think that the model that is established through the Vanessa Behan Crisis Nursery in Spokane, I think it is the only one in our entire State that has addressed this issue of child abuse prevention. It is a safe haven respite care facility for kids, young children who are the subject of abuse or potential abuse. But it may be temporary.

It is an opportunity for the parents of these kids or the custodians or guardians to get out and get some social services help, which I think probably will be help in this bill as well.

So I commend my colleagues to this model, to the great success of the crisis nursery in Spokane, Washington, and I suggest that those who may be interested in this look to the crisis nursery as an example of what can be done in a nongovernmental charitable community-based organizational way.

With that, I will support this bill, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and others who work so hard to make this concept of child abuse a prominent one and prevent the child abuse that exists so much in our country today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this great piece of legislation. Again, I would like to thank my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), and especially the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), the amendment that I speak to now.

Sexual abuse of children is a harsh fact of life in our society, Mr. Chairman. It is more common than most people realize. Some surveys say that at least one out of five adult women and one out of 10 adult men report having had sexual abuse in childhood.

I would like to just give my colleagues an example, Mr. Chairman, of when I was a teacher and this young woman came to school. She was dressed in clothes, just like any other child would be, very nicely dressed; but deep down within, I saw a sadness in her eyes.

When I attempted to talk with her, she started crying. I could not get her to divulge at that time what had actually happened. It was several days before I could draw from her that she had been sexually abused.

Now we talk about abuse in all of the forms that I said earlier that, every minute, a child is abused or neglected in the State of California. But here we are talking about sexual abuse, something that is hard to detect, because it is not a visual thing, per se, not until one has been able to get that child to really talk out and speak out on what has happened.

We also recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the majority of the children who have been abused were abused by people whom they knew. The victims usually know the offender in eight out of 10 reported cases.

When we got to the bottom of this case, Mr. Chairman, we detected that this child had been abused by an uncle, an adult male in the family. She did not want to tell this because she really did not want to divulge something that would hurt the family, though she was hurt.

We must do all that we can to train and teach parents to know when perhaps something is wrong with their child and the child has been sexually abused.

Abuse in all other forms tends to be detected earlier than that of sexual abuse. So, Mr. Chairman, the American Academy of Pediatrics believe that parents need not feel frightened or helpless about this problem, and they provide the following information: One must teach one's child about the privacy of his or her body parts; listen to the child to ensure that, if something is wrong and it is difficult for them to bring this out, for one to really draw and continue to give them that support; giving one's child enough time and attention where he or she will divulge this; know one's child and what type of time is being spent with her; check one's child to make sure there is nothing wrong physically; talk to one's child about sexual abuse; let them know that even, yes, surely someone in the family could abuse them sexually; and then have them to tell somebody in authority when this has happened.

We cannot, Mr. Chairman, continue to allow our young children to be sexually abused because it does, as it has been said, go on into adulthood, and then they, too, become an abuser.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I appreciate the gentlewoman's personal stories as an educator. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM). The reason for emphasizing sexual abuse is to note that children may be sexually abused by family members or nonfamily members and are more frequently abused by males, but boys and girls are victimized. One is not more than the other.

The key of this is to give an extra added emphasis tool, if you will, not exclusionary tool, to these child abuse investigators to remember that sexual

abuse can be the silent abuse, that one really must have to investigate very thoroughly.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to say the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has said it all. I support her amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 321, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JONES OF OHIO TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. JONES of Ohio to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MCCOLLUM:

Page 2, line 17, strike ''Section'' and insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—Section''.

Page 3, after line 6, insert the following:

(b) INTERACTION WITH ANY CAP.—Subsection (a) shall be implemented so that any increase in funding provided thereby shall operate notwithstanding any dollar limitation on the availability of the Crime Victims Fund established under the Victims of Crime Act of 1984.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It strengthens the underlying bill and manager's amendment by ensuring that any increase in funding provided for under the bill will not be prejudiced by any dollar cap imposed on the victims of crime fund. This will help to ensure that Congress will not attempt to balance the budget on the backs of crime victims in general and victims of sexual abuse in particular.

I wish I was not forced to offer this amendment, but I must do so because I fear that some will attempt to tap into money which will otherwise be available to assist in criminal enforcement and compensate crime victims. As a matter of fact, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill, which has recently passed this House, would have us cap the amount of money available to crime victims at $500 million in a futile effort to balance the budget.

I have some concern that any caps imposed by Congress could threaten the stream of victims compensation payments. As a matter of fact, in 1996, the needs of crime victims were so great that we expended funds in excess of the proposed cap.

To victim advocates such as myself, maximizing the stream of victim assistance grants through the Victims of Crime Act is of the utmost importance, given the many large gaps in victims services found in most communities today.

We should never allow any cap to limit the amount of funds available for the prosecution of child abuse cases. This is why the amendment is supported by victims groups such as the National Organization for Victims Assistance. My amendment guarantees that this bill will take full and immediate effect regardless of any gap.

If my colleagues support victims of crime in general and child abuse victims in particular, they should support this amendment. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for the amendment and say it is agreeable to me, and I am more than happy to accept the amendment she is offering. It is a perfecting amendment, as I understand it.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his support and encouragement.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for a very astute amendment. Without resources, we cannot do our job. I will be happy to support the amendment, and I congratulate the gentlewoman for her effort and vision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 321, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) will be postponed.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALLAHAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. HANSEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 764) to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes 470, 471, 472, and 473. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on all four votes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m.

□ 1636

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM) at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 321 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 764.

□ 1637

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 764) to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes, with Mr. BLUNT (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) had been postponed and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 321, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM); amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

AYES—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer
Boucher
Jefferson
LaHood
Mascara
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Moore
Scarborough
Waters

□ 1658

Mr. PAUL changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 321, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JONES OF OHIO TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 389, noes 32, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

AYES—389

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell

Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
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)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—32

Archer
Barr
Burton
Campbell
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Collins
Deal
Doolittle
Everett
Goode
Hefley
Herger
Hostettler
Hunter
Kingston
Largent
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Manzullo
Paul
Porter
Riley
Sanford
Schaffer
Shadegg
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Tancredo
Watts (OK)

NOT VOTING—12

Blumenauer
Ganske
Goodling
Hutchinson
Jefferson
Jones (NC)
LaHood
Mascara
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Scarborough
Taylor (NC)

□ 1706

Mr. HERGER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HANSEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 764) to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 321, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—425

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)

Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—2

Chenoweth-Hage
Paul

NOT VOTING—7

Blumenauer
Fletcher
Jefferson
LaHood
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Scarborough

□ 1725

Mr. SANFORD changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2606, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 307, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 27, 1999, at page H8831).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2606, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

This matter that we are addressing now is something that has been discussed for a great many months. During the rule we talked about the amount of money. True, it is $2 billion below what the President requested. True, it is less than last year. But it is all the money that we can afford under the circumstances this year.

So I ask the Members to consider where we are and what we are offering, and that is an opportunity for the administration to have an effective foreign policy capability with the monies that are available without increasing taxes. The President has suggested that we increase taxes to meet these new needs. This Congress, Mr. Speaker, is not going to do that, and I think both sides of the aisle as well as the President recognize that.

So we are not going to include any new taxes. This Congress has said that we are going to live within the budget caps so we are not going to break the budget caps. This Congress is not going to interfere with the ability that we fund adequately Social Security. So we are not going to break Social Security. We are going to cut foreign aid below the President's request, cut foreign aid below last year. I think it is a responsible thing to do because this is the very thing we are asking Americans to understand in every domestic policy that we have facing us.

So we have a good bill. We have worked in a bipartisan fashion to bring together a bill that recognizes and facilitated the needs of most every Member of Congress that came before us. They came and they asked for assistance to Africa. We increased the assistance to Africa. They came and they asked that we increase child survival. Mr. Speaker, I created the child survival account so I willingly went along with the gentlewoman from California to increase child survival to $700 million, a great step in the right direction.

We tried to hold down on earmarks where we would not hamstring the administration into having to spend money in areas that they did not want to. So we removed most all of the earmarks. We have given them a responsible piece of legislation that affords the President and the Secretary of State to have an effective capability of running the State Department and running our foreign policy.

So we have a good bill, no one disputes that. The only argument that we are going to hear this afternoon is, Mr. Speaker, it is not enough money. But keep in mind, it is not uncommon for this Congress, in fact to the best of my recollection, in every Congress for the last 25 years, the Congress has reduced the President's request. This request is lower than his request, and I am sorry, Mr. President, but we do not have any more money. We are not going to raise taxes; we are not going to take it out of the national defense.

H.R. 2606 - FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE						
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES						
Subsidy appropriation	765,000	839,000	759,000	785,000	759,000	-6,000
Emergency funding (by transfer)	(10,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-10,000)
(Direct loan authorization)	(1,333,000)	(1,687,000)	(1,350,000)	(1,333,000)	(1,350,000)	(+17,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(12,702,000)	(13,825,000)	(10,400,000)	(10,500,000)	(10,400,000)	(-2,302,000)
Administrative expenses	50,000	57,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	+5,000
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	400	.....	.....	.....	.....	-400
Negative subsidy	-25,000	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	+10,000
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States	790,400	881,000	799,000	825,000	799,000	+8,600
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION						
Noncredit account:						
Administrative expenses	32,500	35,000	35,000	31,500	35,000	+2,500
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	840	.....	.....	.....	.....	-840
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections	-260,000	-303,000	-303,000	-303,000	-303,000	-43,000
Direct loans:						
Loan subsidy	4,000	14,000	10,500	14,000	14,000	+10,000
(Loan authorization)	(136,000)	(130,000)	(85,000)	(100,000)	(130,000)	(-6,000)
Guaranteed loans:						
Loan subsidy	46,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	-36,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,750,000)	(1,000,000)	(850,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-750,000)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	1,260	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,260
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation	-175,400	-244,000	-247,500	-247,500	-244,000	-68,600
TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY						
Trade and development agency	44,000	48,000	44,000	43,000	44,000	.....
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance	659,000	685,000	595,500	620,500	599,000	-60,000
(Loan authorizations)	(15,921,000)	(16,642,000)	(12,685,000)	(12,933,000)	(12,880,000)	(-3,041,000)
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Agency for International Development						
Child survival and disease programs fund	650,000	555,000	685,000	.....	715,000	+65,000
UNICEF	.....	.....	.....	(105,000)	(110,000)	(+110,000)
Emergency funding	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
Development assistance	1,225,000	780,440	1,201,000	1,928,500	1,228,000	+3,000
Transfer out - UNICEF	.....	.....	.....	(-105,000)	.....	.....
Central America and the Caribbean Emergency Disaster Recovery Fund (Emergency Funding)	621,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-621,000
Emergency funding (transfer out)	(-17,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+17,000)
Development Fund for Africa	.....	512,560	.....	.....	.....	.....
International disaster assistance	200,000	220,000	200,880	175,000	175,880	-24,120
Emergency funding	188,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-188,000
Micro & Small Enterprise Development program account:						
Subsidy appropriation	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	.....
(Direct loan authorization)	(1,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-1,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(40,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(40,000)	(30,000)	(-10,000)
Administrative expenses	500	500	500	500	500	.....
Urban and environmental credit program account:						
Subsidy appropriation	1,500	3,000	.....	1,500	1,500	.....
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(14,000)	(26,000)	.....	(14,000)	(14,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	5,000	5,000	5,000	4,000	5,000	.....
Development credit authority program account:						
(By transfer)	.....	(15,000)	.....	(7,500)	(3,000)	(+3,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	.....	(200,000)	.....	.....	(40,000)	(+40,000)
Subtotal, development assistance	2,942,500	2,078,000	2,093,880	2,111,000	2,127,380	-815,120
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	44,552	43,837	43,837	43,837	43,837	-715
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development	479,950	507,739	479,950	495,000	495,000	+15,050
Emergency funding (by transfer)	(8,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-8,000)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	10,200	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,200
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General	30,750	25,261	25,000	25,000	25,000	-5,750
Emergency funding (by transfer)	(1,500)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-1,500)
Total, Agency for International Development	3,507,952	2,654,837	2,642,667	2,674,837	2,691,217	-816,735

H.R. 2606 - FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance						
Economic support fund:						
Camp David countries	1,855,000	1,645,000	1,695,000	1,695,000	1,695,000	-160,000
Other	512,000	894,000	532,000	500,000	482,000	-30,000
Rescission	-5,000					+5,000
Subtotal, Economic support fund	2,362,000	2,539,000	2,227,000	2,195,000	2,177,000	-185,000
Emergency funding	211,500					-211,500
Emergency funding (transfer out)	(-3,770)					(+3,770)
International Fund for Ireland	19,600		19,600		19,600	
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States	430,000	393,000	393,000	535,000	535,000	+105,000
Emergency funding	120,000					-120,000
Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union	801,000	1,032,000	725,000	780,000	735,000	-66,000
Emergency funding	46,000					-46,000
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	3,990,100	3,964,000	3,364,600	3,510,000	3,466,600	-523,500
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Inter-American Foundation						
Appropriation		22,300				
(By transfer)	(20,000)		(5,000)	(18,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)
Total	(20,000)	(22,300)	(5,000)	(18,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)
African Development Foundation						
Appropriation		14,400				
(By transfer)	(11,000)		(14,400)	(12,500)	(14,400)	(+3,400)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	137					-137
Total	(11,137)	(14,400)	(14,400)	(12,500)	(14,400)	(+3,263)
Peace Corps						
Appropriation	240,000	270,000	240,000	220,000	235,000	-5,000
Emergency funding (by transfer)	(1,769)					(-1,769)
Department of State						
International narcotics control and law enforcement	261,000	295,000	285,000	215,000	285,000	+24,000
Emergency funding	255,600					-255,600
Migration and refugee assistance	640,000	660,000	640,000	610,000	625,000	-15,000
Emergency funding	266,000					-266,000
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund	30,000	30,000	30,000	20,000	12,500	-17,500
Emergency funding	165,000					-165,000
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs	198,000	231,000	181,630	175,000	181,600	-16,400
Emergency funding	20,000					-20,000
National Commission on Terrorism	840					-840
U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom	3,000					-3,000
Total, Department of State	1,839,440	1,216,000	1,136,630	1,020,000	1,104,100	-735,340
Department of the Treasury						
International affairs technical assistance	3,000	8,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	-1,500
Debt restructuring	33,000	120,000	33,000	43,000	33,000	
Emergency funding	41,000					-41,000
United States community adjustment and investment program	10,000	17,000				-10,000
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury	87,000	145,500	34,500	44,500	34,500	-52,500
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance	9,664,629	8,287,037	7,418,397	7,469,337	7,531,417	-2,133,212
Appropriations	(7,675,192)	(8,287,037)	(7,418,397)	(7,469,337)	(7,531,417)	(-143,775)
Emergency funding	(1,994,437)					(-1,994,437)
Rescission	(-5,000)					(+5,000)
(By transfer)	(10,230)	(15,000)	(19,400)	(38,000)	(22,400)	(+12,170)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(11,269)					(-11,269)
(Loan authorizations)	(55,000)	(256,000)	(30,000)	(54,000)	(84,000)	(+29,000)

H.R. 2606 - FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
International Military Education and Training	50,000	52,000	45,000	50,000	50,000	.....
Foreign Military Financing Program:						
Grants:						
Camp David countries	3,160,000	3,220,000	3,220,000	3,220,000	3,220,000	+60,000
Other	170,000	560,000	250,000	190,000	200,000	+30,000
Subtotal, grants	3,330,000	3,780,000	3,470,000	3,410,000	3,420,000	+90,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(29,910)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(+585)
Direct loans:						
Subsidy appropriation	20,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-20,000
(Loan authorization)	(167,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-167,000)
FMF program level	(3,497,000)	(3,780,000)	(3,470,000)	(3,410,000)	(3,420,000)	(-77,000)
Total, Foreign Military Financing	3,350,000	3,780,000	3,470,000	3,410,000	3,420,000	+70,000
Emergency funding	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund:						
Offsetting collections	-19,000	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000	+13,000
Peacekeeping operations	76,500	130,000	76,500	80,000	78,000	+1,500
Total, title III, Military assistance	3,507,500	3,956,000	3,585,500	3,534,000	3,542,000	+34,500
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(29,910)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(+585)
(Loan authorization)	(167,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-167,000)
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
International Financial Institutions						
World Bank Group						
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Global Environment Facility	192,500	143,333	50,000	25,000	35,800	-156,700
Rescission	-25,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+25,000
Subtotal, Global Environment Facility	167,500	143,333	50,000	25,000	35,800	-131,700
Contribution to the International Development Association	800,000	803,430	568,600	776,600	625,000	-175,000
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency	.....	10,000	.....	10,000	4,000	+4,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	.....	(50,000)	.....	(50,000)	(20,000)	(+20,000)
Total, World Bank Group	967,500	956,763	618,600	811,600	664,800	-302,700
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital	25,611	25,611	25,611	25,611	25,611	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	.....
Fund for special operations	21,152	.....	.....	.....	.....	-21,152
Contribution to the Inter-American Investment Corporation	.....	25,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund	50,000	28,500	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank	96,763	79,111	25,611	25,611	25,611	-71,152
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital	13,222	13,728	13,728	13,728	13,728	+506
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(647,858)	(672,745)	(672,745)	(672,745)	(672,745)	(+24,887)
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund	210,000	177,017	100,000	50,000	77,000	-133,000
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank	223,222	190,745	113,728	63,728	90,728	-132,494
Contribution to the African Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital	.....	5,100	.....	5,100	1,000	+1,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	.....	(80,000)	.....	.....	(16,000)	(+16,000)
Contribution to the African Development Fund	128,000	127,000	108,000	.....	77,000	-51,000
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Paid-in capital	35,779	35,779	35,779	35,779	35,779	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	.....
Total, International Financial Institutions	1,451,264	1,394,498	901,718	941,818	894,918	-556,346
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,274,815)	(2,429,702)	(2,299,702)	(2,349,702)	(2,335,702)	(+60,887)

H.R. 2606 - FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
International Organizations and Programs						
Appropriation	187,000	293,000	167,000	170,000	170,000	-17,000
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	.....
Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance	1,638,264	1,687,498	1,068,718	1,111,818	1,064,918	-573,346
Appropriations	(1,663,264)	(1,687,498)	(1,068,718)	(1,111,818)	(1,064,918)	(-598,346)
Rescission	(-25,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+25,000)
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,274,815)	(2,429,702)	(2,299,702)	(2,349,702)	(2,335,702)	(+60,887)
TITLE VI						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
International Monetary Programs						
Loans to International Monetary Fund	3,361,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-3,361,000
United States Quota, International Monetary Fund	14,500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-14,500,000
Total, International Monetary Programs	17,861,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-17,861,000
Grand total	33,330,393	14,615,535	12,668,115	12,735,655	12,737,335	-20,593,058
Appropriations	(31,313,456)	(14,615,535)	(12,668,115)	(12,735,655)	(12,737,335)	(-18,576,121)
Emergency appropriations	(2,046,937)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-2,046,937)
Rescission	(-30,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+30,000)
(By transfer)	(12,730)	(17,500)	(21,900)	(40,500)	(24,900)	(+12,170)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(21,269)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-21,269)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(29,910)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(+585)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,274,815)	(2,429,702)	(2,299,702)	(2,349,702)	(2,335,702)	(+60,887)
(Loan authorizations)	(16,143,000)	(16,898,000)	(12,715,000)	(12,987,000)	(12,964,000)	(-3,179,000)
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP						
Total mandatory and discretionary	31,246,456	14,615,535	12,668,115	12,735,655	12,737,335	-18,509,121
Mandatory	44,552	43,837	43,837	43,837	43,837	-715
Discretionary	31,201,904	14,571,698	12,624,278	12,691,818	12,693,498	-18,508,406

□ 1730

We are not going to break the caps, and we are not going to touch Social Security. That is our position.

We received a letter today from AIPAC, the Jewish lobby who is so interested in helping our ally, Israel. AIPAC is supportive of this bill. We have provided, I think, as best we can; and certainly the Armenian people feel like we have provided adequately for them under the circumstances.

Everybody would like to have more money. But more money is not available for everybody. We can recommend to the White House some things they might do. The President might stop going to places like Africa with 1,700 people with him, spending $47 million of taxpayers' money. We might save some money in areas like that.

I suggested earlier, Mr. Speaker, that we might impose a visitors' tax on the White House, not for American citizens, but for foreign dignitaries who come to the White House and are greeted with a royal dinner there.

Then after dinner, they all sit around with a glass of wine, and they toast one another, and they talk about what great friends we are. Inevitably, the President of the United States promises them some more money and then calls it an obligation that we, the Members of Congress, who have the responsibility of appropriating the monies that are available to us, must then decide on whether or not it is merited.

So we have a good bill. We have a bipartisan drafted bill. We have a good bill for the administration, because it gives them the flexibility that he needs, and it does not raise taxes, does not hurt Social Security, does not take away from the national defense.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Having recently returned from Israel, Lebanon, and the Palestinian Authority, I wish to urge the House to consider the great opportunity before us to use American food surpluses as a tool to build stability in the Middle East and aid in sustaining the peace process.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate the fiscal year 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations conference report, I wish to focus the attention to the House on a nation in the Middle East is rarely mentioned on this floor, Lebanon. There are strong historical ties between the Lebanese people and the American people—ties that have been repeatedly reinforced by new generations of Lebanese who have immigrated to the United States.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, as we, hopefully, move toward a lasting and just peace in the Middle East, we must recognize the importance of regional stability for the maintenance of that peace. Lebanon is critical to that stability. The pro-market orientation of Lebanon's economy has not alone been sufficient to create economic health in that country. The Lebanese people are struggling to rebuild a society and infrastructure devastated by 15 years of civil war.

We now have an opportunity to assist by allocating U.S. surplus commodities to Lebanon and allowing the proceeds of the sale of these commodities to be invested in medium and long-term development projects in that country.

A preliminary assessment by the Faculty of Agriculture and Food Security at the American University of Beirut suggests that commodities such as corn, soybeans, alfalfa, rice, and red meats would be well suited to the country's needs and circumstances. These commodities have high water requirements and are therefore not produced in water-scarce Lebanon.

Agriculture is an important sector in the Lebanese economy, and there are many areas in which its economic performance could be improved by investments in irrigation networks, an agricultural extension service, modern agricultural processing and marketing systems, scholarships, or endowments for agricultural science, establishment of a land resource database, or many other investments important to developing an agricultural economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to consider the importance of Lebanon to a long-lasting Middle East peace and urge the Departments of State and Agriculture to think creatively about ways to use American agricultural surpluses to sustain the peace process.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. As I have said earlier in the day, I do so with great regret, because I had hoped that, in the course of the legislative process, we would be able to come up with a bill that would meet the needs that we have as a leader in the world as well as one that addressed our concerns about export finance and helping to promote U.S. products abroad.

I do this, though, with great admiration and commendation to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Agencies. He did the best that he could with what he had, and that was not much. It was not enough. But he did have a balanced set of priorities in the bill that he did right.

I take issue, though, with what has been said here in this discussion so far and earlier when we debated the rule. It has been said that there is not going to be any more money for foreign aid because the Democrats want to take money from the Social Security fund to spend it on foreign aid.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and his colleagues know that that is a disingenuous proposal. The fact is that this bill would not be supported by the organization that the gentleman cited as supporting this bill unless they knew that the funding for the Wye agreement would be put before this Congress and put before this Congress soon.

So do not on the one hand tell us we do not want to spend any more money on foreign aid and then on the other hand tell the outside groups, do not worry, the money for the Wye River agreement will be in the bill, just later, so we can make a presentation that says we do not want to spend money on foreign aid. They do, and they want to take it out of one's Social Security, when they know very well that that money is going to be in this bill but at a time that will not be in time for the Wye River agreement. That is why I have a serious concern.

The commitments for the assistance to the parties made at Wye River have become even more important now given the new timetable outlined in the Sharm-El-Sheikh agreement. This agreement calls for the completion of the framework status negotiations by February of next year.

The Wye funds are targeted to fund critical activities for both Israel and the Palestinians. It would make these negotiations more viable.

There are conflicting messages, as I said, coming from the other side about whether the Wye agreement, Wye funding would occur this fall. I for one say it is very, very important for us to have the money in this bill. Let us be honest with the American people about what funding is necessary for us to honor our commitments.

There are also other cuts in the allocation that are serious in addition: Two hundred twelve million dollars or 31 percent is cut from the President's request for democratization and economic recovery programs in Africa, Latin America, and Asia that are meant to give the administration tools to respond to new threats and crises.

Five hundred million dollars is cut from international banking lending programs to the poorest countries in the world, including from IDA, the Asia America Development Bank, InterAmerican Bank, and from the environmental mitigation programs of the global environmental facility. Eighty-seven million dollars is cut from debt relief programs. The additional resources the administration requested to fund the new historic G–7 plan for debt relief has not even been considered.

Two hundred ninety-seven million dollars was cut for the New Independent States programs, severely cutting back on the funding for combined threat reduction initiative. Also cutting funds for pro-reform governments, nongovernmental democratic reforms, and nuclear threat reductions. And $80 million is cut from the request for the Ex-Im bank which helps American companies sell their products abroad.

I enumerate some of these cuts for the following reasons: Three of the pillars of our foreign policy which ensure our national security are stopping the

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This bill cuts the funding for that.

Promoting democratic values throughout the world so that we are dealing with democratic governments, not authoritarian regimes which attack their neighbors and oppress their people. That funding is cut from this bill.

The funding for the Ex-Im Bank. One of the pillars of our foreign policy is growing our economy by promoting our exports abroad. That funding is cut $80 million in the Ex-Im Bank alone.

When we are cooperating with other countries to help them grow their economies and promote their democracies, we are doing what is the right thing. But we are also developing markets for U.S. products abroad.

All of what we talk about in this bill is in the national interest of the United States. We are a great country. We are probably the greatest country that ever existed on the face of the earth. Yet, we act like pikers. We do not understand what our responsibilities are in the world when it comes time to living up to our responsibilities. Certainly we intend to save Social Security. We intend to save it first.

The Democrats will be second to none in saving Social Security. But do not hand this Congress and this country a bill of goods to say that my colleagues are not going to spend the money on the Wye River agreements when we know that they are. If they were not going to, there would be no way an organization like AIPAC would be supporting this bill, as the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) indicated that they were. They know they have a guarantee that that money will be there.

Well, we want it there now when it is in time for the February framework talks. We want our colleagues to be honest with this Congress about how much money will be spent.

When they do the Wye River money, are they contending that that money will be coming out of the Social Security account? If they are contending it when we are proposing it, then they have to contend it then. I do not think it is in either case.

So I encourage our colleagues to let us be honest about what we are talking about here today. Let us live up to our responsibilities. I said earlier today, the city I am proud to represent, San Francisco, was named for Saint Francis. The prayer to Saint Francis is our anthem.

The first line is familiar to my colleagues while they may not recognize its title. That is, ''Oh, Lord, make us a channel of thy peace.''

Our country can be a channel of peace in the Middle East, in the Balkans, in Northern Ireland, and other places throughout the world, but we cannot do it unless we have the resources to commit to promoting prodemocratic reform and stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. And we cannot do it unless we have the appropriate tools for the administration to carry out that great mandate that our country has.

Why should we, this great country, be about the last per capita in terms of the assistance and the cooperation we provide to other countries in the world?

So let us heed the words of John F. Kennedy who at his inauguration, my colleagues may be tired of hearing me say this, but it is my clarion call. Following his very famous statement, ''My fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.'' The very next sentence said, ''Citizens of the world, ask not what America can do for you; but what we can do working together for the freedom of mankind.''

For the freedom of mankind, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill until we can come back to the floor with a product that we can all be proud of, and we can all support. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out just how small a part of the Federal budget this foreign cooperation and assistance is. It is this little blue line in this big yellow pie.

So we are not talking about an opportunity cost for anyone in America taking money from anything else. What we are talking about is investing in a way that it rebounds to the benefit of every person in our country in terms of peace and freedom and exports abroad for America.

So I urge my colleagues to see what a small percentage, less than 1 percent, less than 1 percent, 0.68 percent of the national budget is spent on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I might just address the chart that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) was talking about, that little sliver of pie. What she fails to say is that, included in our foreign aid policy is foreign assistance in the form of the military.

Every time there is a problem in the world, they call on the United States of America. They called on us in Kosovo. They called on us at Desert Storm. They called on us at Haiti. Part of that pie must be expanded.

That sliver becomes almost half the pie of our domestic spending because we utilize our military as foreign assistance to these countries who cannot afford to defend themselves, including Israel, because every time Israel is in trouble, the United States of America, where do my colleagues think we get the money for those missiles to shoot down those missiles that Saddam Hussein was shooting, that is part of our foreign assistance. No country can stand up to the United States of America when it comes to spending money to protecting and helping our allies.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. He is exactly right. Very much of the military budget is for foreign aid purposes and for foreign policy purposes. How much more expensive it is to go into an area because our foreign policy did not work.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), one of the members of our subcommittee, a man very knowledgeable in all aspects of foreign policy.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2606, the Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations Bill for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Agencies.

As a member of the subcommittee, I want to again commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for the outstanding work that he has done, hard work. Shepherding an appropriations bill, particularly this bill, to the process is no easy task. Yet, he has done it with diligence and impartiality, and he has done it, frankly, with extraordinary fairness, I think; and I commend him for that.

I also, of course, want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member. I am disappointed that she is going to oppose this bill.

But I want to thank the staff as well who have contributed so much to bringing this bill to the floor in a shape I think that is satisfactory.

From the beginning, we have worked in a bipartisan fashion to craft a foreign operations bill that reflects our Nation's international priorities, and the chairman mentioned those, while adhering to the budget constraints that we face today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight on a provision in the conference report designed to prevent back-door implementation of the Kyoto Protocol.

Despite what was said during consideration of the rule, in no way does this provision prevent the United States from engaging developing countries under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change signed by President Bush in 1992 and ratified by the Senate. Specifically, Articles 4, 6, and 17 allow voluntary measures and give developed country parties authority to engage in international education, listen carefully, international education, develop technologies, promote sustainable development, and assist vulnerable developing countries.

I point out to my colleagues that not one of these activities arises out of the Kyoto Protocol.

The funding prohibition states that no fund shall be used to implement or prepare to implement the Kyoto protocol.

□ 1745

Not one of the aforementioned diplomatic activities arising out of the U.N. Framework Convention is prevented by this prohibition.

The administration is free to engage developing countries under the U.N. Framework Convention. However, the administration cannot cross the line and engage other nations regarding ratification and implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, which the United States deems totally unworthy of ratification and implementation.

The conference report was crafted, again, in a bipartisan fashion and taking into consideration all of the views, certainly of everybody in this House. And the subcommittee, I think, has worked very well to bring all this together. We need to unite behind this fair bill that will maintain U.S. leadership and strengthen our influence across the globe.

I ask for Members certainly on the other side to rethink their thoughts about voting against this bill. We need to support this conference report.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a very distinguished member of the subcommittee and a champion for democracy and peace throughout the world.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, reluctantly, to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, during the August debate, I was quite clear in expressing my strong reservations about this foreign aid bill. But I voted for it, hoping that some of the most egregious funding cuts would be remedied in conference and the overall flaws in the bill would be repaired through bipartisan negotiations.

I want to commend my friend and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and our ranking member and my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for their hard work in crafting this bill. Despite their best efforts, however, I believe that this bill, plagued by poor funding levels from the start, still has serious problems.

The $12.6 billion measure remains $2 billion under the President's request, $1 billion below last year's level. Passing an inadequate foreign aid package will severely harm the United States' ability to maintain its position of leadership in world affairs.

And referring to the comments before of my good friend and chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), in my judgment it will be a costly mistake. Conflict and problems that could be avoided with a modest allocation today may turn into expensive crises down the road. I would think that by now we should all have learned that lesson.

Let me take a moment to highlight a few of the conference report's biggest problems, in my judgment. First, the Wye River aid package is nowhere to be found. Implementation of the Wye agreement between the Israelis and the Palestinians is now on track and steadily moving forward. Both sides have begun to act on their commitments, and we must act on ours. But we have received no commitment from the leadership to include Wye in this fiscal year. Waiting until the spring for a supplemental is just unacceptable. This is a priority of the United States foreign policy, and it should be addressed immediately. Now is a dangerous time to turn our backs on the Middle East.

Secondly, debt relief in this bill is woefully underfunded. A debt relief program for the highly indebted poorest countries is not even authorized.

To further burden the poorest of the poor, the bill cuts $175 million from the International Development Association. IDA is the primary World Bank lender on primary health care, basic education, microcredit, and a number of other critical development programs.

And in a final blow to the poorest of the poor, the bill provides $22 million less than the President's request for international organizations and programs. This will be disastrous for the United Nations Development Program, which attacks the roots of poverty by creating jobs, promoting economic growth, and providing education and basic social services. Underfunding this program will decrease our contribution to UNDP and will decrease United States leadership in this critical organization.

The list of underfunded accounts is too long to enumerate. The bill is not good for our programs in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and throughout the world.

I stated very clearly during the initial House debate on this measure that my continued support was contingent upon an increase in overall funding levels and inclusion of the Wye aid package. I had high hopes that we would craft a final package that would merit everyone's support. But, regrettably, I must oppose this measure. I think we can do better, and I think that in the interest of our national security we need to try.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this conference report. Let us hope we can get back together again, work in a bipartisan way, and meet our priorities. The United States is the leader of the world. And, again, I think by investing now, we are saving millions and millions of dollars later on.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the foreign operations conference report, and I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), for performing magnificently under very difficult circumstances.

I especially commend the gentleman from Alabama for the sections in his bill on family planning. While the gentleman has differing views, this bill clearly reflects the will of the House on U.S. contribution for the U.N.'s Population Fund.

Next week, the 6 billionth person will be born on this planet. When I was born, we had just over 2 billion people. World population is growing at such a rapid pace, we will likely have to support 12 billion people before our world's population stabilizes. It is long past due that we address this problem by rejoining the UNFPA.

I also want my colleagues to know that while this bill regrettably does not have the vital Wye River Accord Middle East Peace funding, it does contain over $5 billion in current funding for our partners in the Arab-Israeli peace process. No one really doubts that Congress will eventually approve the Wye River Accord funding, which the gentleman from Alabama supports. And I am confident that that will happen. What is important to remember now is that this bill contains the full regular funding for our Israeli allies and their partners in peace.

This foreign operations appropriations legislation fully funds the administration's request to wage our war on drugs at its source and continues vital support for the International Fund for Ireland to promote economic justice at a critical point in the peace process.

I also commend the chairman and his committee for sustaining other key programs to support microenterprise development programs. These programs are the only ones that truly work in reaching the poorest of the poor throughout the world.

Moreover, this bill contains important funding to fight the spread of highly contagious tropical diseases. Our country already suffers from the AIDS epidemic that swept out of central Africa. My home State of New York now suffers from a new outbreak of encephalitis. We are going to have to fight these diseases far from our shores to prevent future outbreaks of that nature.

On the whole, this legislation is a good compromise, supporting our key allies in programs with the limited resources we have in this year's budget. We all wish we could do more, but we are also committed to protecting Social Security and other important social programs. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this foreign operations appropriations legislation.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the distinguished ranking Democratic member on the House Subcommittee on Domestic and

International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her wonderful leadership in international relations and foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the conference report for H.R. 2606, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. This bill makes drastic cuts in vital foreign assistance programs and endangers the lives of millions of children and families who live in poverty in Africa and Latin America.

This conference report cuts funding for debt relief for poor countries to only $33 million. That is $87 million below the President's request. Moreover, it completely eliminates funding for the Highly Indebted Poor Countries, HIPC, initiative that provides debt relief to countries that desperately need it.

Last week, the International Monetary Fund, IMF, held its 1999 annual meeting right here in Washington, D.C. At this meeting, President Clinton announced his support for the cancellation of 100 percent of the debts owed by poor countries to the United States. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I applaud the President's decision; and I urge Congress to appropriate the funds necessary to make full debt cancellation a reality.

Many impoverished countries have been forced to make drastic cuts in essential social services, such as health and education, in order to make payments on their debts. In Tanzania, debt service payments in 1997 were equal to nine times the spending on basic health services and four times the spending on basic education. In Nicaragua, over half of the government's revenue was allocated to debt service payments in 1997. This was equivalent to 2½ times the spending on health and education combined. Now is the time for Congress to cut debt relief funding.

This inhumane conference report cuts funding for the African Development Fund to $77 million. That is $50 million below the administration's request. The African Development Fund is a vitally important program which provides low-interest loans to poor countries in Africa. Furthermore, the conference report also cuts funding for the African Development Bank, which provides market-rate loans to qualifying African countries.

The conference report also cuts refugee assistance to $625 million, which is $35 million below the administration's request. There are 6 million refugees and internally displaced people in Africa today. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees said recently that the world is neglecting the plight of African refugees. Now is not the time to cut funding for refugees.

I just want to say that some people who would like to make it difficult for us to get up here and be advocates for other parts of the world would have us believe that we are taking the taxpayers' money and we are literally throwing it at undeserving people. Well, I do not think that is true. We are leaders, and we should act like leaders and do the right thing by these very poor countries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a ''no'' vote on this conference report.

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

There has been a lot of conversation about debt forgiveness for these poorer nations or developing countries. Let me tell my colleagues when that came to our attention. Two weeks ago, as we were in the middle of our conference, then the President requested that we include an additional $900 million. That was right after his trip to Africa where he took the 1,700 people with him and at the same time spent $47 million of taxpayer money entertaining his friends in Africa. Then he comes back and says we want an additional billion dollars to forgive debt.

Let me tell my colleagues where that debt came from. The World Bank loaned it to these countries. So what we are saying is, we are going to forgive these countries and pay back the World Bank. We have already given the money to the World Bank. The World Bank made a bad investment, because these people cannot repay their loans. Now we are saying let us forgive their debts and open up their books to the poor where they will be more solvent and can borrow more money.

They are not willing to say we will not borrow more money and get right back in the same shape we are in. When the people who borrowed the money that were running these countries at that time absconded, they did not spend it on the bridges; they did not spend it on health care. They took the money, and they put it in Swiss banks. So now they want us to forgive the debt. Well, maybe that would be the right way to go if they would agree not to borrow any more money.

But the point is that personifies the argument I have been making about the President's foreign policy trips. He goes overseas, and he takes 1,700 of his closest friends with him, with the taxpayers paying the bill. They go over there and hold the glasses of wine up, and the President says, relief is coming. And then he comes back and he calls me, and he tells me to include $900 million more than what I have already requested.

□ 1800

And then it becomes an obligation. All of my colleagues, my great friend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), which are standing up saying fulfill the President's request. He just requested it a couple of weeks ago.

So how can we wait every week for the President to make another trip and come back and say, SONNY, now we need some money for Macedonia. Now we need some money for Albania. Whenever he goes, he comes back with a commitment he thinks that we must respond to.

So we can talk about all of this debt forgiveness we want. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) mentioned the African Development Bank, said we cut them. We did not cut them. We gave them $1 million. We got zero last year. So we actually gave them more money than we got last year. And that was at the request of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON). He came back, and said we need to do this. So we gave it to them. Now they are saying, That is not enough. Now we need another $2 billion.

Well, if we carry this thing over for another week or if we carry it over to October 21 when the continuing resolution comes out, good Lord, the President might make another trip and then the $2 billion he is requesting is going to turn into $3 billion. So let us go ahead and pass this thing today. Tell the President to catch up, slow down on his trips, slow down on his promises, and let us keep this budget balanced, keep Social Security intact, and maintain a strong national defense.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), a leader in international relations for our country, a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say that I have a great deal of affection for both the chair and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. Even as we speak, my office is seeking to facilitate one of the chairman's most recent requests.

But even though ever since Mr. CALLAHAN has become chairman of that Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I have never before voted against a foreign operations bill or a conference report. I am compelled to do so now.

There are only two groups of people who should oppose this conference report: one are people who hate foreign aid, because this is $12.7 billion of foreign aid; the other group are the people who like foreign aid, because this bill is woefully inadequate to meet the needs we have now.

That is not the fault of the chairman. He was given an allocation. He has done as well as he could possibly have done with that allocation. But the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) have all pointed out defects in this bill.

I want to focus on one particular item in the bill that is $1.9 billion less than the President requested, a cut of

more than 13 percent. We are not talking 1 percent here, 3 percent, a 13 percent cut from the President's request, a billion dollars below last year's funding level, and when we count for inflation, way below any other bill that the chairman has asked us to vote for in the past.

But on the particular issue that he has spoken about with respect to the Middle East, this bill does not meet the administration's request or the interests that are served by promoting the peace process in the Middle East. Because this bill includes no funding for the Wye plantation supplemental request of the administration.

Now, some in the leadership on the other side say, oh, well, we will do that later. And I say, when? This year? And they say, oh, no, no, not necessarily. It might be next year. And I say to not do the Wye supplemental, to not appropriate those monies before the February framework agreement is to tell both parties that America's commitments cannot be accounted on, that the sacrifices and the compromises that need to be made cannot be carried out because the funding will not be there.

Who knows what is going to happen next spring or next summer when the Republican leadership may choose to bring up a supplemental, and who knows what will be in that supplemental. This is the time to deal with it. This is when we are concluding our budget request. This accord is being implemented as the parties agree now, and we can do no less than to try to fund something that is so essential to American foreign policy interests.

I urge a no vote on the conference report.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), who is a super guy and good friend of mine. And it has nothing to do with friendship, but I might tell my colleagues, he mentioned that there would be certain groups of people and mentioned how they ought to vote.

Let me tell my colleagues, there are some other groups of people they might consider, too. We might consider that they are the fiscally responsible group, those people who think that we ought to continue to have a surplus rather than creating another deficit as we encountered during the first, I guess, 30 years before we took charge of this House. So we have the fiscally responsible group who ought to vote for this bill because it reduces foreign aid.

Secondly, we have those of us who think that we ought to make absolutely certain that Social Security remains solvent. Who knows, we might even be able to solve the notch-baby problem if indeed we can make certain that Social Security is solvent. Who knows what the future holds there.

There are those of us who want to maintain a surplus instead of the deficit that we experienced for the 40 years before we finally, just during the last 2 or 3 years, reached this magnificent level of a surplus instead of a deficit. So there are many groups that ought to look at this bill from many different points of view.

One of them, those who want to protect Social Security, those who want to maintain a surplus instead of going back to deficit spending, those who want to protect the national defense, because one suggestion came that we take away money from the national defense and give it to foreign aid. This is a good bill.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the Democratic ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the charm of the chairman of the committee and the grace of the gentlewoman from California. I do not.

But let me say it as plainly as I can. It is not the fault of the chairman. They have got a disastrous budgetary process forced on them by the whip and the leadership of their party. They refused to really sit down and work out a bipartisan proposal. And the failure of this particular bill will cost us an enormous amount of more money.

We spent a billion dollars under George Bush in Haiti trying to deal with refugees that was flooding Florida, as the chairman of the full committee understands. We spent $61 billion on the Gulf War. We got a lot of that back. But we had to lay out most of it up front. We have spent $5 billion on Kosovo.

My colleagues do not want this President to travel. I have watched the President travel from Ireland to Israel. Wherever this President has traveled, America's interests have succeeded; and he has moved the peace process forward. We ought to encourage him to continue to do that because it is better for America.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the good friend of mine to tell him that I do not mind the President traveling. I think the President should travel.

We all know that in the last year and a half of any presidential term, especially when he is a lame duck, that every President wants to build up an international image. So we can expect the President to travel. I encourage that.

Use Air Force One, that magnificent airplane. Fly all over the world. Impress people. But do not take 1,700 people with him, do not spend $47 million every time the wheels touch down; and every time a glass of wine is raised, do not promise these countries the moon and expect it to be an obligation on the part of the Congress of the United States to fund.

So let me encourage the President to travel. I wish he would go ahead and be gone this week. We could probably settle all this stuff if he would just take a trip. Just do not take 1,700 people with him. Do not take a blank checkbook and make all these promises and expect me to come before this floor and convince the American people that they ought to cut back on their spending.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say I should have added ''charm''. I wish I was as articulate, but the proposition of my colleagues is wrong. We have got a proposal before us that does not meet America's interest. We ought to vote this down and come back with a bipartisan solution that deals with America's foreign policy interests. I thank the gentleman for his graciousness.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the gentleman would yield himself some more time so he could yield to me. He is so generous.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds in order to facilitate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) as I have facilitated her at every segment of this process.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has been most gracious. It is just that there is not enough money in the bill to meet our international responsibilities. But I did want to point out because the gentleman said that the President asked for $900 million. That, as the gentleman knows, is not just for this year but over a period of time.

I also want to make sure I am inferring correctly from the remarks of the gentleman that since we are not going to spend any more money that there will be no money for the Wye Agreement. That is the conclusion that I draw from the statements that have been made by the gentleman and the other speakers from his side.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleague that the Wye Agreement request was not in the President's request. He did not submit that in the budget he sent over here. That came as an afterthought. And now we are saying, well, the President not only wants $2 billion more, he wants $2 billion plus the Wye monies. So we are really talking about the President wanting $4 billion more than what is suggested here in this debate.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because I heard during the debate on the rule that we do not want to spend our money

abroad, that we should not be spending all these tax dollars. Well, I suggest that we spend more money here at home that will have an effect all over the world.

I suggest that we do that by spending more money on the Peace Corps. It may sound like a broken record, but the Peace Corps has been our most effective and most popular foreign aid program.

The President requested more money for the Peace Corps because of the demand out there by the countries in which it serves up. The countries want us and American citizens want to participate in the Peace Corps. The only thing that is holding us from supplying that demand is the money that we appropriate.

Now, it is not the fault of this House. It has been terrific. The chairman of the committee has been terrific. But it is the appropriators on the other side. I suggest that those Americans who are interested in the Peace Corps and want more money in the Peace Corps ought to be petitioning the Members on the other side, particularly the appropriators, to put at least as much money in the budget as the House has.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the ranking member the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the time and certainly thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for his very evenhanded approach to drafting the House version of the foreign operations bill under very tight budget constraints.

Unfortunately, the conference report further cuts programs that I feel are vital to serving those who are less fortunate around the world. I guess the questions that many of us are trying to ask today is, if not now, when?

I was in the meeting when the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations met with Prime Minister Barak from Israel, where we gave him the impression that in this foreign operations bill that we would meet some of the Wye money agreement. There is no evidence in this bill that we are going do that. So, if not now, when will we do it?

We made commitments to the Palestinian authority. If not now, when will we honor these commitments? We made commitments to the Jordanians. If not now, when will we honor these commitments?

What are the costs associated with peace in the Middle East completely collapsing? Have we measured it in terms of cost to our national defense, to our national security in the Middle East what those costs ultimately will be?

I cannot thank the chairman enough for the $1 million that he was kind enough to appropriate to fulfill one of our commitments to the African Development Bank. It is not enough, but it clearly is a start.

I am also seriously concerned about the low level of funding for debt restructuring, only $33 million, $87 million below the administration's request.

Many nations in sub-Saharan Africa are suffering from crushing levels of debt, both bilateral and multilateral, and these nations will never become self-sufficient until we help decrease some of these debt levels.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question becomes: If not now, if not in a regular appropriations bill, at what point in time will we begin to measure these deficits in terms of national security, in terms of our obligations beyond our borders so that we can have a sustainable growth and sustainable development in the world, which will ultimately cost us if in fact the development is not sustainable and it is not growing?

□ 1815

I have really enjoyed working on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and I certainly urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this inadequate conference report.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the debate in my office, and I was compelled to come to the floor because I heard the gentleman outline some priorities we as a nation should adhere to, and the first priority should be domestic spending.

Now I have heard a lot of talk today about our responsibility around the world, and I agree we have a severe and awesome responsibility. But at the end of the day some of us who have voted to help Head Start, National Endowment for the Arts on this side of the aisle, that have participated in AIDS funding and things vitally important to our Nation, and I have to hear the demagoguery coming from the other side that we are being cheap?

Let us find out how cheap we have been over these decades. Let us think about the money that went out of our taxpayers' wallets to Duvalier and the Marcoses and all these other regimes that pocketed our money and sent them to Swiss bank accounts.

And let us talk about fiscal stewardship. We are in this Congress trying to save Social Security, and I keep hearing this constant refrain from the other side: we are being cheap. Well, Mr. Speaker, right outside the capitol door there are Vietnam veterans living homeless. We are doing nothing about them. But somehow today in foreign ops we have got to sit here, criticize the leadership, criticize the Republicans, call it a stacked deck. Somehow we are not caring for our overseas commitments. Has anybody asked where the money is from the IMF that went to the Russian drug lords? Has anybody asked where that cash is?

The taxpayers of the United States of America are home right now paying the bills, and they pay them every April 15, and they pay them every day, and they pay our salaries, and we have to sit here and listen to this nonsense about our commitment and our responsibility.

And I accept the notion we have that, and I respect the President. He has done wonderfully on the Wye accord, he has done wonderfully in Northern Ireland. My God, he has been everywhere in the world, saving the world, helping Africa. God bless America and God bless him. But at the end of the day we have to save our own people's Social Security, we have to provide and protect Medicare, we have to help our children in education. We have to do for our own people at times and sacrifice some of the spending in foreign operations. And I applaud the gentleman for his leadership; I applaud the gentleman from Florida who has done a masterful job on the appropriation.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am going to encourage my colleagues to vote against this measure. I will agree with the previous speaker that being a Member of Congress is all about setting priorities, and I will agree with him that the priorities start here at home.

This is a list from a recent Washington Post article that talked about young people in the United States military living on food stamps and Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Turns out that there is about 12,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who are eligible for food stamps. Now in the defense authorization bill that was signed today, they got a 4.8 percent increase, but do my colleagues know what? 4.8 percent of nothing is still nothing, and we are not doing enough for them.

This young lady is the wife of a United States marine. Same article. She is picking up a used mattress off the side of the road so that other young marines will have someplace to sleep. 4.8 percent of nothing is nothing.

This is a young Marine lance corporal. His name is Harry Schein. He works two part-time jobs so that he can live on his salary that he earns as a United States marine.

It is all about setting priorities.

In this bill is $5 billion for two relatively wealthy countries called Israel and Egypt. I happen to think that taking care of those folks is more important. I hope that a majority of my colleagues will think the same way.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond.

I note that the gentleman from Mississippi was arguing my case. I assume he is supporting the bill because we are trying to save the $2 billion out of the

national defense that probably some are suggesting that we take in order that we can provide for these military people. With respect to the assistance to Israel and Egypt, it was this chairman that negotiated the reduction that is going to wean Israel from all economic support that then-Prime Minister Netayanhu agreed to. So we cut Israel by $60 million and $120 million in economic support, we cut Egypt, and we cut foreign aid.

So the gentleman, no doubt, was arguing in favor of a yes vote on this bill because we are doing exactly what he wants us to do.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), a member of the Committee on Commerce and an expert on environmental protection in the world.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I must rise in strong opposition to this bill as it stands, and I would like to alert my colleagues to something they may not know in that this bill unfortunately is infected with one of the host of anti-environmental riders that have really infested our appropriations process this year.

This bill currently has in it language which would shackle and stop the United States of America from negotiating with other countries, particularly developing nations, to try to get them to join us in efforts to stop greenhouse gas emissions from continuing, to do something about global warming. We must move forward to get other nations to join us.

Section 583 specifically says that none of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for issuing rules, regulations, decrees or orders for the purpose of implementation or in preparation, in preparation for implementation of the Kyoto treaty. This is a major defect in this bill. Why is it there? We have alerted the committee to this problem, but this language is there because unfortunately there are those who want to act like an ostrich and put our Nation's head in the sands and not deal with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, we need to defeat this bill, take this out, and reconsider the issue.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations as well and is very well knowledgeable in the foreign operations aspect of this.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the statement of managers notes that HIV/AIDS is much more of a problem in Africa than perhaps any other country. It has great consequences for economic and political stability. The Morehouse School of Medicine, which is the only African American school to be started in this century, can be and should be part of the solution as we address this horrible problem of AIDS. The President of Morehouse School of Medicine is the distinguished Dr. Lewis W. Sullivan, the former Secretary of HHS.

And the Senate has earmarked $5.5 million dollars in this effort. Accordingly, AID must not delay informing a partnership with Morehouse so that AID resources that focus on Africa can be maximized to their fullest extent. There exists a strong community of interests between the people of sub-Saharan Africa and the African-American citizens of our Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, is it not true that in this bill additional new resources were added by the managers to fight HIV/AIDS in Africa?

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, yes, that is correct. HIV or AIDS in Africa is a major issue, and Morehouse can certainly play an important role in fighting HIV/AIDS. I hope that the gentleman from Georgia has been able to convey my willingness to assist Morehouse College and especially the gentleman in whose district Morehouse college is, that it is imperative that we have a foreign aid bill in order to facilitate Morehouse, and I hope that the gentleman from Georgia can talk to his colleagues who are interested in seeing Morehouse College participate in this program, of the importance of voting yes on this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. OBEY for 11 years, I believe, was the Chair of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs and is well aware of the challenge that we have.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the time. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years this House has been wrapped around the axle on foreign aid, or at least for 2 of those years because of Mexico City policy. For years those who supported the Mexico City provisions on family planning felt that that was so important that they needed to block assistance to some of the poorest people on the face of the globe. It was so important that they had to stop our payments of debts that we owed to the U.N. for years. It was so important that we had to block our contributions to the IMF in the middle of the Asian financial crisis last year.

But then this morning the Washington Post carries a story which indicates that the majority whip told the Republican caucus last night that they had to pass this bill as is today without Mexico City if they wanted to remain in control of the House of Representatives. So suddenly conviction apparently evaporates. It took us 2 years to learn that? I am really impressed. So much for conviction, so much for principle.

I think we need to understand why this is being done. It is being done so that the majority party can continue to prevent or to pretend that they are preventing this spending of the Social Security surplus for the coming year. The fact is that my colleagues have already spent, Mr. Speaker, they have already spent almost $25 billion of next year's Social Security surplus, and they know it even if they do not want to admit it. The soundness of Social Security has nothing whatsoever to do with this bill.

This year and next year we will wind up paying down over $230 worth of debt. That is far and away the best thing we will have done to strengthen Social Security over the past 20 years. Only our Republican friends on the majority side can take a success like this and turn it into a crisis through false rhetoric. What this bill does do is fail to keep our word in the Middle East, it fails to do everything that we ought to be doing to reduce the danger of nuclear weapons within the former Soviet Union.

It is another of the long list of items by which the majority politicizes foreign policy to the detriment of us all, and it would be funny if it were not so sad. The majority party's budget, the plans which were announced today, declines to meet our responsibilities in housing, it declines to meet our responsibilities in education, it declines to meet our responsibilities in health care, it declines to meet our responsibilities to veterans, and a whole host of other crucial initiatives domestically and internationally.

This bill declines our responsibility to meet our international obligations and to defend our international interests as aggressively as we can. As the gentlewoman has indicated, this bill, under our colleague's level or anybody else's is far less than 1 percent of our total national budget. That is a small price to pay for protecting our national interests around the world, and I think we do a discredit to this body and the political dialog that takes place here when we pretend that this bill has anything whatsoever to do with Social Security.

□ 1830

That is a small price to pay for protecting our national interests around the world, and I think we do a discredit to this body and to the political dialogue that takes place here when we pretend that this bill has anything whatsoever to do with Social Security.

The only people I know who believe that are the people who are saying it. It is a laughing stock to everyone else in the country who hears it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, in doing so I want to point out a couple of issues that have come up in the course of the debate. First, let me say that I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill because it is beneath the greatness of our country.

We have an opportunity for peace in the Middle East, and yet this bill does

not include funding to the Wye River agreement, this historic opportunity. When Prime Minister Barak was here we all commended him, wished him well, and now we have no money to help meet our commitment to the Wye River agreement. Contrary to what has been said here, the President did make a request for the Wye River funding in his February budget submission, so this committee has in a timely fashion had that request.

Not only do we not include the Wye River funding, we removed the $100 million for Jordan, a commitment that we made to King Hussein with his strong commitment to peace. He gave his life for peace, and we are removing the funding from the bill, while saying all along that it is an emergency that we help Jordan through this transition time. This opportunity in Wye River can be missed if we do not have the money now.

As I say, our colleagues cannot have it both ways. They cannot wink at that constituency that is concerned about Middle East peace with the idea it will be there later, and then say if we put it in today it is coming out of the Social Security fund. That simply is not a straightforward approach to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to save money too. This budget has been declining since the middle 1980s. We have a very low budget figure we are requesting. It is the least we can do for freedom and democracy and peace in the world.

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

Mr. Speaker, at long last we are going to reach that stage where we get to vote on this document. I love this place, and I love the personalities here and the people here. We have so many brilliant people with such diverse opinions that it is interesting to witness, as a Member of this House, the greatness of this House.

The gentleman from Wisconsin used to chair this very committee that I chair. I was a member of his subcommittee. But I will remind him when he was chairman of that subcommittee they created a $100 billion deficit, in addition to the Social Security monies. Now in the last few years, we have been able to reverse that. And now we have a $100 billion surplus. What a great accomplishment.

I do not take credit for doing all this by myself. I had a lot of help. The President takes credit for doing a lot of it, and he had a lot of help.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the gentleman that I led the opposition to those budgets 7 years in a row, the Reagan budgets, which saddled this country with $4 trillion worth of unnecessary debt.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this was during the Clinton administration.

I might tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the President comes to the Congress, and this President has come to the Congress, and he has requested emergency supplemental assistance for Bosnia, he has requested emergency supplemental assistance for Kosovo, for Honduras, for Nicaragua. Now he is coming with Israel, with the Palestinian Authority and with Jordan. I will remind you also he came back in the middle of last year, in the middle of all of our negotiations, and wanted $18 billion for the International Monetary Fund. So we have not been discourteous to this President in responding to his needs.

So we have to second guess what this bill does. I am contending it cuts foreign aid. We might second guess what the headlines might be. I do not have to go back to Alabama to apologize to anyone when I say folks, I voted against increasing foreign aid. They seem to like that, when I say to the people of Alabama that we have a more responsible piece of legislation because we are earmarking a great portion of it for child survival, to make certain that the money goes directly to the people we are trying to assist.

So the headlines might be, ''Callahan votes to reduce foreign aid.'' That would be fine with me, if the Mobile paper wants to do that. It might say, ''Callahan refuses to respond to the insatiable appetite the President has to spend more money.'' It might say, ''Callahan saves Social Security.'' It might say, ''Congress refuses the President's ridiculous request.'' We do not know what they will say. You can go home and answer any of the things your constituents want you to hear.

I am telling you, this is a responsible piece of legislation that responds to the needs of the administrative branch of government, while at the same time recognizing the priorities that we, especially on this side of the aisle, have, that we are going to insist that Social Security not be touched, that we are not going to tolerate taking money away from the national defense, as the gentlewoman from California suggested in the Committee on Rules, and giving it to foreign aid, and that we are not going to increase taxes in order to facilitate the whims of this President.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are today. We have a responsible bill. Yes, it cuts foreign aid. It cuts the President's request, it cuts it from last year. It does not raise taxes, it does not touch the Social Security program. As a matter of fact, it compliments that program.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the members to vote for this responsible bill, and let us deliver it to the President's desk.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

American spending on our foreign policy priorities represents a tiny percentage of our national budget. It is clear, however, that modest investment in key foreign policy initiatives saves us major expenses when regional problems explode into national security crisis. Unfortunately, the bill before us today is vastly underfunded. This measure will only weaken the world leadership of the United States.

I want to take a moment to discuss what I believe is the most glaring omission in this legislation, the lack of any funding to implement the Middle East peace plan signed at Wye. The 1998 Wye Accord was a triumph in U.S. diplomacy. This agreement—which carefully balanced Israeli security considerations with Palestinian economic and territorial gains—put a long-stalled peace process back on track. And the Sharm el-Sheikh agreement, which the parties signed just one month ago, has already led to the implementation of key components of the Wye accord.

A successful Middle East peace process is in the security and economic interests of the United States. Now is clearly not the time for us to renege on the pledges we made at Wye. The $1.2 billion Wye package would provide critical security assistance to Israel, desperately needed economic aid to the Palestinians, and important economic and social funding for Jordan.

Peace in the Middle East has been a paramount U.S. foreign policy goal for decades. This long-impossible dream is finally becoming a reality. Sadly, the funding bill on the floor today fails to address this exciting opportunity. I must oppose the bill and I hope that new legislation will be brought forward which enables the United States to continue its leadership role in world affairs.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2606—the Conference Report on Foreign Operations Appropriations. The report moves us in the wrong direction. Unfortunately, the conference report moves us into a dangerously low budget from foreign opps. Let me just say that we spend less than 1% on the total foreign aid budget when we spend almost a trillion dollars on defense and other related expenses.

People in my district when polled thought that we spend close to 15% on foreign aid. Recently, Governor Whitman suggested that we cut foreign aid to less developed countries. That's greedy and fails to accomplish what we are all about. How can we take away the meager $1 a day that we give to 1.3 billion of the people in these nations that depend on this.

The conference agreement, which provides $12.6 billion in funding, is nearly $2 billion below the President's request and $1 billion less than last year's bill This low level of funding is untenable—it will be impossible for the U.S. to maintain its leadership role in the world community with an inadequate foreign affairs budget.

Nearly every major account in the conference report is underfunded, and one specific initiative, the Africa accounts, are nonexistent. This omission is particularly troubling, as it signals a lack of support for the recent strides made by the countries in Africa. The Development Fund for Africa (DFA) is being cut almost 40% from last year (512 million). I know the other side will point to the other accounts like Child Survival that has funding for Africa. Let me say that the DFA traditionally supports less developed countries and the grassroots programs. Other egregious funding cuts include: $175 million cut from essential loan program for the poorest nations; $157 million cut from global environmental protection projects; $87 million denied for debt relief initiatives for the poorest countries; $50 million

cut from African development loan initiatives; $200 million cut from economic development and democracy-building programs in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; and $35 million denied for Peace Corps programs, just months after Congress voted to support the expansion of the Peace Corps to 10,000 volunteers.

It is abundantly clear that this Foreign Operations bill just won't work. It will not allow the U.S. to continue to operate its important international programs at current levels, and will undoubtedly detract from the stature of the U.S. in the international community. We have learned from recent events that foreign assistance is a good investment—the dollars we spend today help avoid expensive national security crisis tomorrow. This bill will curtail our ability to help prevent the conflicts and curb the poverty that lead to instability throughout the world.

We cannot adequately pursue our foreign affairs priorities with this conference report. And not only does this bill underfund existing needs, but it ignores emerging global needs, such as earthquake recovery in Turkey and Taiwan, peace implementation in Kosovo, and debt relief for the world's poorest countries. We urge you not to settle for this dangerously underfunded bill. Vote ''no'' on the Foreign Operations Conference Report.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama for bringing this conference report to the floor.

While this subcommittee works with one of the smaller allocations, this bill is usually one of the most contentious. The chairman and his staff have done an outstanding job of trying to address numerous concerns while working within the constraints of, what I consider, too small a budget for the important programs that this bill supports. I am pleased that the conference committee continues to recognize the needs of areas of conflict, such as Armenia and Cyprus and I hope that a peaceful settlement will soon be reached in both of these regions.

Further, I strongly support the committee's suspension of military aid to Indonesia and hope that this will be expanded to multilateral assistance until the results of the referendum in East Timor are permanently implemented. Finally, I am pleased with the language in the Statement of Managers supporting biodiversity programs within AID, specifically those implemented through the Office of Environment and Natural Resources, and strongly urge AID to increase funding for these programs to a level proportionally equal to that provided in 1996.

While I am pleased with many of the issues addressed in this bill, I am concerned that the funding for implementation of the Wye Memorandum is not included. This obviously is due to budget constraints and not because of a lack of congressional interest in furthering the Middle East peace process. Israel has made great strides in furthering this process in the last month and I know that the U.S. will find a way to provide the Wye money before the end of the year.

Finally, while I support this bill, I remain concerned with the continued decreases in U.S. foreign assistance. As I have said before, the U.S. is now the sole superpower and world leader. Yet, we are not leading. As our role in the world becomes more important, our budget for foreign operations continues to shrink, thereby, limiting the impact we can have on global development.

It is simply embarrassing. We are the world leader, with the strongest most productive economy in history, yet we continue to refuse payments to global institutions, including the United Nations and World Bank, and provide the smallest amount of foreign assistance to the developing world of any industrial country, in relation to our GDP.

Many of these global institutions were created over 50 years ago and needed reforms to eliminate bureaucracy and changes to update them for the next century. The U.S. was correct in demanding these changes. However, now that many of these reforms have been made, we must live up to our word and pay our contributions. As we refuse payment, we erode our word and reputation. This must stop. I hope that those who are concerned with our multilateral assistance will take a serious look at the progress that has been made in effecting change at these institutions. I believe that they will find that many of their concerns have been addressed.

I look forward to reversing this decline in foreign assistance in the next century and furthering the values that we cherish here—democracy, human rights, rule of law and free markets—to other parts of the world. Again, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Alabama and his staff for their hard work and ultimate success in bringing a free-standing Foreign Operations Conference Report to the floor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 211, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

YEAS—214

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

NAYS—211

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder

Spratt	Thurman	Waters
Stark	Tierney	Watt (NC)
Stenholm	Towns	Waxman
Strickland	Traficant	Weiner
Stupak	Turner	Wexler
Tanner	Udall (CO)	Weygand
Tauscher	Udall (NM)	Wise
Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	Woolsey
Thompson (CA)	Vento	Wu
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Blumenauer	McKinney	Peterson (PA)
Jefferson	Meeks (NY)	Pomeroy
LaHood	Paul	Scarborough

□ 1900

Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. BARCIA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 480, I was unavoidably detained and was absent during the vote. It was my intention to vote ''no'' on this rollcall vote.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LATEX ALLERGY AWARENESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I use this occasion to recognize this week as Latex Allergy Awareness Week, October 4 through 10, 1999, and to talk about an important health issue, an issue which directly affects a constituent of mine, 9-year-old Jimmy Clark of River Forest, Illinois, whose parents have become leading crusaders to make the public aware of this problem.

Mr. Speaker, Jimmy Clark lives with an ailment that is virtually unrecognized by most Americans and the medical community. Jimmy is latex sensitive. Yes, Jimmy is latex sensitive. He is at risk for serious and potentially fatal allergic reactions when exposed to products made from natural latex.

It is critical that we become fully aware and acknowledge the broad and problematic scope of this issue which the American Academy of Dermatology has called the next major health concern of the decade.

Something as simple as eating lunch in his school's cafeteria could be fatal to Jimmy, since latex gloves are commonly used in the food service industries. Jimmy and others like him are allergic to thousands of items ranging from the balloons at his best friend's birthday party to the examining gloves in an ambulance or at a doctor's office.

It is heartbreaking to know that for thousands of American citizens like Jimmy, that exposure to even these seemingly harmless items could cause him to die. He cannot even receive needed medical treatment or enjoy eating lunch at school without fear of exposure to potentially deadly latex particles.

Reactions to exposure include immediate allergic reactions from skin contact resulting in itching and hives. Reactions to the airborne latex particles include inflammation of the eyes, shortness of breath, asthma, dizziness, and rapid heart rate.

The most severe cases can result in severe blood pressure drop and loss of consciousness. Latex allergy develops most commonly in people who have frequent or intimate exposure to it. At high risk are those who have had frequent surgical procedures, particularly in infancy and workers with occupational exposure, especially to latex gloves. A history of allergies or hay fever also may be a significant risk factor.

Some studies suggest that some individuals who have had dermatitis or rash and wear latex gloves may be at greater risk. Although the American public knows little about latex allergy, the last 5 years have shown increasing evidence that latex allergy has become a major occupational health problem which has become epidemic in scope among highly exposed health care workers and among others with significant occupational exposure. This is largely because the use of latex rubber has increased, especially in medical devices, because latex is used as a disease-prevention barrier.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting who or what is at fault. Nor am I suggesting that latex is not an effective instrument in protecting humans from life-threatening diseases. I am suggesting that we need to increase research in this area and find ways to spare the citizens of this country from unnecessarily developing latex sensitivity.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that an increased awareness will go a long ways towards helping find a solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that our researchers work cooperatively to achieve the right solution, a solution not influenced or marred by special interests from different sides of the spectrum, but a solution developed for those most affected by the disease.

Latex allergy organizations and support groups across this Nation have successfully established a State Latex Allergy Awareness Week in several States. I believe once this awareness of this disease increases, our Nation will see with sincere satisfaction the positive results from research and care for those who suffer from its effects. Hopefully, next year as this same time approaches, both Houses will see fit to declare this week National Latex Allergy Awareness Week.

Mr. Speaker, I close by thanking Mr. and Mrs. Clark and Jimmy for stepping up to the plate to help make Americans more aware of a health problem and a societal need. They embody the real spirit of democracy: if not I, then who? If not then, when? I thank both Jimmy and his parents and say to them that River Forest as well as all of America are proud of them.

ISSUES OF CONCERN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak on several unrelated but very important topics. First I want to quote from an Associated Press story of a few days ago: ''A billion-dollar-a-year air war forgotten by the outside world but droning on over dusty Iraqi towns does not appear to be getting Washington any closer to its ultimate goal of ousting President Saddam Hussein.''

The Associated Press story said that we have dropped 1,400 bombs and missiles on Iraq since mid-December in

this forgotten war. A forgotten war that is doing no good, wasting more than $2.6 million each day, bombing people who could be our friends, but instead making new enemies for the United States each and every day. A billion-dollar-a-year air war that is wasteful, useless, inhumane, and according to the Associated Press, not accomplishing its goal.

Second, I want to mention another ridiculously wasteful project. A few days ago NASA lost a $125 million Mars orbiter because one engineering team used metric units while another used English units for a key spacecraft operation. If this had happened in the private sector, heads would have rolled. However, when it happens with taxpayer money done by totally protected civil servants and big government contractors, no one is really held accountable.

We see over and over and over again that the Federal Government is unable to do anything in an economical, efficient, low-cost manner. Because it is other people's money, they really just do not care. If we want our money to be wasted, just turn it over to Federal bureaucrats. They will be paid regardless of how bad a job they do and at a rate that is about 50 percent higher than the average citizen for whom they are supposed to be working.

Today we just cavalierly lose a $125 million machine because we have a government that is of, by, and for the bureaucrats instead of one that is of, by, and for the people.

Third, Mr. Speaker, let me mention the scandalous grant of clemency to the 16 Puerto Rican terrorists responsible for 130 bombings. These bombings killed six people. They left six people dead, and maimed and injured 84 others. One New York City policeman lost his leg and one lost his sight and has 20 pins holding his head together, and the President and the Department of Justice are refusing to give congressional committees the information and papers leading to these grants of clemency. What are they trying to hide?

Senator ORRIN HATCH, a Member of the other body and chairman of its Committee on the Judiciary said, ''The Justice Department today is run by people who do not care about the law.'' The grants of clemency were given against the advice of every law enforcement agency asked about them.

□ 1915

Three examples, Mr. Speaker, of a Federal Government that is simply too big and out of control and wasting billions of hard-earned tax dollars each and every day.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one other concern I have does not deal with Federal Government wasteful spending, but is it possible that many people are spending money in a harmful way on Ritalin.

I mentioned once before on this floor that a retired high-level Drug Enforcement Agency official wrote in the Knoxville News-Sentinel last year that Ritalin is prescribed six times as much in the United States as in any other industrialized nation. He said that Ritalin has the same properties, basically, as some of the most addictive drugs there are.

Now I read in Time Magazine that production of Ritalin has increased sevenfold in the past 8 years and that 90 percent of it is consumed in the United States. Time Magazine said, ''the growing availability of the drug raises the fear of the abuse: more teenagers try Ritalin by grinding it up and snorting it for $5 a pill than get it by prescription.''

Also, I read in Insight magazine that almost all these teenage school shooters in recent years have been boys who were on at the time or had recently been on Ritalin or some similar mind-altering drug.

Now, I believe there are some people for whom Ritalin has been good. But I also read that it is almost always given to boys who have both parents working full time.

I am simply asking if it is a good thing to give such a strong drug to so many, or is it simply a way for a big drug company to make huge profits. Why 90 percent in the United States? Why do we have at least six times as much of this prescribed in the U.S. as any other industrialized nation?

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that parents, teachers, doctors and everyone else will not be so eager to turn to Ritalin, which is really a potentially dangerous addictive drug and will use it only as an absolute last resort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NATIONAL DEFENSE IS IN BAD SHAPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, today, the President signed the defense bill and he gave, in signing the defense bill, a speech in which I think he gave a dangerously false message to the American people. That message was that defense is in good shape.

Defense is not in good shape. We are $3.5 billion short on ammunition for the Army. We are $193 million short on ammunition for the Marine Corps. We have 10,000 uniformed families on food stamps because they are about 13 percent under the wages of their counterparts in the civilian sector.

Our aircraft are in such bad shape that only about 65 percent of them can get off the ground and go do their mission. Our Navy now is lacking 18,000 sailors because we cannot get sailors to join Mr. Clinton's Navy. We are about 800 pilots short in the Air Force, and it costs millions of dollars to train a pilot, and it takes a long time. If the balloon goes up and we have a war, we are not going to be ready.

So the President has cut defense disastrously. His own Joint Chiefs, some of whom stood behind him in that press conference said that his budget was underfunded by about $20 billion. The Air Force said they need an extra $5 billion. The Navy said they need an extra $6 billion a year, the Army an extra $5 billion, and the Marine Corps an extra $1.75 billion. On top of that, they need an extra $2.5 billion a year to pay for the retirement and the wages that are necessary to keep good people in the service.

So the Clinton administration has dragged down national defense.

Now, Congress has added some money to the defense bill. We have added about $50 billion over the last 6 years, but that is not enough. We have added as much as we thought we could add without getting the bill vetoed by President Clinton. Even then, he has threatened vetoes on a number of occasions.

But defense is in difficult condition. It is in bad shape. If we had to fight the two-war scenario, that is, if we had to fight on the Korean Peninsula and we had to fight in the Middle East today, we would have a lot of Americans coming home in body bags because we are short on ammo, short on spare parts, and short on technically knowledgeable people in extremely critical areas. We need more money. We need it desperately.

ASTROS WIN FIRST GAME

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think there is some good news that we have just heard, and I am delighted to be on the floor with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), and that is that the Astros have just won the first game of the division that will lead them on to the World Series.

Though we see no Georgians on the floor because they are playing the Atlanta Braves, I am prepared to offer a bet of some good Texas barbecue that the Astros will win.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. The gentlewoman and I have both talked to the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). He and I talked a little bit. He knows my affinity for Diet Coke, and I bet him some venison sausage from Texas against a case of Diet Coke. It looks like I may get that Diet Coke from Georgia.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with barbecue and venison on the table, I do not think we can miss. I look forward to a victory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CLAUDE BUDDY YOUNG SHOULD BE INDUCTED INTO FOOTBALL HALL OF FAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage the Pro Football Hall of Fame to induct an extraordinary athlete called Buddy Young, a Chicago hero and graduate of the Wendell Phillips High School in my district.

As Chicago Sun Times columnist Steve Neal recently observed, Buddy Young was among the greatest NFL running backs of the modern era.

From 1944 to 1946, Buddy Young was an All American halfback for the University of Illinois' fighting Illini. In his first season as a college football player, Young was runner up for the coveted Heisman Trophy. As one of the most electrifying players on the team, he tied renowned football legend Red Grange's college record for touchdowns.

In 1947, Young led the NCAA college all star football team in an astounding upset victory over defending pro football champions, the Chicago Bears. Due to his outstanding performance during the game, Buddy Young was selected as the game's MVP.

Following his college football career, Buddy showcased his athletic talents on a number of pro football teams. He is best remembered as a standout offensive threat for the Baltimore Colts where he set a kickoff record that is still standing today.

Also, Young's 27.7 per yard kickoff return average is currently ranked fourth in all-time pro football record books. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Young's record and play as a Colt was so superior that the franchise retired his number, an accolade afforded to only eight other Colt football players.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that, of the nine Baltimore Colt football players to have had their numbers retired, Buddy Young is the sole player who has not been inducted into the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

Although well known for his great football accomplishment, Buddy Young has excelled in other aspects of his life. As the director of player relations of the National Football League, Young was the first African American to become an executive in any major sports league.

Additionally, while in college, Young won the NCAA Division I track and field championship in the 100 yard dash, the 220 yard dash, and he set a world record in the 60-yard dash.

Already, Mr. Speaker, Buddy Young's athletic achievements have earned him induction into the College Football, Chicagoland, and the Rose Bowl Halls of Fame.

It is now both fitting and warranted for the Pro Football Hall of Fame to induct this athlete of athletes into its cherished halls.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I again encourage the Pro Football Hall of Fame selection committee to induct Claude Buddy Young into its prestigious and historical group of athletic legends. Only then will Young's place in athletic history be rightfully immortalized alongside other legends of the great game of football.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as I travel my district in central New Jersey, I am constantly confronted with the growth of these communities. Young families are moving into new houses and school principals get phone calls daily from parents who are moving into the area. The opening days of school are challenging for school principals. Some schools in my New Jersey district have kindergartens that are twice the size of the senior class.

Communities across the State and the Nation are struggling, struggling to address the critical need to build new schools and renovate existing ones to make up for years of deferred maintenance and to accommodate rising school enrollment.

Urban and rural and high growth suburban areas all face different and difficult school modernization problems.

The General Accounting Office estimates that $112 billion is needed just to repair existing schools across the Nation. Twenty-four hundred new public schools will be needed by 2003 to accommodate 1.3 million new students and to relieve overcrowding.

With schools bursting at the seams, new schools being constructed every year, property taxes are reaching astronomical rates. These growing communities need relief. Communities in my New Jersey district are voting down needed construction because they cannot afford even higher property taxes.

That is why, together with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), I am working for legislation to ease the burden for fast growing communities as they construct new schools.

The interest on school construction bonds is a big item. Even on a short-term, 15-year tax exempt bond, the interest on the bond may be an additional 65 percent of the value.

Under our legislation, the Federal government would provide tax credits equal to the interest the local communities would pay to investors on these bonds. This emergency Federal assistance would help communities like mine and others across the country meet the needs of our children.

Let me give my colleagues an example from my district to illustrate that we are facing a serious situation. In Montgomery Township, Somerset County, in 1990, their school enrollment was about 1,500 students. Now Montgomery has to provide seats for 3,500 students, an increase of 134 percent in 10 years. Enrollment is expected to rise another 1,500 students over the next 5 years.

The residents of Montgomery have been very supportive of their school system. However, the strain of paying for an annual operating budget coupled with the payment for new buildings is testing the pocketbooks of even the most ardent supporters of public education. They need our help. In some towns in my district, there is now the added expense to rebuild and repair after Hurricane Floyd.

□ 1930

These days school construction and modernization also includes technology infrastructure. Our schools need to keep up to date on technology to ensure our students are ready for the jobs of the 21st century. Employers depend on talent, skills, and creativity of their workforces for their success. Companies, communities, and students all benefit from a vital and a successful educational system.

Many high-tech firms in my district in central New Jersey already invest in the local schools. They have much to offer, especially in technical areas of science and math. The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce has a program called Tech Corps New Jersey which recruits business volunteers with expertise in computer technology to work with schools that need assistance in the area of education technology. I believe we need to encourage these partnerships where businesses can invest in their local communities.

Businesses can easily help schools keep up to date with their technology infrastructure. The E-rate, which supports discounted internet wiring and services to schools and libraries, is a good example of effective Federal local partnership which can help finance technology infrastructure in our schools.

Certainly local taxpayers bear the responsibility for educating their children, and local taxpayers shoulder most of the cost, but the education of our youth is a national responsibility, similar to national defense, and it is time the Federal Government steps up and accepts our responsibility to local districts for the education of our children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBURN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSWOMAN CARRIE MEEK OF FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mr. Speaker, I want to submit for the RECORD an article that ran in the Sunday September 26 edition of the Miami Herald. This article talks about the achievement the gentlewoman from Florida has made and the obstacles she had to overcome to get to Congress. She was the first African American female to serve in the Florida Senate. And when we both were elected to Congress in 1992, this marked the first time in 127 years that an African American from Florida had been sent to Congress.

This year marks 20 years of service for Congresswoman MEEK. Her constituents are proud of her hard work and the results she brings to her district. She has fought for fairness in the appropriations process, and I am proud to recognize the gentlewoman for her accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted to hear that the gentlewoman is paying tribute to our colleague, and I hope that the gentlewoman will allow me to mention that she has taken a leadership role in heading the task force on census for the Congressional Black Caucus and that she has been very diligent in her legislative duties here.

I really compliment the gentlewoman for making a record of this because the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) is a very worthy person.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I also want to add my congratulations to our colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), and I commend the gentlewoman for bringing this to the floor and putting on RECORD her achievements.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN).

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I really would ask all of my colleagues who have not seen this article to read this in the RECORD. It is a wonderful tribute to a woman who has served in her State legislature and is very much admired.

People just came to her to get information and to get help. She was my chairman on the education subcommittee in appropriations when we served together, and she was fairer than anybody I have ever seen because she understood the entire State of Florida, what it meant for rural areas to have funding as well as the urban areas.

We just all love her in Florida, and we all respect her and admire her for the work that she has done. So I would really hope our colleagues do read this article because it is fabulous.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for yielding to me, and I too would add my voice to the accolades that are being paid our good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

I first met her some, and she may not want me to tell how long ago, 25 or 30 years ago, and I got to know her. I followed her career over the years, and my friends in the State of Florida all have said to me what a great person that she was there in the Florida legislature.

When I came here in the class of 1993, it was a great pleasure for me to be here and to have the opportunity to serve with her. It has been a service that I have enjoyed tremendously, and I can truly say that I do not believe that I would be standing here as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus had it not been for the great support and guidance that I received from her since being here in this body.

The people of Florida should be very proud of her. I am pleased to see it here that her hometown newspaper has paid her such a tremendous tribute. It is one that is well deserved.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. In closing, Mr. Speaker, my favorite saying is, ''Let the work I have done speak for me.'' And certainly Mrs. MEEK's work speaks for itself. In fact, I recommend that she look at serving 20 more years. 20 more years of service from the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) would be a great tribute to Florida and to this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the article I referenced above follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Sept. 26, 1999]

REPRESENTATIVE MEEK MAKES 20-YEAR MARK—MIAMI CONGRESSWOMAN DISPLAYS DEFT POLITICAL TOUCH

(By Andrea Robinson)

WASHINGTON.—Though a morning of angry wind and rain has transformed the nation's capital into a virtual ghost town, an intrepid band of Washington luminaries heads toward a meeting room in a basement of the Capitol.

Among the celebrity attendees: House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt, Sen. Bob Graham, Attorney General Janet Reno and U.S. Reps. Charles Rangel and James Clyburn, chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

The draw? U.S. Rep. Carrie Meek, D-Miami, who has summoned an obedient cadre of political figures to speak to a group of her visiting constituents. ''We're here because Carrie told us to be here,'' Labor Secretary Alexis Herman says.

This year, Meek marks 20 years of public service, 13 of them in the Florida Legislature. She is the first black Floridian to win a seat in Congress in recent history, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, a four-time congressional winner whose only general-election opponent earned just 11 percent of the vote.

Over the past 12 months, Meek is credited with boosting her district by helping to secure notable federal allocations—$130 million in employment-zone tax incentives; $35 million in housing grants to rebuild public housing; $2.2 million to jump-start a Little Haiti program for troubled children.

But most remarkable, political observers say, has been Meek's ability to play politics in more than one arena. Meek—an unapologetically liberal Democrat—has managed to solidfy her standing not only with members of her own party but with those across the aisle.

''She's got a nice way, but she's no pushover,'' says Rep. E. Clay Shaw, R-Fort Lauderdale. ''She has a velvet glove, but sometimes she can have a fist in it. She's so likable that it's sometimes disarming.''

BOLDLY STEPPING FORWARD

Once a neighborhood activist, she has become a power broker.

Carrie Meek has never been timid. When she started in politics, she was audacious.

In the Legislature, Meek regularly intensified floor debates, once threatening to camp out on the doorstep of a colleague who was reluctant to increase funding for Jackson Memorial Hospital.

Back then, if she thought a particular bill needed to be killed, she waved a black flag adorned with a skull and crossbones, declaring the measure needed to be ''black flag dead.''

''It's now in the nomenclature of the Legislature. They wanted my son to use it,'' Meek says, referring to state Sen. Kendrick Meek, D-Miami.

Carrie Meek has established a fairly liberal voting record, generally following Democratic endorsements of affirmative action, abortion rights, gun control, and spending on housing and job creation. She has favored increasing the minimum wage, expanding the rights of immigrants, and giving tax credits to small businesses in her district.

Her current causes: Census 2000, which aims to count minorities fully in the upcoming census, and additional research on lupus, the autoimmune disease that claimed her sister.

Meek has sided with Republicans on some matters, such as opposing military defense cuts or foreign-policy adjustments to ease relations with Cuba.

On voting evaluations this year, Meek scored 95 or better with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the nation's largest public service employees union, and with Americans for Democratic Action, a group that promotes human rights.

She fared worse with business groups, scoring 28 with the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and only four with the American Conservative Union, which focuses on foreign-policy, social and budget issues.

At a party Sept. 17, 300 supporters gathered on a Washington rooftop to celebrate Meek's

20-year tenure in politics. The guest list included Miami-Dade Commissioners Betty Ferguson and Dennis Moss, Opa-locka Mayor Alvin Miller and representatives of Washington's black elite.

The woman they toasted had graduated from neighborhood activist to power broker. She is one of 60 members of the House Appropriations Committee, where virtually every spending billion housing, transportation, taxes or juvenile crime—is scrutinized.

Remarkably, Meek won a spot on Appropriations during her freshman year. In that term, she sponsored, and won, a measure providing Social Security retirement for nannies and day laborers. After Hurricane Andrew, she helped to obtain more than $100 million in federal aid for South Florida, and joined the fight to rebuild what had been Homestead Air Force Base.

The past 12 months have brought success and failure.

Meek pushed unsuccessfully for a bill that would employ welfare recipients as census takers. Also stalled is her attempt to increase funding for lupus research.

On the other hand, Meek helped to bring Miami-Dade about $80 million in economic development money this year. And, with the aid of Florida Republican lawmakers such as Rep. Lincoln Diaz/Balart and Sen. Connie Mack, she helped to establish new protections for almost 50,000 Haitian immigrants.

Perhaps the biggest prize was the empowerment-zone designation, which will mean $130 million in tax incentives over 10 years, and millions more in job grants.

Norman Omstein, a policy analyst for the conservative American Enterprise Institute, says Meek has carved out a political niche.

''She's open, frank . . . a nice person who works hard,'' Ornstein says. ''When people say nice things about her, it's not just blowing smoke. She ranges across a series of areas: Cuba, Haitians, housing. What she does is outside the norm.''

Rep. John Lewis, D–Ga., says Meek has kept her eye on an important goal: looking out for the people in her district.

''We see showboats and we see tugboats,'' Lewis says. ''She's a tugboat. I never want to be on the side of issues against her.''

Carrie Pittman Davis Meek was born in Tallahassee. She is a granddaughter of slaves, the youngest of 12 children and a firsthand witness to the injustices of bigotry.

Though she grew up in the shadow of the Florida Capitol, segregation prevented her from setting foot in state offices. Her father, Willie, one of the great influences in her life, took her onto the Capitol grounds on the only day it was permitted—inauguration day.

''I grew up in a discriminatory society,'' she says. ''I knew what it was like to be treated differently. I wanted to see things changed, and wanted to assist any movement to help with changing it.''

Though she graduated with honors in biology and physical education from Florida A&M, her race kept her from medical training at state colleges. She enrolled at the University of Michigan and received a master's degree in public health.

After college, Meek returned to Florida and pursued a career in education, working for 30 years as an instructor at Florida A&M and Bethune-Cookman College, and as an administrator at Miami-Dade Community College.

Her interest in public service was kindled in the late 1960s, when she became the local director of the federally funded Model Cities program. She designed recreation programs for low-income public housing tenants.

''I learned people needed homes, schools, day-care centers,'' Meek says. ''I learned of all these unmet needs in the community.''

In 1979, some tenants in those same Miami neighborhoods urged Meek to run for a vacant seat in the Legislature. Meek initially ran into resistance from some of Miami's black political leaders, who favored James Burke, a Democrat who had name recognition because of a previous unsuccessful House race. Now, Burke is on trial in federal court, accused of bribery.

Meek defeated Burke in the primary, trounced Republican Roberto Casas in the general election, and assumed office with a central goal: to champion ''little people'' causes such as housing, education and equal access.

Over the past 20 years, Meek has achieved milestones: the first black female to serve in the state Senate, the first leader of the state's black caucus, and the first black from Florida in modern history elected to Congress.

Her District 17 stretches through the central part of Miami-Dade, from Carol City to Homestead.

When not in Washington, Meek returns to the house in Liberty City—a few blocks from the Martin Luther King Metrorail station—where she has lived for 35 years.

Divorced twice and living alone, she likes dancing, quiet evenings at home, reading books or playing with Duchess, a great Dane puppy.

HOPES IN LIBERTY CITY

Federal aid for housing shows 'possibilities of what can happen.' It is just after 10:30 a.m. on a recent weekday, and Carrie Meek is riding along Miami's Northwest 27th Avenue. Since a ceremony last month, the street carries her name: Carrie P. Meek Boulevard.

She is headed to the Miami-Dade Housing Agency to join U.S. Housing and Urban Development Secretary Andrew Cuomo for an announcement: a $35 million federal housing award for renovation of the Scott and Carver housing developments in Liberty City.

On three previous attempts, the county missed a shot at the funding. Last year, Meek's staff asked HUD to help the county craft a better application.

Problems are chronic at the housing developments. But with the new money, housing officials intend to start over. Demolition is set for 754 units at Scott Homes and 96 at Carver Homes. In their place, the county will build 382 single-family and townhome units, adding more grass and trees.

The housing agency has great hopes for the project—lower density, reduced poverty, less crime. Meek says the assistance is long overdue.

''It's about the possibilities of what can happen in Liberty City,'' she says.

COOPERATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about cooperatives, but I cannot resist talking about my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

I did not know the gentlewoman before I came to Congress. I did not have that privilege. But we have become soul mates here, and I certainly want to express my admiration for her constituents, who understand her value and the true quality of the person representing them. I want to commend the newspaper, who also understands quality of service. So I just wanted to add those additional remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about cooperatives and to say this is National Cooperative Week, celebrating the founding of cooperatives and why they are special and why we make this recognition.

Cooperative businesses are special because they are owned by the consumers they serve and because they are guided by a set of principles that reflect the interests of those consumers. More than 100 million people are members of some 47,000 U.S. cooperatives, enabling consumers to secure a wide array of goods and services, such as health care, insurance, housing, food, heating, electricity, credit unions, child care, as well as farming.

Farming community cooperatives indeed have been very important. In the agricultural sector, USDA's Cooperative Services' survey of farmer cooperatives for the year 1995 reported that actually there were more than 4,006 cooperatives in operation. These associations provide a variety of services, from buying, as well as producing, as well as marketing. So they have made a difference.

Cooperatives structured properly can be of great benefit to farmers. They focus on their ability to collectively buy at the most economic rates. They also allow them to sell and to be in an association to market their goods. So cooperatives in the farming community is very, very special, and we want to commend and strengthen their service in the rural community.

Cooperatives are also effective in electric. In my area, I come from rural America, and electric cooperatives have made the difference. They have been in eastern North Carolina from the very beginning. In fact, in the 1940s, it was not very profitable to have electricity in our areas, and they were established in eastern North Carolina, which is sparsely populated, and they have made the difference. They have grown in my district. In fact, I perhaps have more electric cooperatives than anyone else in my State, and they are of value.

In fact, in the recent Hurricane Floyd that we had, it was indeed the cooperatives not only in the State but those cooperatives from out of the State who came to the rescue of the cooperatives who were affected by Floyd. In fact, some 260 electric members were without electricity for a period of time, and there were 700 cooperative linemen of the entire State who engaged in securing the additional support for the rural utility service.

So I want to just commend cooperatives and to say how valuable they have been for the quality of life and the protection of consumers and the value they have meant both in the agricultural community and also in the electrical service area.

Cooperatives structured properly can be of great benefit to farmers. They help focus buying strength for quantity discounts on input and combine a larger volume to get a higher price on output.

From an economic standpoint cooperatives can improve the bottom line and cut out the middleman, they create efficiencies that allow cooperative members to be stock holders and receive rebates.

Cooperatives were born out of the low prices of the 1930's as the farmers' response to dealing with these low prices . . . now as we move towards consolidation and vertical integration farmers cooperatives in general will serve a more vital role than they have in the past.

Cooperatives will continue to hold down prices by creating diversity within the market place.

Electric cooperatives have been these since ''the beginning'' because they began electric power service in North Carolina. In the 1940s it simply wasn't profitable for established power companies to serve the sparsely-settled areas of eastern North Carolina.

The electric cooperatives have grown with my district. Without stable, reliable electric infrastructure, economic development could not have taken place.

Are they still needed today? Of course, they are. Cooperatives—owned by their customers—have been there when no one else wanted the outlying areas and they are still there, standing shoulder to shoulder with today's businesses ensuring that customers—large and small—can benefit in an ever-changing market environment.

Electric cooperatives are not just cooperatives in name only, they truly stand for ''co-operation''.

Hurricane Floyd provides an all too timely and graphic example as to the value of electric cooperatives.

While more than 260,000 electric members were without power, the 700 cooperative linemen of the entire state came together to ''turn on the lights'' in eastern NC. Additionally, 600 electric co-op linemen from 10 states came in to assist. As the cooperatives borrow the Rural Utilities Service, standard engineering and construction facilitate out of state electric cooperative crews coming in to provide much needed hands-on assistance that is vital to restoring power.

Electric cooperatives continue to serve vital functions in the coming new millennium as they did when they were first formed. Rather than constructing and bringing power into kerosene-lit homes, they now will continue to assist consumers through an ever-changing landscape of a restructured electric industry. Through the use of the cooperative model and principles, consumers need to be able to pull together as a electric-buying cooperative in order to create buying leverage in an open marketplace. Consumers can make themselves a powerful force in the marketplace . . . just as cooperatives have been doing for years.

Electric cooperatives are working on models such as this in areas of the country that have begun to open their electric markets.

Cooperatives can also serve consumers by bundling packages of utility services—such as internet, other home heating sources, water and sewer—to provide ''one stop'' shopping convenience. This is especially true for rural areas that traditionally are left behind when it comes to competitive services.

CO-OPS IMPORTANT TO IOWA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here tonight along with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) to honor and appreciate cooperatives across America. It is important to honor and recognize these valuable institutions, America's co-ops, not only during national co-op month but every day because of the importance they play in every community's life.

Years ago, farmers across our State, many years ago, had no place to purchase their inputs or no place to store their grain or to market. They were really at the mercy of a handful of people, and sometimes they could not even get their grain anywhere. Well, co-ops came into existence. They were organized across our State and across the land, and they are very important to our Nation and they are very important to our State of Iowa.

There are 47,000 cooperatives of all types in the U.S., and they serve 120 million in all 50 States. One of every four people in the United States is a member of a co-op. In Iowa, co-ops originate about 75 percent of the grain sold by Iowa farmers. Iowa's rural electric co-ops, which the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) mentioned how important they are, they certainly are to me, I have three meters on a co-op line at my farm, serve more than 176,000 farms, homes, and businesses in all of our 99 counties. There are over 220 credit unions in Iowa that have more than 740,000 members. Iowa has 124 cooperative farm organizations that total 322 sites throughout the State. The bottom line is nearly everyone's life in Iowa is touched by a co-op in one way or another.

Cooperative associations can take on different forms within the communities they serve. Certainly they serve as business organizations, but they can also be the lifeblood of the community, providing the backbone and the strength to the residents of the area. Local control and local ownership make co-ops a special kind of business because of the commitment not only to the people they serve but also to the communities in which they exist.

Co-ops can take on many different functions in a community. In rural Iowa, where I am from, the farmer cooperative can be the center of many of the community's actions. I have said for a long time in farm communities today they need at least a minimum of two important things to do business: they have to have a bank and they have to have an elevator. And I would say very often a co-op elevator. Both are very important. They are a must to do business down on the farm.

On the business side, the farmer cooperative can help create a business superstructure for individual farmers or other cooperatives which allow for a more coordinated and efficient farm operation. They supply services and supplies that are essential to the day-to-day running of the operation.

On the personal side, they allow farmers the opportunity to join together to provide inputs in the market, share information, and provide co-op regional support. My local farmer cooperative in Lamoni, Iowa, is part of the reason I am here today in the United States Congress. Back in the 1980s, during the last farm crisis, my neighbors and fellow farmers asked me to serve as the president of their co-op. We worked as a community to keep our people on the farm and to keep our towns and our schools and our churches and our local businesses viable.

Co-op members have always helped each other make it through the tough times by sharing resources and experiences and helping each other work through the problems and struggles associated with crises. I can recall serving on the local co-op board during the farm crisis of the 1980s. It was a tough time, but I was sure glad to have the associates that I had. Now, American agriculture is again faced with a growing crisis, and again cooperatives will be there to lend a helping hand and, in many cases, the glue that holds communities together.

□ 1945

By joining together and marketing their products together, farmers are better able to gain strength they need to compete with the large multinational corporate farming operations that now control much of agriculture.

There are going to be many dramatic success stories coming out of the current agriculture crisis, and once again it is going to be the farmer cooperatives playing a very significant role. Cooperation by whatever means and whatever name you call it, networks or co-ops, is what built our system of family farms in the Midwest, and they may well be the best strategy for preserving it to the greatest degree possible as we meet future farm challenges.

Once again I am pleased to join with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) to honor and appreciate the importance of America's co-ops.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following: ''I must study politics and war that my sons and daughters may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy. My sons and daughters ought to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history, naval architecture, navigation, commerce, and agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry, and porcelain.''—Letter to Abigail Adams from John Adams [May 12, 1780].

Mr. Speaker, Jamie Whitten, the former chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee for forty years, said the only real wealth we have is the land. Much like President Adams, he believed that what farmers do provides us with the greatest security in the

world—the freedom from hunger so that we are afforded the freedom to undertake other endeavors.

Farmer Cooperatives have been a real source of strength in the 20th century. They provide an opportunity for many small producers to band together to create strength among themselves for themselves. Farmers have been able to purchase supplies and sell product through cooperatives. They have banded together based on commodities or region for the betterment of all.

They also have been a vital source of development in rural areas with telephone and electric power services.

They provide collaborative financing for producers and rural businesses (Farm Credit Services).

There are more than 3,500 cooperatives in the US, with total sales of over $100 billion. They employ nearly 300,000 people, with a payroll of $6.8 billion.

Cooperatives have been storehouses of ideas and innovation. As we see consolidation in the agriculture industry today, co-ops offer farmers the opportunity to vertically integrate and take advantage of profit sharing as a way to keep rural areas and rural families productive, while offering new opportunities for prosperity.

Farmers have been unfairly portrayed as unsophisticated individuals who could easily be fooled by ''city slickers''. The next time you want to talk with someone who is knowledgeable in cutting edge science, the intricacies of international trade, who is prepared to compete on a global scale, and must depend upon every available tool to stay ahead, you might want to think about Intel and Microsoft. But you would be wrong. The person you need to talk to is the American farmer and his co-op manager. There are no more savvy people like them in the world.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, October is Coop Month and I am delighted to join with my colleagues in recognizing the importance of cooperatives to our country.

The cooperative idea is as old as civilization itself. It began with people recognizing that by banding together for their mutual benefit they could achieve much more than they could as individuals.

When we think of co-ops in America we generally think of agricultural organizations who, beginning in the Midwest in the 1860s and 1870s, understood this principal and began to organize around it. Because of the foresight and determination of a number of pioneers in the Grange, founded in 1867, rural Americans began to enjoy the benefits of cooperative stores to serve their members with farm supplies and machinery, groceries and household essentials. Soon, farm commodities from cotton to milk to wheat were being marketed through co-ops.

In the following decades the fortunes of co-ops fluctuated, but by the early decades of the twentieth century co-ops had become the prevailing feature of the farm economy helping farmers not only with supplies and marketing, but with financing, housing and electrification. Today, Rural Electric Co-ops alone operate more than half the electrical lines in America and provide electric power to more than 25 million people in 46 states. In the field of telecommunications, cooperatives have become vital in ensuring that rural residents are not bypassed by the information revolution.

Today, co-ops are a common feature throughout both rural and urban America and throughout all sectors of the economy, while they remain a vital part of the food and agriculture industry. In recent years, cooperative members have been spreading that message abroad to the developing world and to newly-emerging democracies in Eastern Europe. And, with the help of Congress and the federal government, new co-op development is underway here at home through Co-op Development Centers and the Co-op Development Grants Program at the U.S. Department of Agriculture whereby small federal investments are helping to leverage substantial amounts of non-federal support to help start and strengthen businesses, create jobs and build communities.

In 1908, Teddy Roosevelt's Country Life Commission recommended cooperatives as a means to improve economies of scale, strengthen agricultural production and supply and promote infrastructure development. 90 years later, the National Commission on Small Farms called for increased federal investments to support rural cooperative development at the grassroots. While America has changed almost out of all recognition in the intervening years, the cooperative principals upon which much of America's wealth and values is built remain as important as ever.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to help celebrate Co-op Month and to recognize the vital role that co-ops have played in the development of our nation.

THE IMPORTANCE OF COOPERATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, October is National Co-op Month, and throughout the month of October cooperatives, whether agricultural, consumer, electrical or child care, from all over the Nation will celebrate the importance of cooperatives. Across the United States more than 100 million Americans benefited by 48,000 cooperatives that will generate $100 billion annually to our Nation's economy.

Tonight, I would like to highlight the importance of cooperatives to my home State, North Dakota. Throughout their history cooperatives have been a symbol of rural America just like the wind mill, the old country barn, and the four bottom plow. Cooperatives represent the very fiber of American ingenuity and community that have made this country great.

From the first successful cooperative organized in the United States by Benjamin Franklin to the 1990's cooperatives, like housing and baby-sitting cooperatives, cooperatives were created with the belief that individuals joining together in cooperative efforts can best market the product they produce. Cooperatives are associations of people uniting voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs through a jointly owned, democratically controlled organization.

Cooperatives are based on the values of self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity, and solidarity. In the tradition of their founders, cooperative members believe the ethical values of honesty, openness, and social responsibility in caring for others.

In the 1920s, the country witnessed the growth of the dairy cooperatives; in the 1930s country grain elevators were created; in the 1940s oil and gas cooperatives; and in the 1950s, electrical and telephone cooperatives were created. Each of these co-ops provided the basic essential, providing quality products for consumers and producers at the most cost-efficient beneficial means. Over the past 20 years cooperatives have entered a new and exciting phase. We have begun to observe a new wave of cooperation such as the North Dakota examples I will speak about tonight.

Specifically in responding to consolidation and concentration in agriculture occurring at an alarming rate, cooperatives have helped provide an avenue for farmers joining together. In North Dakota cooperatives have become, it seems, our State's newest best strategy in bringing to farmers a value-added component of marketing their products. North Dakota is a leader in cooperative development.

All the necessary ingredients are there, the long history of progressive prairie populism, its rural population used to pulling together to meet trying times. Now our heavy dependence on agriculture has made the ability to produce the value-added component to the product very, very important.

Since 1990, nearly $800 million in value-added facilities have been creating 600 new jobs in North Dakota. Some of the examples, the American Sugar Crystal Cooperative, one of the most recognizable cooperatives in North Dakota founded in 1972, and now with literally hundreds of growers, it has been a very, very successful marriage between the grower and the producer through this shared cooperative experience.

The Dakota Pasta Growers, one of the most fascinating cooperatives in North Dakota. The Dakota Pasta Growers, founded in the late 1980s by durum farmers who believed they could pull together and get themselves a better market for their product by actually producing the seminola flour and the pasta products itself; and Dakota pasta has succeeded in the face of many skeptics in Carrington, North Dakota, by hard work, ingenuity and producing a very top quality product. Today they will increase storage capacity from 120,000 to 370,000 bushels doubling milling capacity, all in all an outstanding success.

The North American Bison Cooperative, an excellent example of how farmers can band together to try new products. The prairie bison, now jointly slaughtered in this cooperative slaughtering plant. Five years ago, the co-op got off to a terrific start, and every year its product marketing continues

to grow. This past year they slaughtered 8,000 bison in this 5-year-old cooperative, to give you an idea of how things have grown.

Now clearly as we look at the cooperatives in total, the government at all levels has a role in cooperative development and maintenance. It is important they work. They bring economic opportunity to people, and they have as a result different tax statuses, different contracts and, most importantly, nonprofit philosophies.

As a Federal law maker when it comes to cooperatives, I believe it is my role to maintain and preserve the opportunity for development of cooperatives so especially essential to our rural communities.

The 1996 farm bill increased the risk of production agriculture on the family farmer. It is more important than ever therefore to have the farmer be able to pull together and create new economic opportunities in the value-added piece, in the wonderful examples of the North Dakota cooperatives that we have demonstrated.

The development of rural business today is just as vital today as it was 50 or 75 years ago. As I mentioned before, the smaller business owner, the farmer and the rancher is going to continue to be squeezed in the marketplace in light of the concentration that we are seeing; and their best shot at being able to preserve their ongoing place in production agriculture and in the value-added component is by teaming together through the cooperative philosophy, banding together to achieve collectively what it would be impossible for them to achieve individually. That is the miracle of cooperatives.

We certainly are proud to recognize them tonight and wish farmers and others all across the country thinking about how they might achieve a different dimension of success, to urge them to look at the cooperative way. It works as North Dakota examples have shown.

I. OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

Mr. Speaker, October is ''National Co-op Month.'' Throughout the month of October, cooperatives—whether agricultural, consumer, electrical, or child care—from all over the nation will celebrate the importance of cooperatives. Across the United States, more than 100 million Americans benefit by 48,000 cooperatives that generate $100 billion annually to our nation's economy.

Tonight, colleagues from across the United States and from all sides of the political spectrum will join me in highlighting the importance of cooperatives to our constituents.

A. HISTORICAL ROOTS

Throughout their history, cooperatives have been a symbol of rural America—just like the windmill, the old country barn, and the four bottom plow. Cooperatives represent the very fiber of American ingenuity and community that have made this country great. From the first successful cooperative organized in the United States by Ben Franklin to 1990's cooperatives like housing and baby sitting cooperatives, cooperatives were created with the belief that individuals joining together in cooperative efforts can best market the product they produce.

Cooperatives are autonomous associations of people uniting voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly owned democratically controlled enterprise. Cooperatives are based on the values of self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity, and solidarity. In the tradition of their founders, cooperative members believe the ethical values of honesty, openness, social responsibility and caring for others.

The contemporary cooperative as we know it was created in the 1920's as a reaction to the rapidly growing, unchecked corporate, business climate on Wall Street. Also, in 1922, Congress passed the Capper-Volstead Act which allowed farmers to act together to market their products without being in violation of antitrust laws.

In the 1920's, the country witnessed the growth of the dairy cooperatives, in the 1930's, country grain elevators were created, in the 1940's oil and gas cooperatives, and in the 1950's electrical and telephone cooperatives were created. Each of these cooperatives provided the same basic essential providing quality products for consumers and producers at the most cost-effective, beneficial means.

Over the past 20 years, cooperatives have entered a new and exciting phase. We have begun to observe new wave cooperatives such as the North Dakota examples that I will speak about tonight.

The growth of cooperatives can be compared to the game of football. From their modern-day inception in the 1920's through the 1950's, cooperatives were created in an act of defense. Defense to protect the smaller producers and vulnerable rural communities from the unregulated, massive corporate companies.

Cooperatives have evolved throughout history seeming to continue to be one step ahead of contemporary society by meeting the ever changing needs of consumers.

B. THE IMPACTS OF MARKET CONCENTRATION ON COOPERATIVES

As you all know, concentration is occurring at a very rapid rate in nearly all aspects of our economy. In the past five years, mergers have occurred in the oil, technological, chemical and seed, automobile, and agriculture sectors.

Specifically in agriculture, 4 meat packers control 80 percent of the beef and lamb processing industry compared to 36 percent in 1980, 5 meat packers control 65 percent of the hog industry, four firms control 59 percent of port facilities, 62 percent of flour milling, 74 percent of wet corn milling, and 76 percent of soybean crushing. Moreover, in 1980, the farmer got 37 cents of every dollar consumers spent on food compared to 23 cents in 1997.

Obviously, with market concentration occurring at such a rapid rate in all aspects of our economy, the role of cooperatives as a means to market a product become more important for producers' economic livelihoods.

Cooperatives, as we head into the 21st Century, must be prepared to meet the complex challenges of meeting the diverse needs of the American consumers while at the same time continuing their role of a producer-driven cooperative.

II. THE ''NORTH DAKOTA EXPERIMENT''—COOPERATIVES AT THEIR BEST

A. WHY COOPERATIVES ARE WORKING IN NORTH DAKOTA?

In North Dakota, cooperatives have become, it seems, our State's newest obsession. North Dakota is one of the leaders in the nation on cooperative development.

All the necessary ingredients for cooperatives is in North Dakota. North Dakota has a long history or progressive, prairie populism, its rural population does not want to fall victim to corporate greed, and its farmers are tired of receiving low prices for the bountiful products they produce.

North Dakota's heavy dependence on agriculture (nearly 40 percent of the entire state's economy) has made the ability to produce value-added a foremost concern for producers. With producers experiencing extremely low commodity prices in recent years, many have decided to form cooperatives because of their communal marketing advantages to sell the product.

Since 1990, nearly $800 million in value-added facilities creating more than 600 new jobs in North Dakota. Clearly, the cooperative spirit has had an impact in North Dakota.

B. COOPERATIVE EXAMPLES IN NORTH DAKOTA

American Crystal Sugar.—One of the most recognizable cooperatives in North Dakota is American Crystal Sugar in the Red River Valley. The American Crystal Sugar cooperative was formed in the spring of 1972, when sugar beet growers from throughout the Red River Valley decided to purchase the processing facility of American Crystal Sugar Company. With over 70 percent of the vote (1,065 to 443), the Red River Valley Sugar Beet Growers decided to purchase American Crystal and begin what has been a very prosperous 27 year marriage between the grower and the processor.

Dakota Pasta Growers—Carrington, ND.—One of the most fascinating cooperatives North Dakota has seen in recent years is the Dakota Pasta Growers in Carrington, ND. The Dakota Pasta Growers began due to the ideas of local durum wheat farmers in the late 1980's. The durum farmers were tired of the low prices they were receiving for the high quality, unique product (75 percent of the nation's durum is grown in North Dakota) and were not receiving nearly the benefits of their product they felt they deserved.

In 1993, the Dakota Pasta Growers were born. It is the world's first and only grower-owned, fully-integrated pasta manufacturing company with 1,080 drurum producers who serve as the owners. In only four years, the Dakota Pasta Growers doubled its rollstands to 28, increased storage capacity from 120,000 to 370,000 bushels, doubled milling capacity to 20,000 bushels, and increased the size of the plant from 110,000 to 160,000 square feet. Currently, Dakota Pasta Growers producers 470 million pounds of pasta annually with more than 75 shapes and flavors for retail, food service and industrial segments. The Dakota Pasta Growers now has three manufacturing facilities in Carrington, Minneapolis and New Hope, Minnesota .

Clearly, the Dakota Pasta Growers seems to have perfected its very own method of spinning wheat into gold.

North American Bison Cooperative—New Rockford, ND.—The North American Bison

Cooperative is an excellent example of a cooperative that is facing a serious at-risk financial situation. The North American Bison Cooperative is an example of how the community cooperative spirit is alive and well, but the complex, intricacies of successfully marketing the cooperative's product have not been met.

Five years ago the bixon cooperative got off to a terrific start. Every year, it has grown every year by selling a substantial amount of bison in Europe. But, that growth has brought new challenges. To meet the growing demand for the steaks and roasts, more bison had to be slaughtered. It was real easy to market all of the meat when you only slaughtered a thousand head a year, but it's very different issue when you've increased your production to more than 8,000 animals.

While this cooperative has had excellent markets for every bison steak and roast, it has extreme difficulty in marketing the other half of the animal that is ground up into burgers. Those trim products built up in the freezer while new products and markets were developed. Yes, the cooperative has developed several products—sausages, jerky, and ravioli—and those products are in a whole lot of stores throughout the Dakotas, Minnesota, and Montana. But that has not been enough. The cooperative has developed a strategic marketing relationship with a private firm in Denver, Colorado. This firm also developed new value-added bison products.

But every new product takes time to develop. Therefore, USDA has had to get involved the past two years to assist in the purchase of bison trim to move the Bison Cooperative's product. Clearly, USDA has recognized that this cooperative needs a financial shove and is willing to ante up to allow the Bison Cooperative to survive in its infant phase.

C. NORTH DAKOTA—MORE THAN JUST AG COOPERATIVES

Even though, North Dakota is a predominantly rural state, it has more than just agriculture cooperatives. North Dakota because of its rural communities has electric, credit unions, housing, and telephone cooperatives to name a few.

III. COOPERATIVES AND THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

A. BACKGROUND ON GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Clearly, the government at all levels has a role in cooperative development and maintenance. Cooperatives serve different functions than corporations or small businesses. They have different tax statuses, different contracts, and most importantly, have non-profit philosophies.

As a federal lawmaker, I believe my role in cooperative development and maintenance is essential—especially in regard to agriculture cooperatives.

As you may know, the 1996 Farm Bill changed the course of agriculture policy in the U.S. for the first time in sixty years (since the New Deal). No longer does the government provide a safety net for producers who have suffered from low prices and severe weather. Instead, the new farm bill leaves it up to the producer, through his own instincts, to market the product he produces. In my opinion, the farm bill has made the occupation of farming similar to rolling dice.

B. COOPERATIVE COMPONENTS OF THE 1996 FARM BILL

The 1996 Farm Bill did include provisions to promote value-added agriculture. It created the Rural Business Cooperative office of the USDA Rural Development Agency. The Rural Business Cooperative's mission is very simple: to enhance the quality of life for all Americans by providing leadership in building competitive businesses and cooperatives that can prosper in the global marketplace.

The Rural Business Cooperative has many methods of providing credit for cooperatives to get started. The Business and Industry (B&I) Guarantee Loan Program helps create jobs and stimulates rural economies by providing financial backing for rural businesses. This program guarantees up to 80 percent of a loan made by a commercial lender. Loan proceeds may be used for working capital, machinery and equipment, buildings and real estate, and certain types of debt refinancing.

The B&I Direct Loan Program provides loans to public entities and private parties who cannot obtain credit from other sources. This type of assistance is available in rural areas.

The 1996 Farm Bill, in my opinion, needs to be reexamined because of its lack of a safety net, but I am a strong support of the efforts for value-added cooperatives.

C. COOPERATIVES AND THE 106TH CONGRESS

It is important to me that Congress maintain its commitment to cooperative development by continuing funding for the Rural Cooperative Development Grant Program within the USDA's Rural Development.

The dollars committed to this program have generated hundreds if not thousands of jobs and brought many producers back from the brink of economic disaster.

It is very clear to me just how important this under funded and little recognized program has been to many of the organizations who have come together as part of the National Network of Centers for Rural Cooperative Development.

IV. COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

A. ABOUT COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

The development of rural businesses today is just as vital as it was 50 or 75 years ago.

As mentioned before, the smaller business owner, farmer, and rancher will continue to be squeezed out of the marketplace by giant corporate conglomerates that are vertically integrated, beholden to Wall Street and its stockholders.

Cooperatives represent the best hope that most rural communities, rural residents, rural business owners, and farmers have for ever hoping to control their destiny.

Cooperatives require commitment and hard work, and I know that they are not always going to succeed.

Of the eight Centers represented in the national network, I was proud to learn that at least half are involved in establishing value-added agricultural cooperatives.

I'm particularly proud of my fellow North Dakotan—Bill Patrie. Bill has established a phenomenal number of value-added cooperatives in our state, and most have been very successful. But, Bill also knows the pain of witnessing a great idea not succeed.

B. MORE PEOPLE WHO ARE COOPERATIVE LEADERS

Andy Ferguson in the Northeast who is breaking new ground to establish energy cooperatives; Rosemary Mahoney and E.G. Nadeau who are building value-added markets for organic products in the Upper Midwest; Gus Townes who is developing new value-added vegetable cooperatives and credit unions in the Southeast; Melbah Smith who is building partnerships with state agencies, universities, and private businesses to help small Mississippi sweet potato growers build a multi-million dollar cooperative enterprise; Annette Pagan who is working with poultry producers and small wood manufacturers in Arkansas; and Mahlon Lang and Karen Spatz who continue to with members of the Hmong in building a cooperative that strengthens their community.

V. CONCLUSION

A. COOPERATIVES AS WE HEAD INTO A NEW MILLENNIUM

There are many challenges facing cooperatives as we head into the 21st Century. Cooperatives will be faced with the struggling challenges of increased competition through market concentration, internal forces urging the cooperative to get bigger, and continuing to meet the producer-owners' interests. And, at the same time, meeting the very diverse needs of American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, October is ''National Co-op Month'' and it is an excellent opportunity for the American consumer to recognize the importance of cooperatives in ''the American way of life.''

OUR SCHOOLS ARE TOO BIG AND TOO IMPERSONAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last April, shortly after the terrible tragedy that occurred at Columbine High School in Colorado, I spoke with my freshman colleague from the State of Washington (Mr. BAIRD). My colleague from Washington is a trained psychologist, so I asked him for his thoughts about the Columbine tragedy. Since Mr. BAIRD is a trained psychologist, I was expecting a long academic explanation using lots of psychological terms regular people do not understand. Instead, he had a simple solution, an explanation. He looked at me and said, ''Baron, our schools are too big, and these kids do not know one another.''

The Columbine tragedy and other recent events of violence in our schools have made all of us take a serious look at our children, our schools, and ourselves. These recent tragedies have forced us to think about how we educate our children and how we can make our schools safer and better.

This is a personal issue for me, for my wife, Betty, is a middle school teacher; and my youngest daughter is in the eighth grade at a public school in my hometown of Seymour, Indiana. I do not believe that there is one easy solution to all of the problems our schools and our children face today, nor do I believe that we politicians in Congress could pass some law that would solve every school's and every child's problem. I strongly believe that the people who work with children every day, the parents, the teachers and local school administrators, are in the best position to make decisions about their schools.

But this week I am introducing a bill that I hope will make some small contribution to addressing a problem that I and other people have been talking about for many years. It is a problem that the recent episodes of school violence in Colorado and Georgia and other places around the country have once again brought to the forefront of our national debate. It is the problem that my colleague Dr. BAIRD was talking about.

Our schools are too big and too impersonal. Too many of our children wake up every day and go to schools that make them feel disconnected and detached from their teachers, their parents and their communities. The goal of my bill that I am introducing, the Smaller Schools Stronger Communities Act, is to make our schools smaller and to help parents, teachers and administrators and students strengthen the sense of community that many of our schools today are lacking.

My strong feelings about this issue come from my own experience growing up in southern Indiana. When I was growing up in Jackson County, there were more high schools than there are today in towns like Tampico and Clear Spring and Cortland. There were high schools that local kids attended and local families supported. These communities were proud of their schools. Their schools brought people together and helped keep their towns strong and vital places to live.

These schools were the hearts of the communities, and when we consolidated, when school consolidation forced their high schools to close, it tore the heart out of these communities. These high schools along with thousands of other smaller schools around America were closed because for many years educators have followed the rule that bigger schools are better. For a long time we all assumed that bigger schools were better because they could offer students more courses, more extracurricular activities, and could save school districts money.

The statistics on school size show how dramatically this bigger-is-better approach has changed the way we educate our children. In 1930 there were 262,000 elementary, middle and high schools in America. Today there are only 88,000 schools. In 1930 the average school had 100 students. Today's average school has 500 students.

Some education experts are now arguing that school consolidation has gone too far. More and more educators today believe that our children do better academically and socially in smaller schools that are closer to their homes and their parents than in the big schools with thousands of students. Because many schools have become too big, they sometimes harm the students they are supposed to be helping. Many students in big schools never develop any meaningful relationships with their teachers and never experienced a sense of belonging in their schools.

When I start looking at the issue of big schools, I was surprised to find that some of the biggest critics of big schools are high school principals. The men and women who run our high schools, who work with our teenagers every day, say that schools are too big and too impersonal. In 1966 the national association of secondary school principals released a report criticizing the bigness of today's high schools. The principals recommended that the high school of the 21st century be much more student centered and personalized.

Here is what the high school principals said: students take more interest in school when they experience a sense of belonging. Some students cope in large impersonal high schools because they have the advantage of external motivation that allows them to transcend the disadvantage of school size. Many others, however, would benefit from a more intimate setting in which their presence could be more readily and repeatedly acknowledged. Experts have found that achievement levels in smaller schools are higher especially among children from disadvantaged backgrounds who need extra help to succeed.

A recent study of academic achievement and school size concluded that high schools and smaller schools perform better in course subjects of reading, math, history, and science. Students in smaller schools also have better attendance records, are less likely to get in fights or join gangs. A principal of a successful small high school recently wrote that small schools offer what metal detectors and guards cannot, the safety and security of being where you are well known by the people who care for you the most.

The bill that I am introducing, the Smaller School Strong Stronger Communities Act provides grants to school districts that want to develop school size reduction strategy. This bill does not introduce a new mandate or try to micromanage local education authority. It simply supports education leaders in school districts who decide they want to implement a plan to reduce the size of their school units either through new building space or through schools within schools.

I hope this bill will encourage local school districts to take a look at this idea and perhaps think about ways they can make their schools smaller and to find ways to help students feel connected again to their schools and their communities and their parents. This bill and the academic research I have been discussing here today make a very simple point about our schools, our kids, and ourselves. Our lives are better when we feel connected to the people we live and work with.

□ 2000

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about health care tonight, and I am going to get into some legislative language. I think it is important that we do that, because we are going to be voting tomorrow and the next day on pieces of legislation that will have as big an impact on the quality of life of the American people as anything that will be voted on this session. And I think sometimes it is important that before we vote on bills, we actually read them and take a look at what they say. I hope that comes clear in the course of my discussion this evening.

Before I get into what may sound to some people, however, like a bit of a law school discourse or exercise, I want to talk about the real impact these bills are going to have on real people.

There is nothing more important to the average American and his or her family than the quality of the health insurance that they have access to.

We need health care reform in this country, and we have to keep in mind that it has two aspects. First and foremost, we have to help people who do not have access to good quality private health insurance get access to that health insurance.

Then the second thing we have to do is ensure once they have access to that insurance, it delivers for them. When they get sick, they get the care their physician says that they need, when they need it, before they become seriously ill or before they die. But it is very important that we make certain that in providing for health care reform and providing for accountability of managed care plans, we do not increase the number of people who do not have health insurance in the first place.

Health care reform of insurance is of no value to you if you do not have the insurance, and too many people in America today do not have health care insurance. Forty-four million people in the United States do not have health insurance. One out of every six Americans is without health insurance. They face the risk of illness, they and their families, without having health insurance.

There is nothing more tragic than talking to individuals in this situation. Maybe they have been downsized by a company, they are working for a small employer who does not provide health insurance, they cannot afford it. Maybe they are 55, 60 years old, retired, but they are not old enough for Medicare. Maybe they have a history of illness and they do not work for a large employer and they cannot buy health insurance on the individual market.

These are our friends and neighbors, and we need to help them. Eleven million of them are children, and 75 percent of the people who are uninsured work for small businesses or own small

businesses, or are the dependents of people who work for or own small businesses.

That is the first thing that we need to do with health care reform. We are going to have an opportunity to do that tomorrow. We are going to have an opportunity to pass an accessibility bill that will open up health insurance to millions of people who currently do not have it, and we are going to do that with a number of things in the bill. Some of them provide tax relief to people so they can better afford health insurance on the individual market.

One important provision that I cosponsored allows small employers to pool together in associations, the Chamber of Commerce, the Farm Bureau, the Psychologist Association. They can pool together in an association. The association can sponsor health care plans. Then the small employers can buy those plans for their employees and they can have health care, the same way big employers offer health insurance to their employees today. We are going to have an opportunity to vote on that bill tomorrow.

We are also going to have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to vote on the whole issue of accountability, so that, again, when people get health insurance, and that is the number one thing, we ensure that they get the care their physician prescribes when they need it, before they get seriously ill, before they die, and we do that without big government, without increasing costs in a way that increases the number of uninsured. We will have an opportunity to do that also in the next couple of days.

Now, in considering how we can hold HMOs accountable, the problem is this, and most Americans are familiar with it. The concern is maybe less what their insurance covers than the fact that when they get sick, their HMO may not provide the coverage they are supposed to provide. A lot of people have been in that situation. Other people are afraid of being in that situation.

The best thing to do about that is to give individuals and their physicians access to speedy, low cost, internal and external review before independent physicians when the plan has denied their care. So here would be an example, and I am going to use this example several times throughout this discussion, Mr. Speaker.

Let us suppose you belong to a managed care plan or you are a participant in it. You have a heart problem. Your cardiologist recommends beta blockers. That is a drug that will help clear up the arteries if they are blocked. The health care plan says no, you do not need beta blockers. More conservative treatment is appropriate.

We need to make certain that people can have access to external review procedures under those circumstances. They can appeal, in a low cost, quick, timely way, to a panel of independent specialists, cardiologists who are not controlled by the health care plan, and those cardiologists decide whether or not that treatment is medically necessary under those circumstances.

Professionals in any field should be reviewed by other professionals and specialists in that field. We can do that. We are going to have the opportunity to vote for legislation that does that.

It may be appropriate to back that up with liability, limited kinds of liability against the health care plan, to reinforce that external review procedure. So it the plan does not go along with the decision of the independent physicians, they can be sued and they can be hammered with punitive damages under those circumstances.

What we want to avoid, Mr. Speaker, is open-ended liability against employers in particular and against labor unions, in addition to against health care plans, that will jack up the cost of health insurance by billions of dollars, moving that money out of health care and into litigation; moving people out of treatment rooms and into courtrooms.

If we pass a bill that does that, Mr. Speaker, we are going to make the problem worse instead of better, because we are going to vastly increase the number of people in the United States who are uninsured.

It is my concern that the bill being offered by my colleagues, Mr. NORWOOD and Mr. DINGELL, would do exactly that. I say this with the sincerest of respect for their passion and their dedication on this issue, but I am concerned that their bill, the Norwood-Dingell bill, opens up precisely the kind of liability that will jack up the number of uninsured in the country by moving people again out of treatment rooms and into courtrooms.

The Norwood-Dingell liability provision is open-ended liability in hundreds of State courts around the country for any result that someone claims to be negative in a health care case, if that result can be connected in any way to any aspect of the operation of any health plan, with unlimited damages, including punitive damages, for the employer, for a labor union if it is a labor-management plan, and for the employees of the employer and the labor union, and, in fact, for contractors or accountants or people associated with the employer or the labor union if they assisted in any way in setting up the health care plan. Again, it would move billions of dollars out of treatment, out of health care, into litigation. That is not good for anybody.

So much for my preface, Mr. Speaker. I want to get to the language in the Norwood-Dingell bill. It would be kind of hard to read it this way, so let me turn it around.

The Norwood-Dingell bill allows any cause of action, there it is in bold, against any person, it does not define ''person,'' so that means the employer, it means the health care plan, it means employees of the employer or the health care plan, for any personal injury, and they define that to mean a physical injury or a mental injury, so it cannot be an economic injury, but allows a cause of action against any person for any physical injury that is connected to or arises from, in connection with or that arises out of, the provision of insurance, the administrative services, or medical services, or the arrangement thereof.

This is not just a cause of action for the denial of a benefit. It is not just a cause of action when a health care plan goes against the treating physician or the external reviewer. It is much more broadly written than that. It could not be more broadly written. It is a cause of action for any injury arising out of or in connection with in any way the operation or arrangement of a health care plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am a lawyer. When I read this language, I put my lawyer's hat on and I thought, now, what kind of lawsuits are we going to see in response to that kind of language?

Well, just a couple of what we lawyers call hypotheticals. They are hypotheticals in the sense that they have not actually happened because we have not actually passed this bill, but they are the kinds of cases that will be brought if we do pass this bill.

First the classic case. Let me go back to my beta blocker example. When physicians treat clogged arteries, they have to choose whether to use beta blockers, which is a drug or a cardiac cath, a minor surgery or some more aggressive kinds of surgery or treatment.

So, let us suppose that somebody goes to their cardiologist in a managed care plan, and the cardiologist decides to grant a cardiac cath, to prescribe a cardiac cath, and the plan reviews that decision by the treating physician and denies the cardiac cath and, as a result, some kind of injury arises.

Well, that is a physical injury arising out of the provision of medical services, so clearly a cause of action would be warranted. But let us suppose that the plan grants the treating physician's decision and allows the cardiac cath and an injury results. That too is a physical injury in connection with or arising out of the operation of a health plan and you can sue the health care plan for that.

Or let us assume the health care plan says look, we do not even want to review this. We are going to let the physicians prescribe whatever they want, and go along with that, and a bad result occurs. Then you could sue the plan for not reviewing what the physician does, and that would be a physical injury arising out of or in connection with the arrangement of a health care plan and a cause of action would lie under the Norwood-Dingell bill.

That cause of action, remember, is against any person. Not just the plan, but the employer who purchased the plan, the restaurant owner, the small restaurant owner who went out and decided he was going to try to provide

health insurance to his people and linked up with a managed care network, or a big employer with a big HR department and tries to operate these plans in a conscientious way. You could sue them. You could sue the employees of the big employer who helped set up the plan. You could sue a contractor or consultant that you relied on. All of these people would be open to lawsuits for punitive damages in State courts around the country.

That is a pretty obvious case. Let us take a different case, again with the beta blocker example. Let us suppose that a plan has a quality assurance plan. Many managed care plans do. So they go out and they try to make sure their physicians are up-to-date in all the latest kinds of medical developments. So they go out and give seminars on when you use beta blockers and when you use a cardiac cath or more kinds of aggressive treatment, and the physicians go to these seminars.

Then a patient is going to one of these physicians, and the physician recommends beta blockers in a particular case and you get a bad result or what somebody alleges is a bad result or a physical injury. Now you can sue the plan because they were not aggressive enough in recommending cardiac caths.

But let us suppose the physician recommends the cardiac cath. Now you could sue the plan because in the way it operated its quality assurance plan they were not aggressive enough in recommending beta blockers. Or if they did not have a quality insurance plan you could sue them for that. Or if they did not have enough seminars in their quality assurance plan, you could sue them for that. Or if they did not require that the physicians attend all the seminars, you could sue them for that. And what would constitute an adequately and properly run quality assurance plan would be determined in State courts in jurisdictions all around this country, even though many of these plans are national plans.

So what a plan that was hired by a big employer would have to do with regard to quality assurance plans would differ from one circuit court in one State to another circuit court in another State. And if they got it wrong, if a jury believed they got it wrong, they would be open to unlimited damages, including punitive damages, and you could sue the employer and the employer's employee as well, although I will get to that language in a minute.

Let me give one more example, and I could give hypotheticals with my lawyer's hat on all night long. Let us assume a situation where somebody is having some heart pain or chest pain. They belong to a managed care network. They try and make an appointment with the cardiologist. They do not get in for a week or so, and, as a result, their condition worsens.

Now they say well, you do not have enough cardiologists who are close enough to me so I could get an appointment. So, again, you sue the plan. You say you have to have more cardiologists than this within a certain number of miles from me, and all the other plan participants as well.

Again you have the same kind of lawsuit, and again you have the standards for what is quality care being determined for national plans in State courts after the fact in jury deliberations in circuit courts all around this country. If you get it wrong, why, you owe punitive damages.

By the way, you can, of course, sue the people who consulted with you in determining how much cardiologists you had to have and the employees you hired to determine how many cardiologists you had to have, and all resulting in billions of dollars being transferred out of the health care system, out of the treatment room, into the court room.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, not only would the plan and the employer in these circumstances be subject to punitive damages, they would not be able to avail themselves of any malpractice limits that had been passed in State statutes, because these actions are not for malpractice, these are actions for negligence or whatever the State statute provided in the operation of the health care plan.

☐ 2015

So it would not sound, as we lawyers call it, it would not arise out of a malpractice action. Therefore, you would not be allowed the limits that you would have in a malpractice action.

Let us go to the liability of the employer under these circumstances. I want to say, the bill contains, in a different provision, and I did not have it all here, a shield for employers from lawsuits. So the bill does have a defense. It says you cannot sue employers, except in certain circumstances.

These are the circumstances under which you can sue the employer or other plan sponsor, and that, of course, would include labor unions, in the event of a labor-management plan. You can sue the employer or the labor union for the exercise of discretionary authority to make a decision on a claim for benefits; not deny a claim for benefits, but whenever the employer or the labor union makes a decision on a claim for benefits.

So let us go back to the first hypothetical and put a lawyer's hat back on again. The case was where the question was whether the cardiologist would recommend beta blockers or whether the cardiologist would recommend a cardiac cath or some more aggressive treatment.

If the employer exercises his discretionary authority to deny the care recommended by the cardiologist, he has obviously made a decision on claim for benefits on the exercise of his discretionary authority, and if injury results, the employer would be open to lawsuits.

Remember, this includes small employers, not just big employers. It does include the big employers, the big national plans, whose employees by and large are satisfied with their health care.

Suppose the employer grants or sustains the benefits and a bad result occurs. Now you can sue the employer saying, you were negligent in the exercise of your discretionary authority in sustaining the benefits. You should have overruled them.

But let us say the employer says, I do not want to get in this kind of liability. I am not going to do anything. I am not going to be involved in this process.

In the first place, they could be liable under ERISA. Under ERISA, the basic network of laws under which all this operates, the plan sponsor is supposed to be a fiduciary. They are supposed to operate the trust for the benefit of the participants.

If you explicitly refuse to exercise your discretionary authority on behalf of the participants, you have violated ERISA. But if you say, I am not going to exercise my discretionary authority, I am going to let the plan do everything, Mr. Speaker, you have exercised your discretionary authority not to exercise your discretionary authority, and you could be sued for that.

If I was counsel for the employer, I would say that is the most dangerous thing of all, because when you get before a jury, and I am going to bring this home to real life and real lawsuits in just a minute, when you get before a jury, you are going to have to explain to the jury why you did not care enough to try and oversee in any way the operation of your health care plan when somebody was injured as a result of that.

That kind of lawsuit is the least in the liability that the employer faces. And remember, there are punitive damages for this. There is no shield in this bill for the employer against punitive damages under any circumstances. Remember, you could sue the employees of the employer or the labor union under these circumstances.

I think you might be able to defeat this defense in other ways. Again, I don't want to get too exotic here with my hypotheticals, but I think you could say if an employer hires a health care plan and does not engage in adequate due diligence, does not look into enough whether that health care plan was a good plan, maybe willfully neglects doing that, that is the exercise of the discretionary authority to hire a bad plan when you should have known it was a bad plan, and you should have known it would result in affecting decisions made on claims of benefits, and as a result, the entire shield is removed.

Those are the kinds of hard cases when there is a serious injury to somebody that makes bad law. Those will be pushed in every courtroom in the country.

Let me go over again, and I am going to wrap this up in a minute, Mr. Speaker, but let me go over again what we

are talking about here, and the dangers that we are talking about: again, open-ended liability for employers, labor unions, health care plans, their employees, contractors, associations, for any physical injury that arises or is connected in any way with the operation or administration of any health care plan.

This is going to result in billions of dollars being spent in litigation, in avoiding litigation, in settling litigation that is not going to go to health care. It is going to result in a diminution, a lessening, Mr. Speaker, of benefits for individuals who have insurance, and a vast increase in the number of people who do not.

The final points. Again, the Norwood-Dingell bill does not define ''person.'' So again, anybody can be sued: the health care plan, the employer, any of their employees. Employers are going to have to have directors and officers liability insurance for their employees who run human resources operations. They are going to have to have insurance on their employees, in order to get health insurance for the employees.

Winning is not everything. This is very important to understand. If I am a lawyer and I am representing somebody who has been hurt, and I do not criticize lawyers in saying this, they have an absolute obligation to zealously represent their client in an attempt to recover whatever they can recover for them if they have been physically injured. You are going to sue everybody. You are going to name everybody, including the employer.

Now, this defense is what we lawyers call an affirmative defense. So you are going to be sued in State court, you are going to raise this affirmative defense in the answer. When you file your original papers, you going to say, no, I was not exercising my discretionary authority, so under Federal law you cannot sue me.

Okay, immediately what is called the interrogatories go out. Immediately they ask you for every document relating to how you developed your health care plan or how you were involved in this particular decision. After that they begin the depositions. They will depose whoever it was, anybody who was involved in any way or should have been involved with choosing the health care plan. Meanwhile, of course, the legal bills are adding up, because of course you are having your lawyers write memos to try and determine what exactly this means, because these terms in here are not defined, so thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars in legal fees are adding up.

Then after the interrogatories and after the depositions, you file what is called a motion for summary judgment. In other words, you say to the court, look, it is evident from the information we have gathered so far that you cannot sue me under this bill. Now you are up to $40,000, $50,000, spent in legal fees, even if there is not a basis for claiming that you exercised your discretionary authority to make a decision on benefits.

How is anybody going to know, because this is entirely new law? We are making it up in this bill. Many of these terms are undefined. Then, if you lose at that point, and very often a judge will exercise his discretion not to grant a motion for summary judgment and let the case go to a jury, now you are before a jury, and a jury is making a judgment about whether you exercised discretionary authority. So this legal term here, this aspect of Federal law, is going to be defined by juries all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to some people who came into my office who owned restaurants. I am the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, so I talk a lot to small business people. Small business people by and large want good employees, so they want to shape compensation packages to get good employees. They are by and large very distressed that they usually cannot offer as good health care as the big employers can because they cannot fashion big pools.

I asked them what would happen, what they would do if they were faced with this kind of liability. These were restaurant owners. The restaurant business is a business where many people who work in that business do not have health insurance. Many restaurant owners do not offer health insurance. I asked them what they do. They said, we will drop the health insurance. We cannot open ourselves to this kind of liability. These are not wealthy people.

If we talk to people who run big companies, who want their health plans to be good so people are satisfied because they have to compete for good employees, what are they going to do when their costs start going up? I hope none of them drop their coverage. At least the cost of the coverage is going to have to go up. They are going to have to reduce the number of benefits. They are going to have to increase the number of employees. They are going to have to pass along costs to their employees, and they are going to have access to poorer quality health insurance.

That is unprecedented liability for employers. I just reviewed that. External review is useless. The Norwood-Dingell bill requires resort to external review in the event of a denial of a claim. Well, most of the actions I have just talked about do not involve denying a claim, so the external review that I talked about in the beginning that is the answer to the problem of accountability would not even be available. We cannot go to external review on the issue of whether a quality assurance plan was adequate or not.

Also, the bill permits people to avoid external review when there is injury suffered before the external review panel can meet. So if the heart condition gets worse in the week while you are waiting for external review, you can get around it and you can sue.

We ought not to be getting people out of external review. That is the right answer. We ought to be encouraging people to go into external review so that physicians are reviewing the decisions of physicians, not juries or courtrooms reviewing the decisions of physicians.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the liability provisions in the Norwood-Dingell bill would apply to private sector employees, but would not apply to Federal employees. They would not apply to Congressmen. This is a liability provision which is supposedly good for people, but once again, Congress would exempt itself from the operation of this procedure.

Now, I have talked with some Members today. They indicated to me that, no, they thought well, maybe you could not sue if you were a Federal employee. Maybe today you could not sue the Federal Government, and right there you have a difference, because the Norwood-Dingell bill allows you to sue employers. Under current law, you cannot sue the Federal Government.

But they have told me, but you can at least sue the health care plan or the carrier with whom the Federal Government contracts. So they say, well, no, the Federal employees are excluded from the Norwood-Dingell bill. That is true, but that is because they can already sue their health plans or their health carriers.

Here is what title V, section 890 107(C) of the Federal regulations say with regard to actions by employees of the Federal Government.

It says, ''A legal action to review final action by the OPM,'' the Office of Personnel Management, and you must go first to the Office of Personnel Management if you have a claim, ''involving such denial of health benefits must be brought against OPM and not against the carrier or the carrier's subcontractors. The recovery in such a suit shall be limited to a court order directing OPM to require the carrier to pay the amount of benefits in dispute.''

So under current law, which would not be changed by the Norwood-Dingell bill, Federal employees cannot sue their carriers, Federal employees cannot sue the Federal Government, but under this provision, employers, private employers, would be subject to actions.

Mr. Speaker, this does not have to be all or nothing at all. We do not have to go on with the current system, where people have rights, supposedly, under health care contracts, but no effective way of enforcing those rights. We can have accountability. We can do it through tightly-written, low-cost, easily accessible external review procedures where physicians are reviewing the decisions of other physicians. We can back that up with liability, in cases where the external review process is ignored or where it is fraudulent or where it is frustrated.

The least we need to do with the Norwood-Dingell bill is to make clear that

liability against the employer is strictly limited to cases where the employer directly participated in the denial of benefits. We need to make clear that punitive damages are strictly limited or not allowed. We need to require exhaustion of external review.

We need to be certain that where we allow quality of care actions, we make clear in the law what quality of care is, so that people know what the law is and can set up their health care plans accordingly, and we do not have that judgment being made in State courts around the country.

The reason, again, is because all of this makes a difference to real people who are really confronted with illness and the threat of illness. There are too many people in the United States today, Mr. Speaker, who do not have health insurance, and most of them do not have health insurance because it costs too much. Every time we increase the cost of health insurance, it means more and more people are not covered. Patient protections do not help you if you do not have insurance.

We have the chance in the next couple of days to pass good bills to increase accessibility, to increase the availability of private health insurance to people who do not have it, good private health insurance to these employees of small employers. We have the chance to hold HMOs accountable to get people in treatment rooms where they ought to be, not at home ill and untreated, and not in courtrooms afterwards, after they become seriously ill.

We can do these things. We have that opportunity. I want to close by saying that I welcome the fact that the bills have come this far. There are many competing factions in this House, and it is because of the passion and the energy of those factions that we have a bill and we have the opportunity to vote on it.

I have been working intensively on this for 2 years. I have wanted to see this day come. I am glad we have this opportunity. But let us not do something that will hurt the very people that we are trying to help. Let us not punish the employers and the small employers in this country and their employees by driving up the cost of health insurance to them in a way that is not necessary to ensure the kind of accountability that we all seek in the health care system.

□ 2030

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREEN of Texas. 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 the subject of the special order by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

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

There was no objection.

TEXAS' EXPERIENCE WITH MANAGED CARE REFORM: A MODEL FOR THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and also thank our minority leader for allowing me to have this second hour tonight and follow the gentleman from Missouri. Obviously, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) because Missouri has been the ''Show Me State'' all of my life, and for the next hour from Texas we are going to show him why he is wrong in his statements.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first talk about that in the last 2 years in Texas we have had basically the same law that we are trying to pass here tomorrow and Thursday, and the examples offered by the gentleman from Missouri just do not hold water, at least they have not in the State of Texas.

First a little background. Before I was elected to Congress, I actually helped manage a small business in Houston, a printing business. One of my jobs in that business was to shop for our insurance and to make sure our 13 or so employees had adequate coverage, because our company was under a union contract and we could buy it from the union benefit plan or buy on our own if it was either equivalent or better, and so we did that.

And having experience of shopping for a number of years for insurance as both a manager and one who had to make sure we also paid the bills at the end of the week so we could afford it, I bring that kind of experience of a small business, even though I do not serve on the committee.

The other thing I would like to mention, the gentleman talked a great deal of time about threats of suits for employers, and it is not in the intention of myself or the sponsors of the Norwood-Dingell bill that employers will be responsible unless they make those medical decisions. I have offered in my own district and even here in Washington to the National Association of Manufacturers, give me the language and we will sponsor it as an amendment to make sure that employers are not held liable unless they are putting themselves in the place of a health care provider or health care decision-maker. That is saying to their employees, No you cannot do this or you cannot do that.

Again, having been a manager, I know that sometimes employers and businesses can afford a Cadillac plan that pays for a lot. Sometimes they can only afford a Chevy plan that does not pay as much. But just so they are getting what they are paying for, for their employees; and that is what I think the managed care reform and HMO reform issue is about and it has been about for the last 2 years.

Let me follow up too, the gentleman had mentioned that this bill does not cover Federal employees. Well, right now as a Federal employee or as a State government employee, we have the right to sue our insurance company. We have the right under our plan. All we are trying to do with this bill is to provide to all the other Americans some of the same rights as Members of Congress have. And also it covers the Federal insurance plans, whether it be BlueCross or whatever other plans, because there are so many of them that the consumer would have the right to go to the courthouse ultimately.

So there was a lot of things the gentleman said during his time; and hopefully during the next hour we will hear a lot of folks who have real-life experiences from the State of Texas, because we have had a Patients' Bill of Rights under State law for over 2 years, and it only covers insurance policies that are licensed by the State of Texas.

That is why we have to pass something on the Federal level, because 60 percent of the insurance policies in the district I represent come under ERISA, come under Federal law. Even though the State of Texas 2 years ago passed these very same protections, we have to do it on the Federal level to cover the citizens of Texas who do not come under the State insurance policy.

In fact, this next hour hopefully we will have a lot of folks, and people who like to hear Texas accents will hear them for the next hour, because we will talk about the Texas experience with a little bit of help from some of our Texas colleagues and some from other parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, let me address some of the issues. The insurance industry and managed care organizations and HMOs have been repeatedly trying to scare the American people saying the bill that we are going to vote on, the Norwood-Dingell bill, would dramatically raise premiums and force employers to drop health insurance. I even heard one of the special interest groups say that this number would be as high as 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, once they have spread all of this inaccurate information, let me give the experience that not only we have in Texas but also from the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office is a nonpartisan agency. They analyzed the Patients' Bill of Rights and said that the best they could determine, that the cost to the beneficiaries under the Patients' Bill of Rights may cost $2 a month. That is less than the cost of a Happy Meal to provide fairness and protection and accountability.

But in the State of Texas, even if one does not agree with the Congressional Budget Office, and sometimes I disagree with their estimates, we need to look at real-life experience for the last

2 years in Texas. Again, Texas passed this same legislation in 1997, and it became effective in September of 1997; and so we have had over 2 years of experience.

In Texas the patient protections included a consensus HMO reform bill that had external appeals and also the accountability issue, the liability. And over the first 2 years there has been no significant increase in premiums. In fact, the analysis shows that the first quarter of 1999, premiums in Dallas and Houston have increased about half the national average.

And we know there are lots of things that go into increases in premiums, particularly with HMOs because of some of the problems they have now. They tried to expand so rapidly, and now they are having to contract and they are also increasing their premiums; but they are doing it around the country.

So in Texas we have not seen any increase in 2 years in health insurance premiums attributable to the Patients' Bill of Rights. In some cases it is attributable to the increased cost for prescription medication or for other reasons. Health care costs in Texas have increased 4 percent in the first quarter compared to 8 percent in the rest of the country. These estimates are based on reality provided by the Texas Medical Association, and it is more than a theoretical study that should be our guide for the HMO debate.

Moreover, beyond the slim cost of the increase, there has been no exodus by employers to drop health insurance coverage, nor has there been any exodus by patients to go to a courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, in an earlier life I was licensed to practice law, and I have to admit we do not have any shortage of plaintiff's lawyers in Texas who will go to court if they have that opportunity. But, again, in the 2 years we have had it, we have not seen more than four suits, and I will talk about that later in the hour if we get to it. But four lawsuits in Texas. Although we have a fifth one that may be out there, but one of them was by one of the insurance companies challenging the law.

So what Texas residents have is health care protections that they needed, and they are enjoying them now; and as Members of Congress we owe the duty to provide those same protections on a nationwide basis. Unfortunately, instead of recognizing the affordability and value of the consensus bill tomorrow, the Norwood-Dingell bill, our Republican leadership seems poised to repeat last year's actions and come up with imitation bills, and we will talk about those over the next hour also.

But I see my colleague, the gentleman from San Antonio, Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ). Before he came to Washington, he served in the Texas legislature for a number of years. He knows it is not easy to pass major legislation there unless it is consensus. In fact, the gentleman was in the State legislature in 1997 when Texas passed that law, and I yield to my colleague from San Antonio.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, as a State representative from Texas I know the situation well, and we in Texas are known for the blue bonnets, the Texas barbecue and the champion San Antonio Spurs, the beautiful Rio Grande; but we are also known for the changes that we have made in managed care reform.

Two years ago, Texas was fortunate to have the foresight to enact and implement its own managed care reform. The days and nights prior to that passage are very similar to tonight and this week here in the U.S. Congress where the discussions are over one side that says that health care costs are going to skyrocket and the other side, the good side, saying that we cannot compromise the health care even at the expense of losing one individual for the almighty dollar.

I am of the thinking that health care should not be about compromising anyone's life, but rather about health care and promotion and education.

Two major issues that have helped address the health care concerns of consumers in Texas are the external review process and the ability to hold an HMO liable through a lawsuit. Through the external review process, hundreds of individuals in Texas have the opportunity to have their cases heard by an outside party. The decisions are made by the doctors chosen by an independent medical foundation. The doctors review the cases and render a decision based on that information.

The best part of it is that it is done in a timely manner. In Texas we take pride in that we mandate the review to occur within 14 days and in cases of life or death, for them to move within 3 days in making those life-threatening decisions.

What is even better is that what the doctor says goes. It is not the way we have it right now where an accountant or an insurance person is the one dictating what should happen versus what the doctor is saying.

Nearly 600 cases have been handled in this manner through the external and internal review in Texas and guess what? Half of them have been ruled on behalf of the patients. So it has gone 50–50. So we feel it has been a very fair system that has been working.

For the States that are not fortunate to have this law, I believe that we need to pass Federal legislation here on the Federal level that will ensure that all Americans, not just Texans, have that opportunity to have a due process.

A testament to the fact that the Texas' system works is evidenced through the story that was told in an article by the U.S. News and World Report in March. The story is about a young boy, little Travis, who had a medical condition that came from the fact that he had difficulty breathing. And I was hearing the comments by the previous gentleman out here talking about the external review process being useless. The gentleman should tell that to little Travis. That was the difference between life and death.

Because of his condition, his doctor asked the HMO to authorize an on-duty nurse. Hard to believe, but the HMO later refused to pay for that nurse. An internal review of the case by the HMO doctor ended up upholding the HMO decision, so the first internal review they sided with the HMO. But thank God the next step was the external review. An outside doctor reviewed the case and found that little Travis was, indeed, entitled to that nursing care. And this is a case with the HMO playing with a little boy's life and it is a serious situation.

Mr. Speaker, thank God he lived in Texas. Each time he stopped breathing, he and his parents knew that he was within moments of suffocating. Having a nurse on hand part-time provided the necessary care for little Travis who needed it when his parents were not around. The external review process works for many, but for those that do not have that access, it cannot work. We have got to assure that those individuals have access to that opportunity.

For the positive happening for little Travis's case, it is great. But there are too many out there who still suffer under those situations.

I would also like to mention that I believe that the ability to sue HMOs in Texas, there was a lot of talk about the fact that there was going to be a lot of lawsuits and that everyone was going to be sue happy. This is not the case, and we have had it there over 2 years. So the reality is, and I will challenge my colleagues, do not be fearful. It is not going to happen. In the State of Texas only five lawsuits have been filed. Think about it. It is a State of 4 million individuals that are in managed care with only five lawsuits that have been filed.

Members can say what they will about managed care reform, but in Texas it has been working. It is alive and well and serving the best interests of those individuals under managed care.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also just congratulate my fellow colleagues and I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before my colleague leaves, and I appreciate the gentleman being here, let me give some updated information on the appeals process in Texas. As of August of 1999, during the month of August there were only 23 requests for the independent review. But from November 1 of 1997 to the present, the total requests were 626 appeals in those 2 years. 610 of them were completed. The number they upheld was 47. The number of overturned was 46. And partially overturned was 42. So what we are seeing is about 50–50 for the external appeals process.

Again, they are not clogging up the process, but what they are doing is

making sure people have a right to go outside and ask for an appeals process. They do not really want to go to court in Texas. The 2 years we have had that there have been so few lawsuits, but we have had a lot of appeals and people are getting the health care that they need and these appeals are being done quick. They ask for them, and they can complete them almost within that 30 days.

□ 2045

So instead of waiting for 2 years to get to the courthouse, they are actually able to get that health care that they need. That is what is so important.

Again, in the last 2 years since November, a little less than 2 years because the actual appeals process went into effect November 1 of 1997, again half the decisions are in favor of the insurance company, and about a little over half are in favor of the patient.

So what that means is that I feel much more comfortable as a patient that, instead of the chance of a flip of the coin, that we have a better percentage of upholding HMO's decisions or managed care decisions if they had it. But they are losing about half of them in Texas, actually a little more than half.

So that is why it is so important that we pass on a national level a real strong external review process backed up by the accountability.

The reason we do not have the lawsuits in Texas and what is estimated by the people at home is that we have a good, tough external review process where people get their case heard, they get their health care; or they lay out their case, and they do not receive their health care because they are not entitled to it.

It is tough to go to court after one has been through that external review process and find out that one really does not have enough that even an independent review does not do it.

What worries me is that the Republican leadership this year, with what we are going to do tomorrow, there is going to be a number of other plans that will be considered, every one of them is found lacking in what we need to do.

It is so important that we adopt the Norwood-Dingell bill, it is a consensus bill, a bipartisan bill, and attack or defeat the poison pills that are really there just to cloud the issue and not provide the health care that we need.

Let me talk a little bit about the concern about one of the amendments to move these suits to Federal court. Again, in Texas, they go to State court. Again, having practiced law, I do not have a lot of Federal experience in Federal courts, but there was a reason for that. I would much rather go before judges that are elected than judges on the Federal level.

My worry is, if we move these cases to Federal court, that they will be there for years and years and years. If they have to go to court, one needs to go the quickest one can if one has to.

In Texas, we have not had but three or four cases, maybe five at the most, in 2 years. That is why moving to Federal court in one of the amendments tomorrow would be wrong. It would actually be against the patients ability to have justice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from East Texas (Mr. TURNER). Again, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) served as a State representative in Texas, State Senator, in fact was a State Senator in 1995 when the first Patients' Bill of Rights was passed by the legislature and vetoed by the Governor at that time. But in 1997, he let it become law without his signature. I am glad Governor Bush did that in 1997 and saw the error of his ways.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, all three of the Texans here tonight served in the legislature, and we all have fought for this issue in our State legislature, and that is one of the reasons we feel so strongly about the fact that the protections that we have provided in law for all Texans should be protections that every American enjoys.

I am glad to see the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) here tonight who is a medical doctor who has fought hard on the Republican side to help pass the Norwood-Dingell bill, also referred to as the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act, which I think aptly describes the bill that we are trying to pass because it has been crafted with bipartisan support.

It has been worked on for many, many months. Those who have worked on it have been responsive to any concern that has been expressed about it. We are convinced that it is the right bill, and this is the right time to pass these protections for all Americans.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) mentioned, I was in the Texas Senate in 1995 when the Texas legislature passed the first patient protection legislation in the country. That bill, unfortunately, was vetoed by Governor Bush.

The legislature came back in Texas in 1997 and passed similar legislation once again, broke it down into four separate bills. Three of those bills were signed by the Governor. The fourth he allowed to become law without his signature.

Unfortunately, when we passed the bill the first time in 1995, even though we passed it with overwhelming support, over 90 percent of the members of each house voting in favor, we passed it at the end of the session, and the Governor was able to veto it without an opportunity to overturn the veto.

But we are here tonight to try to provide the same kind of protections for all Americans that we provided for Texans in 1997.

When we passed that bill in 1995 and again in 1997, we had no idea that it would not apply to all Texans. But an insurance company went to court shortly after we passed our legislation and it had become law, and the courts ruled that a Federal law preempted our State law, and that all insurance plans covered by the ERISA law that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) referred to at Federal law meant that those protections that we had provided in our State legislature did not apply to all of those plans that were multi-State plans covered under the Federal ERISA law.

So we have a very awkward situation all across the country today because State after State after State have passed patient protection legislation to protect their patients. Yet, we find there is a Federal law standing in the way that has basically meant that about 40 percent of all the folks that are insured in this country under managed care are not covered by the basic patient protections that their State legislatures have passed over the last 2 and 3 years.

So the Norwood-Dingell bill is designed to change that, to be sure that all people enrolled in managed care plans have the same protections that we believe are just common sense.

Things like ensuring that a patient can go to the nearest emergency room when he has an emergency. Rights like being able to go to the doctor in your own town rather than going to a doctor in an adjoining community. Rights like having access to go to a specialist when one needs one when one's doctor says he wants to refer one to a specialist. Basic rights like not being forced to change doctors and hospitals right in the middle of one's treatment just because one's employer happens to change their managed care company. Basic protections like making sure that medical decisions are made by doctors, not by insurance company clerks.

These are the basic protections that we provided in Texas in 1997, and these are the basic protections that we want to provide for all patients across the United States in the Norwood-Dingell bill.

One of the things that always amazes me, we faced it in 1995 in Texas, we faced it in 1997 in Texas, and now we are facing it here in Washington in 1999, with the managed care companies saying that the sky is going to fall if we pass this legislation. They are claiming that health care costs are going to go up.

They had even gotten the folks who carry their insurance for the employers and the business community all worked up and speaking out against this bill because they think the cost of insuring their employees is going to go up.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) pointed out, the Congressional Budget Office says the cost of this legislation would be less than $2 a month per patient. Very small cost in my judgment to protect patients.

When it comes right down to it, business people in this country care very much about their employees and their employees health care. I think most businessmen and women understand

that, when they sign up with an insurance company to provide health insurance for their employees, they want a plan that is going to take care of those employees.

Right now, we have a situation where these basic protections are not guaranteed, and some managed care companies, I understand, today, are already providing these, but many are not.

I really think it would be a lot easier for the average businessman or woman in selecting health insurance for their employees to know that every plan, no matter what proposal is laid on their desk, and no matter what price is offered to them for coverage of their employees, that they know these very basic common sense protections are in every plan.

Right now, I think health care is in turmoil in this country. Doctors are not happy, having to make ten and twenty phone calls to a managed care company just to get something approved that they know their patient needs.

I have talked to these doctors. They are really frustrated with the system as we know it today. I have talked to patients who wonder why they cannot get simple care from a specialist simply because their plan denies them access to a specialist. They do not understand that kind of treatment. They do not understand why they cannot go to an emergency room and have a doctor in the emergency room make a decision as to whether or not there is an emergency rather than having to get on the phone and call the insurance company clerk in some far-off city and find out whether or not they can receive emergency treatment. Those kind of basic protections patients deserve. Employers who want to take care of their employees want this kind of protection for their employees as well.

The truth of the matter is, if we are going to have a health care system in this country that works for everybody, the employers, those who are insured, the doctors, and other health care providers, we need to pass this legislation, because the further we go down the road and find patients being abused and managed care companies doing a shoddy job of rendering care, the more we are going to undermine what has become known for many years as the finest system of health care in the entire world.

So what we are really fighting for here tonight is, not only the protection of patients, individual patients and their families, but we are fighting to preserve the finest quality system of health care the world has ever known. We need the stability in health care that this legislation will provide.

Now, the big debate is over this issue of accountability. Should a managed care company be accountable for their decisions? Well, frankly, I think that the answer is pretty obvious. Certainly they should be accountable. All of us are accountable for our decisions. All of us can end up in court if we are negligent or make a mistake.

Frankly, the rule really is pretty simple, I think, that should be applied in this debate; and that is, when health insurance companies make medical decisions, they should be accountable in the same way that one's doctor is accountable when he makes a health care decision. We all know in this country that, if a doctor happens to make a mistake in the operating room, happens to do something that causes injury to one or one's children, that one can go to the courthouse and seek redress, seek recovery of injuries. A child who is paralyzed for life because of a mistake of a medical provider, that family can go to court, be compensated in damages. That is what our American system of legal justice guaranties all of us.

If a managed care company makes a decision that denies one health care when it is covered under the plan, now if it is not covered, it is just not covered and it is not going to be paid for, but if it is covered and, in their review of medical necessity they say one does not need that care, one's doctor is standing there all the while saying, yes, my patient needs that care, and the managed care company says, no, and one goes under the Norwood-Dingell bill and appeals that internally, and one appeals that externally, and one has got a decision, and one finds out that still the decision of the managed care company was wrong, every American ought to have the right to go to the courthouse and seek their damages. That is what the American system of justice is all about.

So if a doctor makes a mistake, he knows he has to go to the courthouse or could go to the courthouse. That is why he buys malpractice insurance. What is wrong with asking managed care companies to also carry malpractice insurance? Every profession in the United States, every individual who is a doctor, a lawyer, an engineer carries malpractice insurance. It is a wonderful thing, insurance. We spread the risk of loss among all of us to protect each of us individually.

Why should we in this hallowed hall of the House of Representatives declare this week that the only group in America that can never be held accountable in a court of law is a managed care insurance company? That is wrong, and we cannot let that happen.

I think we have a good bill. It ensures accountability, and it is drafted in a fair way. The only way one can go to court and sue a managed care company under this legislation is after one has gone through the internal and the external review procedure.

In Texas, the sky has not fallen. In Texas, we have the right to go to the courthouse. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) pointed out, there has only been a handful of lawsuits. In fact, there has only been five filed in Texas.

The author of the legislation that did pass in 1997, Senator David Sibley, a Republican, good friend of mine, carried that bill. He says, and I quote, ''The sky did not fall. Those horror stories raised by the industry just did not transpire.'' Dave Sibley, the sponsor of the bill is a lawyer, former doctor, an ally of Governor Bush.

Even Governor Bush acknowledged in the Washington Post September of this year that he believes the law in Texas has worked well.

I believe every American deserves the protection that we fought to give Texans in 1997. This legislation is long overdue.

I appreciate so very much the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) reserving this hour to give us the opportunity to talk about this important bill.

I believe the American people want this legislation. I believe the employers of this country who believe in protecting their employees want this legislation. I believe we need to ensure the long-term stability of the best health care system the world has ever known, and this bill moves us along the road in ensuring that.

□ 2100

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague. Again, having served with the gentleman both in the State legislature, the Senate and the House, and now in the Congress, we have gotten to that point. Because as Texans we brag all the time about how great our State is, and sometimes we puff it up a little bit; but we are not puffing on this legislation. This has worked in Texas, it has provided the benefits, all the accountability, the outside appeals process, the anti-gag orders so doctors can actually talk to their patients; and it has allowed patients to go to the closest emergency room without having to drive by closer emergency rooms.

So there are so many things I am proud of. Always proud to be a Texan, but particularly because of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to yield to another good friend who I serve with on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. And I might just mention that her State, California, just recently passed a series of bills just similar to this, and I know Governor Davis signed them into law about a week ago.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and would like to compliment him for sharing with us tonight the experience of Texas in health maintenance organization reform. It is particularly appropriate that we are here tonight, because tomorrow, after fighting for more than 2 years, the House actually has a real shot at passing a managed care reform bill. The American people want this. In fact, they are demanding that we pass managed care reform, and I am particularly glad that this House is finally rising to the occasion.

I am also pleased that the Democrats and Republicans have worked together

to support a common sense patient protection bill. It is bipartisan. It is called, in fact, the bipartisan Dingell-Norwood bill. And any of my colleagues who are saying the Dingell-Norwood bill will not work are very, very wrong; and they have to review what has gone on in Texas. If they will pay attention to the Texas experience, they will know that the sky will not fall if we take care of patients when they are covered by a health maintenance organization.

I would like to share also some of the recent accomplishments from my State, the State of California, where just last week Governor Gray Davis signed landmark legislation that put health decisions back in the hands of 20 million patients and their doctors. This comprehensive package is made up of 19 bills, and it will absolutely overhaul the way HMOs do business in California.

A key piece in the package includes managed care accountability. The State now has a new Department of Managed Care, which will act as a watchdog for patients with HMO providers. This State agency is devoted exclusively to the licensing and regulation of health plans. The legislation will also include a new Office of Patient Advocate, which will assist in enrollees with complaints, provide education guidelines, issue annual reports, and make recommendations on consumer issues.

With this legislation, Californians now have the right to an external review of their health care coverage decisions by an independent group of medical experts. By January 1, 2001, this external review program will dispute claims when a patient's treatment has been delayed, denied, or modified.

I am proud to tell my colleagues that the package also includes HMO liability, giving Californians the right to sue their HMO for harm caused by failure to provide appropriate and/or necessary care. This is a much-needed remedy for any family harmed by a decision made by the HMO or by a clerk working for the HMO. Any decision that would delay, deny, or modify medically necessary treatment will be under scrutiny.

In addition, Californians can look forward, under this legislation, to new consumer protections. These protections will include a second medical opinion, upon request for patients; expanded patient privacy rights will prohibit the release of mental health information, unless patient notice is provided; and a prohibition on the selling, sharing or use of medical information for any purpose not necessary to provide health care services.

This legislation in California sets procedures for HMOs to review a treatment request by a doctor to ensure that timely information and decisions regarding a patient's treatment needs come forward at the right time. Patients will be informed of the process used by a doctor when that doctor determines whether to deny, modify, or approve health care services.

In fact, Californians are also guaranteed the right to hold an HMO accountable by seeking punitive damages in court if and when harm comes to a patient. Congress should take note that if California can do it, and if California can pass similar reforms as those in the Dingell-Norwood bill, then, for Heaven's sake, we can pass the same type of legislation for our country. Because California has the population and the economy of a country in and of itself. California has 33 million people, and the challenge has been met.

Tomorrow, the Dingell-Norwood bill is a good starting point for the managed care reform we need in this Nation. The Norwood-Dingell bill provides Americans the ability to choose their own doctor, to get emergency room care, to see a specialist, and unleash their doctor from HMO gag rules on treatment options. And especially important for Americans is that the Dingell-Norwood bill holds HMOs accountable.

This bill has bipartisan support as well as support from more than 300 health care and consumer groups. I am convinced that this bipartisan bill deserves a clean up or down vote. It does not need to have any amendments.

The American people are counting on us to take heed of the Texas and the California accomplishments in HMO reform, so let us focus tomorrow on the consensus we have built. Let us accept no substitutes to the vital patient protections in the Dingell-Norwood bill, and let us again pay attention to what other States have been able to accomplish, such as Texas.

We are going to hear from Wisconsin and North Carolina, and we will see that the people in this country are telling us that they want and they demand health care reform and managed care reform, and we must heed this and go forward tomorrow.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for having this special order tonight.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague from California. It is great to serve with the gentlewoman on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

And the gentlewoman is right. In the California experience, it is both rural and urban. Just like Texas is rural and urban. So it will be a great example of making it work in this country from one coast to the other coast. We need to make sure that we have real patient care and managed care reform.

I would like to now yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who came in the same class as I did, in 1993.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and arranging for this special order for us to talk about the provision in the bipartisan manage care reform bill known as the Dingell-Norwood bill. I am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss it before we debate it on the floor tomorrow.

I am proud to be one of the original cosponsors of the bill and to be an advocate for it. I also serve as the co-chair of a health task force. And as an individual coming from a rural area, where a lot of our patients are still uninsured, I can also be a very strong advocate for this bill, which gives protection for managed care.

We have just heard recently that, indeed, the uninsured have increased. And I am concerned about that because many of the people in my district are indeed part of that uninsured. So my support for the Norwood-Dingell bill does not diminish my advocacy for making sure that we find ways of insuring more of the uninsured. Indeed, it was almost predictable, because we did not do what we could have done earlier when we had the opportunity to look at health care reform that, indeed, this rise would occur. I think we have an opportunity to speak to that, but I do not think one negates the other. So as one who is an advocate for making sure the uninsured are also protected, I strongly advocate the provisions of the bipartisan bill.

This bipartisan bill gives increased access to patients in a variety of areas. It says first that those who have emergencies should not have to have prior approval. They have immediate access for emergency treatment, even at the emergency hospitals of their choice. They should not have to be shifted around to various hospitals in that area.

It also increases the protections for women who want to be protected under this bill. It increases that access. It also increases access for those patients who have special needs and need to have specialty providers in treating their conditions. So the access is enhanced for those who have a managed care program.

Let me just say parenthetically that there are, indeed, good managed care programs. This is not to negate where there are positive managed care programs. This is to improve and to give some minimal standards that the managed care programs that people have should be dependable, they should be held accountable for their care, and they should be aware of defining medical necessity. All of these are to ensure that whatever plans we have, they should be the kind of plans that patients can have confidence in.

I cannot understand why it is that people are afraid of being held accountable. If they say they are going to provide certain services, they should be honored to say that they will be held accountable for those services. Indeed, being held accountable allows a review process. And if in the review process arbitration does not work out, the patient has the right to go to court. They have that opportunity.

Also, the bill protects the provider. And this is very, very important, because many doctors have said they

have been under a gag rule. They cannot tell their patient all of the options that they know would be good for their health care. So they are prevented from telling them options that would perhaps provide the right medical treatment because it is not the most economical treatment in that area. The anti-gag provision in this bill prevents that. It means that we protect the providers and we assure the confidentiality and the professional care between a doctor and their patient. And the patient also has a right in the selection of the provider that is adequately trained in those areas.

All of these provisions go to making the managed care program stronger for patients who have to have these insurance provisions. So I want to say to our colleagues that as we debate this bill tomorrow, that any options or amendments or substitutes that are being offered, and offered in glorious terms as being a cure-all for health care, are, indeed, poison pills. And if we are ensuring that patients have good health care, we have to vote down each and every one of those substitutes as well as those amendments.

So I urge my colleagues to give Americans a choice and, indeed, to give them a clean bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights. And I thank the gentleman once again.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and I want her to know that I am aware of the devastation in the gentlewoman's district, we talked about it today, from the hurricane. In Texas, we are familiar with hurricanes damaging our coast.

I would like to now yield, Mr. Speaker, to a new Member, a very active new Member from Wisconsin. And like I said earlier, we have people from not only the West Coast in California but North Carolina, on the East Coast, and of course in Texas, and also now the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), and I yield to her.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for organizing this special order.

Time and time again we hear how the United States has the best health care in the world, but that does not matter if a health plan denies meaningful access to the health care system when individuals are sick. Managed care was designed to provide the best health care available at a lower cost. But what does it matter if in addition to our health insurance premium we still have to pay sizable, sometimes enormous out-of-pocket costs for needed tests or treatments that our health plan will not cover.

□ 2115

There was a time when we paid our health insurance premiums trusting that when we got sick our doctors would make his or her recommendations for treatment and that our health insurance would pay for that treatment. This just does not seem to be the case any more. We no longer trust that the best medical decisions are being made in this system, and too many people with health care coverage are being driven into debt because necessary treatment is not being covered by their managed care company.

As my colleagues know, families in my community in Wisconsin feel very anxious about the state of health care in America. They are increasingly concerned that medical decisions are being made by accountants, by managers, by other insurance company employees instead of the doctors and the patients making the decisions; and too often profit is taking a priority over a sick patient in need.

Patients are losing faith that they can count on their health insurance plans to provide the care that they were promised when they enrolled and faithfully paid their premiums.

We have all read the stories, and those of us who have the privilege of serving here have often heard painful firsthand accounts from families and individuals who sent us here to fight for them, to represent them, people who were denied care or services by managed care providers.

I recall reading an article last winter in Wisconsin about a young man struggling with known Hodgkin's lymphoma. He was told by his doctor that the most promising and potential cure, a bone marrow transplant, was not going to be covered by his plan. Chemotherapy in his case would only slow down the disease. The prognosis they gave him was up to 10 years to live, and according to this prognosis 5 of those years his cancer with chemotherapy would likely to be in some sort of remission. However it would likely come back sometime within the second 5 years and get steadily worse. He underwent a round of chemotherapy because that is what his insurance company would cover. In his case his earlier prognosis was not accurate. It did not even give him 5 years of remission. Instead the cancer re-appeared in only 8 months.

Now this was a highly publicized case in my State, and because of the negative publicity and the public outcry, his insurance company relented and permitted the bone marrow transplant admitting belatedly. According to the medical literature, this was not a treatment that was regarded in the medical literature as experimental. Unfortunately, it was too late for this 41-year-old young man, and he passed away earlier this year.

But people should not have to wage publicity campaigns to shame their health care plans into covering medically necessary procedures. They should have appeals processes, not publicity campaigns.

I was deeply disturbed when I heard of another poignant case in my district. This is a story of a man who is in the hospital. He was recovering from a procedure, and he received a phone call from the representative of his HMO in his room saying that if he stayed in the hospital room past midnight, his insurance company was not going to cover it.

Now this gentleman had just gotten out of intensive care, and it was all he could do practically to reach over and pick up the phone, and I just think how frightening this experience must be for the patient, for the family and for those who hear of it and wonder whether their insurance, their health care plans, their managed care plans are really going to cover them.

As my colleagues know, having a recourse when something goes wrong is so vital, and health plans should not be allowed to escape responsibility for their actions when their decisions kill or injure patients.

Six years ago we were promised reform that would guarantee every American the health care they needed. That vision was not realized. In this time of economic prosperity, in this time of rapidly changing medicine, in this time of political opportunity, I think it is time that we renew our commitment to the health care security for all; and when I think about what that means, I believe that health care security for all encompasses both the notion that we must cover the uninsured and the effort to fully protect those who already have health care coverage but find that is not the security blanket that they thought they had purchased.

Many States have taken steps to establish some of these patient protections. We heard about Texas and California earlier this hour. Unfortunately, most States have only passed a few of the protections contained in this bill before us, and there are many gaps that remain to be filled. Even States with strong consumer protection laws cannot cover a large number of their residents, the 50 million Americans who receive their insurance from a self-insured employer plan under ERISA and are not protected under State law.

We need comprehensive Federal legislation that provides a minimum standard of patient protections for all Americans. The Norwood-Dingell bill will do just that, and I hope tomorrow that this Congress rises to the occasion to pass this vital legislation.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate our colleague from Wisconsin in being here this evening and joining in this. We only have a few minutes left before our colleague from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) comes to the floor. Having watched Dr. GANSKE over the last number of weeks and sitting in my office, returning phone calls, thank goodness an hour earlier in Texas, and I can catch up on that, and his efforts on managed care reform and his efforts over the last, in the last session of Congress.

Let me talk before we close about some of the bills or the competitive bills tomorrow to the Norwood-Dingell bill. There will be a bill called the Comprehensive Access and Responsibility Act introduced by the gentleman

from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER). Which is one of the two alternatives. It falls very far short of the Norwood-Dingell bill and the protections that are in there. The biggest problem is it does not cover as many Americans as the Norwood-Dingell bill. It is very limited. Moreover, the bill has no provision to hold HMOs accountable for the decisions that harm their customers that are enrollees, and every other business in America is subject to liability for poor judgment, and why should not the health plans be any different?

Finally, this bill does not allow chronically ill patients to designate their specialist as a primary care provider. As our colleague from Wisconsin mentioned, there are times that you might need if it is an oncologist, if you have a cancer, if you have some other type of illness, you might want to designate that specialist as your primary care person, and that is in the Norwood-Dingell bill.

The other alternative by a couple Members of Congress, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), it is called the Health Care Quality and Choice Act. Now again for most folks who watch Congress and they understand that there is no requirement that the actual title of the bill reflect what is in the body of the bill, and we do not have any truth in titling here in Congress, because their bill again falls short. It would force patients harmed by their HMOs to go to Federal court so you can get behind all the Federal cases, and in Texas most of the Federal cases are drug cases, and they have preference; criminal cases have preference. So their bill would require you to go to Federal court.

First, the Federal system is much more difficult and expensive to access than State courts, and there are fewer of them, so patients will be forced to travel long distances, and particularly in rural areas, but even in Houston we have many more State courts in Harris County, Texas, than we ever have Federal courts. And worse yet, Federal law gives that priority to criminal cases over civil cases. So, in other words, maybe a decision will be made on whether you should have that bone marrow transplant. By the time you get to Federal court after all the other criminal cases are there, it may be 5 or 6 years later, and health care delayed is health care denied.

The Dingell-Norwood consensus bill is the only bipartisan bill that we have that recognizes medical necessity, that allows the patient and the doctor to define medical necessity based on the medical history and the specific need of that patient.

Appeals process. Again, modeled after the Texas law, allows patients to appeal the decision of their HMO to an independent external panel of specialists.

Access to specialists. As I said earlier, the bill requires health care plans to include access to specialists and offer access to specialists that the patient needs.

Emergency room coverage. The bill provides guaranteed access to emergency services to managed care enrollees and requires a plan to pay for those services if a prudent lay person believes that they are in a health, in a life-threatening situation, and I use the example: I am a lay person. I do not know if I am having chest pains because of the pizza I had last night or it is because I am actually having a heart attack. I should not have to make that decision. That is why we need to go to the closest emergency room.

But the most important and the final issue is accountability. The reason the appeals process in Texas works is because ultimately they could go to court, and it is also the most controversial; but again this is modeled after the Texas law, and we have over 2 years experience. This bill allows Americans harmed by their HMOs to seek redress in the State court. However, to prevent frivolous cases, they can only sue after they have exhausted their appeals and the patient is harmed. The provision is tightly crafted so not only to hold the medical decision maker accountable.

And let me say in brief I had, a couple of years ago I had the opportunity to speak to the Harris County Medical Society, and after talking about some of the bills I have been working on, the first question from a doctor was, and by the way, I joked about my daughter having 2 weeks in medical school, and she was not quite ready to do brain surgery. The first question from that doctor to me said, you know your daughter after 2 weeks in medical school has more training than the person I call to treat my patients.

That is what is wrong with our medical system we have now. We do have the greatest health care system in the world. People come from all over the world to get to us to have that system, but we are denying it to some of our folks who have insurance, and we need to change that. We need to make sure that we restore that health care provider and that doctor so they can talk to their patient.

The reason, reasons the consensus bill are so insistent on accountability provision, because if you do not have that, you will not have, they will not have the incentive to change their practices, and while opponents of the strong binding consensus bill claim it would dramatically increase health costs, we know in Texas it has not increased health costs in 2 years; and what we found in Texas, that patients are right and about half their appeals in the health care plans honor that decision because they do not want to get sued. All the people want is their health care. They do not want to have to go to court; they do not want to have to go to State court, much less Federal court that is in some of the alternatives.

I would hope that my colleagues tomorrow would reject the poison pill amendments. Sure we need to do additional access, and I would hope we can do that on the floor of the House sometime but without trying to dirty up the waters on providing access in modernization of the HMO process.

I have had my colleagues talk about earlier that all we are asking for is some guidelines for managed care to deal with their customers and our constituents and the doctors' patients. In fact, over the past 5 years all 50 States have passed laws to protect patients in State-regulated plans. Some of them are stronger than others, and these alternative bills essentially disregard the advances that are made in each State and moreover more people into Federal regulation would lose protections.

These laws have been passed by Democratic and Republican legislators. They have been signed into law by Democratic and Republican governors. But the Republican leadership would jeopardize the health care of millions in these protections unless we pass it tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank my colleagues who were here tonight and all those who are listening because tomorrow, Wednesday, and Thursday this week this House will make some major decisions; and if we make the wrong decision like we did last year, then we will continue to have people denied adequate health care in our country. Our country is too great to do that.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Will enactment of the Norwood-Dingell Bill lead to skyrocketing health care costs?

Since Texas began to implement a series of managed care reforms in 1995, our HMO premium increases have mirrored or trailed those premium hikes in other states that don't have managed care reform bills in place.

Nationally, health care costs have increased by 3.7 percent in 1998 while in Texas, the costs increased by only 1.10 percent for the same period.

Will enactment of the Norwood-Dingell Bill lead to frivolous law suits?

Since Texas enacted its Patient's Bill of Rights in 1997, there have been only five lawsuits in a managed care system that serves four million patients.

This number of lawsuits is low because our patients are fully using the external review process that is a component of the Norwood-Dingell bill. More than 700 patients have used the external review process in the past two years to appeal the decisions made by health plans. Of those, about half of the decisions have gone in favor of the HMOs.

Will the Norwood-Dingell Bill result in employers dropping their employees from health care coverage and thus drive up the number of uninsured families?

It may be too early to tell using our state's example. But the fact remains that as HMOs have increased penetration in recent years, so has the nubmer of uninsured. That is the case in Texas and around the nation.

Since the Texas Legislature made managed-care plans liable for malpractice, there have been five known lawsuits from among the 4 million Texans who belong to HMOs.

''The sky didn't fall,'' said Sen. David Sibley, the Republican who championed the Texas

version of the Patient's Bill of Rights. ''Those horror stories,'' envisioned by the health insurance industry ''just did not transpire.''

While it is too early to see the full effect on my state it is evident that the implementation of this legislation has had a dramatic effect on resolving complaints between patients and their health plans—before they get to the courthouse.

Clearly this legislation has acted as a prime motivator for HMOs to settle their disputes with their patients. Regrettably, the vast majority of Americans do not have this option. That's why it is vital that we have national Patient's Bill of Rights that has some teeth in it—that permits patients to suit their HMOs when treatment decisions result in injury or death as well as granting patients access to emergency care and specialty care that is not currently allowed.

I strongly believe that the Texas experience strongly speaks to the benefits of empowering patients and doctors so that they can work with the insurance companies in ensuring that our health care system provides the best care for all Americans.

Republican Health Care Bill:

The Republicans introduced the Quality Care for the Uninsured Act. This legislation does move the health care debate forward. But not very far. It is not a bipartisan bill and it does not address that entire scope of health care delivery or what's wrong with managed care.

At best the Republican bill nibbles around the corners of health care debate. It provides for Medical Savings Plans and 100 percent deductibility of individual insurance premiums for the self-insured and uninsured.

This legislation does nothing to increase access to emergency services or ob-gyn. It does nothing to address the lopsided nature of the managed care equation in which insurance companies make most of the patient decisions, while doctors and the patients themselves are left in the waiting room.

BI-PARTISAN CONSENSUS MANAGED CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT (H.R. 2723)

H.R. 2723 that has already been introduced by Representatives CHARLES NORWOOD and JOHN DINGELL truly addresses the consumer and provider issues that have undermined the health care in America. I am a cosponsor of this legislation.

Its independent external appeals process will help patients get care quickly and resolve disputes without resorting to a court fight.

Once the appeals process has been exhausted patients will be able to hold health care plans accountable when they make negligent decisions that result in patient injury or death. At the same time, this legislation includes safeguards to protect employers from lawsuits and punitive damages against health plans that comply with the external review determination.

This legislation also provides patients with other essential protections including access to specialty care, emergency care, clinical trials and direct access to women's health services. Patients who need to go out-of-network for care will have access to a point-of-service option.

I look forward to a fair debate between our bi-partisan Patient's Bill of Rights versus the Republican Leadership's alternative. Once the American people fully understand what's in each bill—I am confident that the bi-partisan bill will prevail.

The majority of Americans would rather have a strong say in how they receive medical treatment than nibbling at the edges of this important problem.

Support and protect the Norwood-Dingell Bill; it's the only way to put doctors, nurses, and patients back into the business of patient care.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lone Star State has been a leader in health insurance reform. The Texas Legislature enacted a law in 1997 which protects patients' rights when insurance companies stand in the way of common sense and good medicine.

So what has happened in my home state over the past two years? Have our courts been overrun with frivolous lawsuits? Are families saddled with growing premiums? Are HMOs being run out of business? No. Not by a Texas mile.

Last week the Washington Post noted that only five lawsuits have been filed against health plans in Texas. That's five lawsuits in two years. Of the roughly six hundred complaints submitted to the independent review system established under the Texas law, about half of the cases have been resolved in favor of the patients, half in favor of the insurance companies. And premiums have not increased in our state. In fact, we enjoy some of the lowest premiums in the country. Almost everything is big in Texas.

And now the Lone Star State is not alone. California and Georgia have enacted health care legislation that will enable policyholders to sue their HMOs. And the majority of members of this body favor similar bi-partisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the question is no longer whether such provisions are a good idea, or even whether they are supported by legislators across the land and here in Washington. The question now is whether or not we, the House, will even have a chance to consider this measure. It will take, from the Republican leadership, the courage to stand up to big insurance companies and their scare tactics. And, I think, it will take an ounce of good old Texas courage.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and include their extraneous material on the subject of this special order speech that I and my colleagues have given tonight.

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

There was no objection.

WHILE COVERING UNINSURED, LET'S FIX MANAGED CARE

(By U.S. Rep. Gene Green)

As the Congress prepared to debate several HMO reform bills this week, House Speaker Dennis Hastert, R-Ill., has stated his intention to include in the managed-care reform debate, health-care-related tax cuts. These incentives, called the ''access package,'' are intended to allow tax cuts to the 44 million uninsured Americans who cannot afford health-care coverage.

While it is important that everyone has access to affordable health care, the issue that Congress has been debating for several months and that we should resolve, is how to reform our current managed-care system. If we are truly concerned about the uninsured, let's expand health-insurance access to them—insurance that will actually provide quality health care. Various managed-care proposals will be debated, but it is important to look beyond the titles to see what each proposal would do to really protect patients.

The fact is, 48 million Americans belong to self-funded health-insurance plans that offer very little protection for individuals from neglectful and wrongful decisions made by their insurance plans. Although some states—Texas, for instance—have passed laws that protect consumers from health-insurance malpractice, the protections enacted by states only affect insurance policies licensed by the state. We need a national set of guidelines for health-plan conduct.

The Dingell/Norwood consensus managed-care reform proposal is the only bipartisan bill that provides the necessary protections to revamp the current managed-care system. This bill, developed over weeks of negotiations, would provide every American in an HMO or managed-care plan the fundamental rights they need to ensure they receive quality health care. Its major provisions are:

Medical necessity: Allows the patient and the doctor to define medical necessity based on the medical history and specific needs of the patient.

Appeals process: Allows patients to appeal the decision of their HMO to an independent, external panel of specialists.

Access to specialists: Requires health plans that include access to specialists to offer access to the specialist that the patient needs.

Emergency room coverage: Provides guaranteed access to emergency services to managed-care enrollees and requires the plan to pay for those services if a ''prudent layperson'' believes they are in a life-threatening situation.

Accountability: Allows patients harmed by their HMO to hold their health plan accountable in state court.

While other bills claim to provide these same protections for patients, one look beyond their titles proves otherwise. The Comprehensive Access and Responsibility Act, introduced by Rep. John Boehner, R-Ohio, does not apply to all Americans. It only covers employer-sponsored health plans, and leaves out the most vulnerable insurance consumers—those who do not have an employer to negotiate for them. Moreover, this bill has no provision to hold HMOs accountable when their decision harms a patient.

The other alternative is sponsored by Rep. Tom Coburn, R-Okla., and Rep. John Shadegg, R-Ariz. This bill would force patients harmed by their HMO to seek remedies in federal court. The practical impact of this provision would be devastating to patients. First, the federal court system is much more difficult and expensive to access than state courts. There are fewer of them, so some patients could be forced to travel long distances. Worse yet, because federal law gives priority to criminal cases over civil cases, patients seeking remedies could be forced to wait years while the backlog of criminal cases clears. Finally, this bill does not allow chronically ill patients to designate their specialist as their primary-care provider. This means that every time they need to see their doctor, they have to go to another primary-care doctor first and get a referral.

Accountability and enforcement for medical decisions is the critical issue in the HMO debate. Without an effective accountability provision, managed-care companies will never have an incentive to change their practices of placing profits before patients. And while opponents of the strong and binding Norwood-Dingell bill claim it would dramatically increase health costs, we in Texas know it won't. The majority of the ''expensive'' provisions in the bill—which include

accountability, decisions of medical necessity and external appeals—were modeled after the Texas law. What we have found in Texas is that patients are right in about half of their appeals and health plans honor that decision. Since the law took effect, health-cost increases in Texas have been a reflection of rising prescription drug costs and inflation—just as we have seen in every other state.

It is our responsibility to ensure that patients get the high-quality health care they pay for and deserve. When Americans buy health insurance, they should not have to lose their relationship with their doctor or worry if their insurance plan will pay for the medical bill as they are heading to the emergency room. It is time that we provide patient-protection rights for consumers and for managed-care plans to be made accountable for delivering quality care and respecting basic consumer rights.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my colleagues from across the aisle as they relate to health care. I am going to continue the discussion on health care, and if my colleagues from Texas want to contribute to some of this, that would be just great; and I will be happy to recognize them periodically.

Let us talk a little bit about how people receive health care in this country.

So I have a chart here I want to share with my colleagues.

□ 2130

Let us just assume that this square represents all of the health insurance market, and the circle represents, both red and white in the circle, employer-based health insurance. So that you have about two-thirds of employer-based health insurance, consisting of employers offering fully insured products, i.e., you have your small business that contracts with an HMO. About one-third of employer-based health insurance is what we call self-funded employer plans. Then you have, outside of the employer-based health insurance, you have health insurance that is provided by churches and certain nonprofit organizations, Medicare, Medicaid, public sector employees, i.e., government employees, both Federal and State, and you have individuals who buy insurance policies.

Now, Congress passed a law related to pensions about 25 years ago called the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, and those people who receive insurance from their employer, those within the circle here, are under that law, the ERISA law.

Now, about two-thirds of those employer-based programs are under both Federal and State regulation. To some extent states regulate those plans, but the white area here is totally regulated by the Federal law.

The problem is in this area that frequently there are jurisdictional disputes between whether the State has the right to oversee those plans in some ways, or the Federal Government does, and that frequently ends you up in court fighting that out or with legal disputes. That needs to be clarified by Congress.

But one thing is pretty clear, and that is that there has been a universal feeling that if you are in an employer-based plan, both the red and the white in this circle, that then you are shielded from any responsibility, any legal responsibility, for bad actions that could result from the medical decisions that your health plan makes. The health plan is shielded from their negligent actions. That is something we need to address here in a few minutes.

Now, we are going to be debating in the next two days both a bill related to increasing the number of people in this country that are inside this square, i.e., those that have insurance, and we are going to be debating what quality of care those who are inside the circle receive.

Let me speak for a minute about those that are off the chart, the 44 million Americans that do not have health insurance.

This number has gone up steadily over the last several years. As a percentage of the number of people in this country, however, it is staying about the same, about 16.2 percent. In other words, the number of people in our country is increasing as well.

Who are those people who are not inside the box, that do not have health insurance? They are primarily the young, i.e., those between 18 and 24, and the poor, and there is a sizable percentage of them who qualify for Federal programs already, but they are not enrolled.

There are 11 million uninsured children in this country today. More than half of those children qualify for Federal programs to pay for their insurance, either through Medicaid or through what we call the children's health insurance plan, the CHIP program.

Why are they not enrolled if they are qualified? Frequently it is a matter that the parents do not even know about it, or the states and Federal Government have not done a very good job in making sure that people who qualify take advantage of those benefits. That would go a long way. If you could reduce the number of uninsured children in this country by 5 million simply by getting those children into the programs that already exist, you have made a big dent in the number of uninsured. We ought to do that.

We are going to be debating on the floor some tax measures, some measures related to changes in what are called association health plans; there will probably be some debate on medical savings accounts, some things like that.

Some of those areas I agree with; some I have some problems with. I am worried that with the association health plan measure in the access bill that it could have unintended consequences to actually increase the cost of insurance for those who are, for instance, in the individual market, the individual health insurance market. Nevertheless, we are going to have a debate on that. I anticipate there will be some support for that bill from both sides of the aisle. Then we are going to have a debate on how to improve the health care for those people in this country who are already spending a lot of money on health care.

But while I have this chart up here, I think it is useful to point out something, because there was a recent study by the Kaiser Family Foundation on the relative cost of lawsuits in comparing those people who are in the ERISA plans who are shielded, whose plans are shielded from liability, to those that are in non-ERISA plans where you can obtain legal redress against your HMO if they commit an injury to you or your loved one.

Remember this: Government employees are in non-ERISA plans. That means that government employees have a right to sue their HMO. But if you receive your health insurance from your employer, either through an employer offering fully insured products, like HMOs or self-funded products, you do not.

So this is a good comparison, the comparison on premiums and on the incidence of lawsuits between those that can sue, i.e., churches, people in churches or public sector employees or individuals, versus those that cannot.

The Kaiser Family Foundation found out that the incidence of lawsuits in those who are in plans where you can sue is very low, and that the cost, the estimated cost for providing that right to those who do not have it, would be in the range of 3 to 12 cents per month per employee. That is a rather modest cost when you think about how that could prevent something truly awful.

Let me describe a case that is truly awful. We have here a little boy, a beautiful little boy about 6 months old, and he is tugging on his sister's sleeve. His name is James.

Sometime shortly after this picture was taken he became sick. At about 3 in the morning he had a temperature of 104 or 105, and his mother, Lamona, looked at him and she knew he needed to go to the emergency room because he was really sick. So she phones her HMO on a 1–800 number and says, ''My little boy is really sick and needs to go to the emergency room.'' Some disembodied voice over a 1–800 telephone line who has never seen Jimmy Adams says, ''Well, I guess I could let you go, but I am only going to authorize you to go to one hospital that we have a contract with.'' The mother says, ''That is fine, where is it?'' The medical reviewer says, ''I don't know. Find a map.''

Well, it turns out it is a long ways away, 70-some miles away, and you

have to drive through Atlanta to get there. So at 3 in the morning mom and dad wrap up little Jimmy and they start out in their truck. About halfway through they pass three hospitals that have emergency rooms, but, you know, they have not received an authorization from their HMO to stop there, and, if they do, their HMO is not going to pay for it.

They are not medical professionals. They do not know exactly how sick Jimmy is, so they decide to push on. Unfortunately, before they get to the authorized hospital, I would say an unreasonably long distance from where their home is, little Jimmy has a cardiac arrest.

So picture mom and dad trying to keep Jimmy alive in the car while they are driving like crazy to get to the hospital emergency room that has been authorized. They pull in to the driveway to the hospital, the mother leaps out holding little Jimmy screaming ''help me, help me,'' and a nurse comes running out and starts mouth to mouth resuscitation. They put in the IVs, they pump his chest, they get him moving, they get him going, the little guy is tough and he lives.

Unfortunately, because of that medically negligent decision, that medical judgment by the HMO that caused the cardiac arrest before he got in a timely fashion to an emergency room, little Jimmy ends up with gangrene of both hands and both feet. No blood supply to both hands and both feet, and both hands and both feet turn black and dead.

So, what happens? This is little Jimmy after his HMO care. Under that Federal law, the only thing that that HMO is liable for is the cost of the amputations of both his hands and both his legs.

This little boy will never be able to play basketball. This little boy will never be able to wrestle. Some day, when he gets married, he will never be able to caress the cheek of the woman that he loves with his hand.

I asked his mother how he is doing. Well, he is learning how to put on his bilateral leg stump, his leg prosthesis with his arm stumps, but he needs a lot of help in getting on his bilateral hooks. He is always going to be that way. He is doing great. He is a courageous little kid.

But I ask you, how is it that when HMOs under employer systems are making medical judgments and decisions that can result in losing your hands and your feet, that the only thing those plans are responsible for is the cost of the amputations? Is that fair? Is that justice? If that HMO had known that they would be liable, they would have been much more careful, and they would have said, ''Take him to the closest emergency room,'' not 70 miles away. That would have helped prevent this.

It is cases like this that have come before the Federal judiciary that has caused our Federal judges to be so frustrated, because the only recourse that Jimmy has at this point in time is the fact that the HMO paid for his amputations. That has caused some judges like Judge Gorton in Turner v. Fallon to say, ''Even more disturbing to this court is the failure of Congress to amend a statute that, due to the changing realities of the modern health care system, has gone conspicuously awry from its original intent.'' That statute that he is talking about is the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA, that 25 years ago was meant to be a plan that would protect employees in terms of their pensions.

□ 2145

It has been turned on its head as a protection for employers and for health plans, not for employees. Federal judges are saying, Congress, fix it.

Judge Garbis, in the case Pomeroy v. Johns Hopkins, says the prevalent system of utilization review now in effect in most health care programs may warrant a revaluation of ERISA by Congress so that its central purpose of protecting employees may be reconfirmed.

A judge looked at this case involving little Jimmy Adams. He reviewed the case. Do you know what he said? He said, the margin of safety by that HMO was ''razor thin.'' I would add to that, about as razor thin as the scalpel that had to cut off his hands and his feet.

Judge Bennett, in Prudential Insurance Company v. National Park Medical Center, said, ''If Congress wants the American citizens to have access to adequate health care, then Congress must accept its responsibility to define the scope of ERISA preemption and to enact legislation that will ensure every patient has access to that care.''

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but especially my colleagues, my fellow Republicans, do the right thing in the next 2 days, and you will be fulfilling Republican principles.

What are those principles? Those principles that we Republicans have talked about are individual responsibility. We have been for tort reform, we have been for States' rights, we have been for market reform. We have been for adequate enforcement on some of the legislation we have passed. We are all for fairness.

Let me go into this in a little bit more detail. I do not know how somebody who has voted for welfare reform, where we say that if a person is able-bodied, that they have a responsibility to go out and work, to get an education to work and support their family, that is a Republican principle of responsibility. That was the major thrust of our welfare reform bill.

Republicans have repeatedly on this floor, my fellow Republicans, myself included, said that if somebody commits murder or rape, then they ought to be responsible for that. How can we say that a health plan or an HMO which makes a medical decision that results in a little baby boy losing his hands and feet, that they should not be responsible? I do not know how one can justify his other actions. Do we only talk about responsibility if it does not involve some big special interest money? Let us think about this for a minute.

How about the issue of tort reform? This is tort reform. This is fairness. When we have a system that is tilted, that is unbalanced, it creates distortions. What we are talking about is that there is no other industry in this country that has this type of liability shield.

If an automobile manufacturer came to us and said, you know, I do not think under ERISA we should be liable for any of the bad things we do, or if an airplane manufacturer said that, I think they would get laughed off Capitol Hill. I mean, if they do a negligent action that cost the lives of our constituents, then they should be liable. They are not coming to us for that.

So we have this bizarre situation where an organization which is making daily life and death decisions by a 25-year-old antiquated law that needs to be updated in one particular area has an exemption from responsibility for their actions.

States' rights, let us talk about that for a minute. Today in our Republican Conference we had a discussion on patient protection legislation. I pointed out that a couple of the bills that will come up in the next 2 days seek to take away from State jurisdiction personal injury and move it into Federal courts.

After we had a discussion about that, which I am going to discuss some more, I said, somewhat tongue in cheek, to a colleague of mine from South Carolina, I just, I just do not understand how a successor for John C. Calhoun, the major proponent of States' rights, how Republicans who have repeatedly said, hey, we need to get big government off your back and devolve power back to the States, and we have said that on education, we have said that on welfare, we have said that on all sorts of things, I do not know how a representative from South Carolina could be for moving this to Federal court under two of the bills that we will, I hope, defeat in the next 2 days. And my friend said, yes, but John C. Calhoun is dead. And a voice from the back of the room said, yes, but he passed away because of his HMO.

Well, I think that when we are looking at States' rights, this is really important. Since the beginning of our Constitution, in the area of personal injury, this has been an issue that has been handled at the State level.

My father managed a grocery store. What was one of the things he always watched out for? A grape on the floor in the produce department, because somebody could slip on a piece of produce and hurt themselves, and once in a while that happened. Once in a while then you had a lawsuit arise out of that. That is handled, if you are talking about any national retail chain, whether you are talking about

Target or whether you are talking about Wal-Mart, anything like that today is handled in your local State court. That is where it should be handled.

But under two of the bills that we are going to be debating, the major thrust of the liability provisions is that you take those out of State jurisdiction and put them into Federal. That just stands our Federal-State relationship on its head. It would be the biggest usurpation of Federal big government power that I think I have ever seen in Congress, and unnecessary.

What the bipartisan consensus managed care bill says is that when we have a problem that requires that you go to court because of a health plan's problem, you simply go back to State court, to a jurisdiction where it has always been in the past. We are not creating a new cause of action, we are simply returning it back to where it was before 25 years ago.

Why is that important? Well, when we are talking about the issue of Federal versus State jurisdiction, I would read this report by Chief Justice William Rehnquist, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He said, ''This principle was enunciated by Abraham Lincoln in the 19th century and Dwight Eisenhower in the 20th century. Matters that can be handled adequately by the States should be left to them. Matters that cannot be handled should be undertaken by the Federal Government.''

Do Members know what? I will bet there is not a single Congressperson here who has gotten a phone call from one of his constituents complaining that their State court has not been able to take care of those problems of personal injury. I do not think that we are going to find very many Congressmen that think that their States are not able to handle this, their State courts are unable to handle this. So the bill that I support simply says, return the jurisdiction to that.

Look, if a State wants to pass a law like Texas did on managed care liability, or like California did, they can devise whatever law they want to. Under the bill, the bipartisan managed care consensus bill, we do not tell them how to do it in California or how to do it in Texas. For all I know, a State could pass a law that would say, we do not think that any employer ought to be liable for anything. And under our bill, that is the way it would be handled in that State, because I believe philosophically that this is where the decision should be made, in the States. I am willing to walk the talk.

I wonder if the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) would like to interject a comment.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague, one, for being willing to do this night after night, and I know how firm he is in his belief, because I have watched the gentleman in our committee, in the Subcommittee on Health in the Committee on Commerce.

The fear I have from some of the options tomorrow, some of the poison pill amendments, as we call them, is that transfer to Federal court, in my experience as a lawyer, again, practicing law, I did not want to go to Federal court. I had one case in my almost 20 years of practicing law that was in Federal court, but I liked the State court one because you could get to court quicker, you had more access, more judges in the court.

Again, the Federal courts under our rules now, and we voted for them, they would give preference to criminal cases. I want that to still be the case. I want them to be able to handle the drug cases in the Southern District of Texas, because that is the overwhelming number we get in our Federal courts. I do not want to continue to add more cases to the Federal court when they cannot deal with the criminal cases now.

So that is what worries me about allowing these to be brought in Federal court. It will just delay it. They will have to be behind the criminal cases. Why should we not take advantage of the State courts, because these are State issues? Typically, insurance has been a State-regulated commodity, except on ERISA, but we have a right as a Member of Congress and as a Congress to say, on these issues, go back to your State court. I think that is good.

The gentleman used the great example of his father, who managed produce. If somebody had slipped on that grape, they were going to State court. Whether it is Wal-Mart or Safeway or anyone else, why should they not be able to go to State court, just like they would if there is a personal injury?

Mr. GANSKE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman would agree, if a Wal-Mart came to Congress and said, we think that we ought to take slip and fall injury out of State court and make it a Federal law, a Federal tort, does the gentleman not think they would be laughed off Capitol Hill?

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I would hope so. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. There are certain cases the Federal court needs to be dealing with.

We have not created Federal courts on the floor of this House. The Senate has trouble even filling the vacancies. But there are so many more opportunities for justice to be had in the local and State courts.

Like I said, in Harris County, Texas, Houston, Texas, we have dozens more State judges than we do Federal judges. And again, we have State courts for civil jurisdiction, and we have the district courts, depending on the size of the loss. We could go to a county court if it is a small loss, whereas on the Federal level, you are in there, whether it is your small case, you are in there with those multi-million dollar cases, but also you are behind the criminal cases.

Again, our experience in the Southern District of Texas with the border region we have that comes up to Houston, most of the cases in our Federal District Courts are drug cases and criminal cases. They do not try as many civil cases as they used to. All these issues would be behind those criminal cases, because I want them to do those criminal cases. We want that justice swift for someone who is accused of violating our law, so they can either be found not guilty, or start serving their time.

Mr. GANSKE. Let us be specific about this. The two bills that are going to come before us that would move an entire area of State law into the Federal courts are the Coburn-Thomas substitute and the Houghton substitute.

What are some practical implications for that? The gentleman has already alluded to some of them. Let me speak from Iowa's perspective. I represent central and southwest Iowa. In Iowa we have 99 counties. There is a State courthouse. There is a county courthouse in every one of those counties, and a State court, but there are only two Federal courts in Iowa, one in Des Moines and one in Cedar Rapids.

In Texas, I know there are 372 State courts, but there are only 39 Federal courts. Texas is a bigger State than Iowa. How about in Oklahoma? There are 77 State courts, but one Federal court.

What does that mean? That means that if we look at being able to get our say in court, and we have to go to Federal court in Iowa, someone may be traveling 200 miles to get into Des Moines, instead of going to the county seat. In Texas, I imagine, out in the panhandle, it could be significantly longer distances. Then you have the travel expenses, and as you mentioned, under a law that passed Congress about 25 years ago, the Federal judiciary is bound to handle criminal cases first before they can handle these.

□ 2200

And Chief Justice Rehnquist has told us that the Federal court system in the last 2 years has had a 22 percent increase in their caseload. They do not want this jurisdiction. They are understaffed now. If we look at current Federal judicial vacancies, there are currently 65 judicial vacancies. Twenty-two Federal jurisdictions, because of the case overload, are called emergency jurisdictions. We anticipate that there will be another 16 vacancies in the next 6 months.

That adds up to an understaffed Federal system, long distances, and for what purpose? The State courts are doing their job. I can hardly believe that some of my Republican colleagues would be in favor of expanding the big Federal Government in this area at the expense of their States.

And we have talked about the fact that criminal case filings in Federal court are up 15 percent in 1998 alone. That is because Congress has passed some laws related to increased criminal penalties. We have talked about the

fact that those criminal cases have priority in the Federal cases. So what does this mean? It means that consumers are not going to get a speedy resolution of their problem with an HMO if they have to go to Federal court.

Now, some people, i.e. some of the HMOs, they would love it if they could delay 5 or 6 or 7 years. They would especially love it if we do not change ERISA because maybe the patient is dead by then and at that point in time under the ERISA law they would be liable for nothing.

In Chief Justice Rehnquist's 1999 proposed long-range plan for the Federal courts he said, ''Congress should commit itself to conserving the Federal courts as a distinctive judicial forum of limited jurisdiction in our system of Federalism. Civil and criminal jurisdiction should be assigned to the Federal courts only to further clearly define a justified national interest, leaving to the State courts the responsibility for adjudicating other matters.''

And I have here a letter from the National Association of Attorneys General that says, ''Any Federal legislation enacted should at a minimum provide full authority for states to enforce all legal standards independently of Federal entities.''

I have here a letter from the National Conference of Chief Justices relating to this Federal-State issue. They say relating to court jurisdiction, ''Following the exhaustion of administrative remedies and consistent with the general principles of Federalism, State courts should be designated as the primary forum for the consideration of benefit claims.''

I think that quite frankly if the national governors are aware that we are about ready to take away State jurisdiction in something like this, they are going to come out pretty darn strongly against a piece of legislation that usurps State authority.

Now, let me move on to something that the gentleman from Missouri talked about in terms of how our bill, the bipartisan managed care bill, the Norwood-Dingell bill either does or does not protect employers, because this is a crucial point. I would say that it does protect employers. As a physician who ran a medical office, and who has a lot of friends who run medical offices, employing a lot of people providing health insurance for them, I would not be in favor of a bill that would say that they would now be liable for a decision by their HMO that they have contracted with for their employees that would put them at risk. The bill that we have does not.

We simply say this: that if one hires an HMO as a business and that HMO makes a decision that results in an injury to the patient and you as an employer have not entered into that decision, then you are not liable. Period.

I have here an assessment by one of the leading law firms in the country that deals with the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, the ERISA law. They analyzed the language in our bill that is designed to protect employers. They specifically addressed the claims by those opponents to our legislation. They say that those claims that our bill does not protect employers do not represent an accurate analysis of the employer protections in the bipartisan bill. The claims that the bill would subject plan sponsors or employers to a flood of lawsuits in State courts over all benefit decisions and suggests that plan sponsors, i.e. employers, would be forced to abandon their plans is incorrect for the following reasons:

Number one, most lawsuits would not be against employers. Under current ERISA preemption, lawsuits seeking State law remedies for injury or wrongful death of group health plan participants are already allowed in numerous jurisdictions; and those cases show that those suits are normally brought against HMOs, not against employers.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield, I would simply like to congratulate my friend and tell him that I have just filed a rule, which in fact, will allow us to have the freest, fairest debate that we have had in over a quarter century on the health care issues.

We anxiously look forward to bringing that measure up tomorrow morning here on the House floor, and we will continue to debate it into Thursday. And I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I look forward to his continued remarks.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, let me continue on talking about this analysis that was done by a leading law firm on how the bill that I support, the Norwood-Dingell bill, bipartisan consensus managed care reform act actually does protect employers. And there are about four or five points that this legal brief makes.

First is that lawsuits would not be against plan sponsors. Second is that plan sponsor is limited. Third is that the statute's plain meaning limits employer liability. And the fourth is that they point out several reasons why the private sector health care would not be destroyed.

This is what is in our liability provision. It basically says that if there is a problem, it goes back to State jurisdiction. But we do not want to increase the number of lawsuits. We want people to get the care that they need before they lose their hands or lose their feet like the little boy who I showed. So what we do is we say that an HMO should have an internal appeals process in a timely fashion, but that if the patient or family is not still happy with a denial of care at the end of the internal appeals, they go to an external appeal by an independent peer panel of doctors that can make a binding decision on the health plan and does not need to follow the plan guidelines.

In other words, they can consider those plan guidelines on medical necessity, but they can take into consideration the medical literature, prevailing standards of care, NIH consensus statements. In other words, the things that are necessary in order to make a determination.

We say they cannot overrule a specific exclusion of coverage. And so let me just say there is nothing in this legislation that prevents an employer who has business in many different States from being able to design a standard benefits package. There is nothing in this bill that says that they now have to follow State mandates as it regards to benefits.

All we are saying is that if they are up front and say they do not cover bone marrow transplants, then that independent panel, even if the patient needs it, cannot tell the health plan that they have to give it. But if they do not have a specific exclusion and that patient needs it, then the independent panel can tell the plan they have to provide it; and if the plan follows the recommendation, then we have a fair compromise.

The Democratic side of the aisle made a big compromise on this. It is that if the health plan follows that recommendation by the independent panel, then there can be no punitive damages against that employer; and that would be a punitive damages relief not just for group health plans but also for all other health plans. Individuals as well. Not just for ERISA plans but for non-ERISA plans. That is a major compromise, but it is a fair one because if the plan follows the recommendation of the independent panel that has made the decision, then they cannot be maliciously liable for someone else's decision.

But we need to have the liability provision in there as the ultimate inducer to the HMO to follow the law. Why is that? Let me give an example from Texas. Texas just passed this HMO reform bill that includes liability for health plans. In that bill they say that if a physician recommends treatment to a patient, say a patient is in the hospital but the HMO says no, we do not want to pay for it but the physician says, hey, this patient could suffer injury, then under the law that dispute is supposed to go immediately to a peer review organization for a determination. It is supposed to be sent there, the determination is supposed to be sent there by the plan.

Well, about a year or so ago after this law was passed in Texas, a psychiatrist who was taking care of a man who was suicidal. He was in the hospital. The psychiatrist thought that this man could commit suicide and so he told the health plan this patient needs to stay in the hospital. The health plan said no we are not going to pay for it any more. Send him home, and told the family that. Now, under Texas law they were required in that situation to get an independent peer

review decision, but they did not. They did not follow the law. They just told the patient to leave. So the patient went home that night. He drank half a gallon of antifreeze and he died. It took him 2 days of a horrible, painful death.

Now, in that circumstance under Texas law, that health plan is now liable. They did not follow the law. If we did not have liability, why would any plan ever follow the law? It will take about two or three cases like that and then the health plans in Texas will decide, we had better follow the law before a patient goes home and commits suicide.

That is part of the reason why we need enforcement. But I honestly think that if we combine the appeals process, if we combine the provisions in our bill related to emergency care, related to clinical trials, related to physicians being able to tell their patients all of their treatment options, and we follow an internal and external appeals process, that we are actually going to decrease the incidence of injuries, and we are going to decrease the number of lawsuits.

□ 2215

That in fact has been what Texas has found out.

Before they passed the Texas law, the HMOs, the business groups, they lobbied furiously against that law. They said the sky will fall, the sky will fall. There will be an avalanche of lawsuits. Premiums will go out of sight. The HMOs will all leave Texas.

What has happened? There has just been a couple lawsuits like the one I mentioned where the plans did not follow the law. Premiums have not gone up any faster in Texas than they have anywhere else. In fact, they still have lower than average premiums. There were 30 HMOs in Texas before this law passed. There are 51 HMOs in Texas today. The sky did not fall.

There have been over 600 decisions made to resolve disputes because of that Texas law, and more than half of them have been decided in favor of the health plans; and that has provided an adequate relief to the patients to know that they are getting the right care. But half of the time the independent panels have decided for the patient, and so they have gotten the treatment before an injury has occurred.

This is just common sense. All our bill does in terms of ERISA is say that, let the State jurisdiction as it relates to liability function. In Texas, one has to follow these rules and regulations. There are protections for employers. That is the law as it relates to liability.

California just passed an HMO liability bill. That would be the way that it would be handled in California. This is federalism. This is returning power to States. This is following up on Republican principles where the States are the crucible of democracy. This is following the Constitution. This is following the remarks of the Supreme Court Justice who says, please, do not load up the Federal judiciary any more than what would be absolutely necessary for national security. Do not take away jurisdiction from the States if they are doing a reasonable and good job; and they are in this area.

So I just have to ask my Republican friends, it seems to me that if they are for States rights, if they are for responsibility, then they would be against a bill that would remove this authority from the States. They would be against the Coburn-Thomas bill. They would be against the Houghton substitute. They would be for the Norwood-Dingell bill. Those are Republican principles, and they will be done at a very modest cost.

As I said before, we are looking at, for an average family of four, potentially an increase in the cost of premiums of about $36 a year. That is money that my constituents tell me is well worth it if it can reassure them that they are going to be treated fairly by their HMO.

So when we have our debate in the next day or so on this, let us try to get past some of the special interest smoke and mirrors and Chicken Little statements. Let us do something right. Let us do something for justice. Let us correct a problem that Congress created 25 years ago. Let us be for our principles of States rights and responsibility, and not tilting the deck against a fair market.

Let us be for the Norwood-Dingell Bipartisan Managed Care Reform Act. Vote, I would say to my colleagues, however my colleagues want on the access bill. My colleagues are going to have to balance some of those individual provisions. If it passes, it will go to conference. But I would urge my colleagues strongly to vote against the Coburn-Thomas bill and against another substitute that would be against our Republican principles of States rights and individual responsibility.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2990, QUALITY CARE FOR THE UNINSURED ACT OF 1999, AND H.R. 2723, BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS MANAGED CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER (during special order of Mr. GANSKE) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–366) on the resolution (H. Res. 323) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2990) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals greater access to health insurance through a health care tax deduction, a long-term care deduction, and other health-related tax incentives, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide access to and choice in health care through association health plans, to amend the Public Health Service Act to create new pooling opportunities for small employers to obtain greater access to health coverage through HealthMarts, and for other purposes, and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2723) to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DRUG PROBLEMS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to come before the House this evening, as I do on most Tuesday evenings when the House is in session, to talk about an area of responsibility that I inherited in this particular session of Congress. That responsibility is Chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Relations of the House. It is an investigations and oversight panel of Congress.

One of its primary responsibilities is to try to develop a coherent and effective national drug policy. It is a very difficult task, but a very important task, because illegal narcotics have taken an incredible toll among our citizens.

We have a costs estimated at $250 billion a year affecting our economy, not only the cost of criminal justice, but lost employment, social disruption, costs that just transcends every part of our society. Those are the dollar and cents costs, not talking about human suffering and the effects on families and children across our Nation. Certainly illegal narcotics must be our biggest social problem.

Additionally, the statistics are staggering as to the number of people incarcerated. Somewhere between 1.8 million and 2 million Americans are in jails and prisons, Federal facilities, across the Nation. It is estimated that 60 to 70 percent of those individuals incarcerated are there because of a drug-related offense.

Now, there are many myths and misconceptions about some of these problems related to illegal narcotics. Tonight, I would like to touch upon a few of them.

As Chairman of this subcommittee with this responsibility, I have tried to not ignore the problem, not ignore the various alternatives, but try to have an open, free, and honest debate in our subcommittee and also stimulate it here in the Congress and the House of Representatives and among the American people, because we have a very, very serious problem facing our Nation.

In that regard, we have held a number of hearings, on average, three or four a month in this year. Prior to my

assuming that responsibility, that responsibility was held by the former chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice on which I served. That individual who chaired that responsibility and that subcommittee was the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) who is now the Speaker of the House of Representatives. He reawakened some of the interest in this topic and also certainly gave impetus to congressional action for a refocus, reexamination of this issue.

I might, as I have done in the past, review a bit of the history of the illegal narcotics problem and the efforts of this Congress and past Congresses to deal with this problem.

During the Reagan administration, and having been a staff member in the other body during 1981 to 1985, I witnessed firsthand the beginning of what was actually a war on drugs, a multifaceted approach to attacking illegal narcotics, drug abuse, and misuse by our population. That was continued for the most part through the Bush administration until, again, this House of Representatives and the United States Senate and the White House were all dominated by one party in 1992 with that election.

It happened to be the year I was elected, so I saw firsthand the dismantling of any real Federal effort with regard to illegal narcotics. The national drug policy was pretty much taken apart, dismantled. Our interdiction efforts, which is a national responsibility were decimated, halved.

The source country and international programs, also a Federal responsibility, were cut dramatically, also halved. Most of the resources were put into treatment programs and to other priorities that, again, changed dramatically.

The Drug Czar's office was dramatically reduced in size, probably 70 percent reduction. Appointees of the administration were individuals who had a different philosophy, ''just say maybe to illegal narcotics.''

Some of that has had a very specific result with our population. Attitudes particularly among leaders of Congress and the Nation, and also our chief health officer for the country, certainly those attitudes certainly do impact our population's thinking and particularly the actions of our young people.

I have used these charts before to show exactly what happened. Tonight I will use them once again. Even today, we had Governor Gary Johnson, a Republican Governor from New Mexico who participated in a national symposium on a new attitude towards illegal narcotics. He talked about and also has made statements that the war on drugs has been a failure.

I submit that the war on drugs has basically, again, closed down in the 1990 to 1993 period. Again, a Federal responsibility was Federal expenditures for international programs. International programs would be stopping illegal narcotics at their source.

This is an interesting chart in that it shows, again, a dramatic reduction. My colleagues see back where the Republicans, new majority took over. Right now, in 1999, we are getting back in 1992 dollars to where we were in 1992 and 1999 on these international programs.

These international programs do make a difference. For example, let me cite, if I may, one success that we have seen from the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard seized a record 111,689 pounds of cocaine with a street value of $3.9 billion in fiscal 1999, an increase of 35 percent over last year, the agency said on Tuesday.

□ 2230

More than two-thirds of the cocaine seized in 1999 was the Miami-based 7th Coast Guard district that included Florida, South Carolina, Georgia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and most of the Caribbean. Secretary of Transportation who oversees the Coast Guard, and in this case Secretary Slater, attributed the record seizures in part to a 10-month-old counternarcotics initiative in the Caribbean. And that, of course, was funded by the initiative that was undertaken by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) some 2 years ago in restarting a war on drugs and, again, a Federal responsibility to stop drugs at their source and interdicting them.

What I have spoken to here is really the success of the interdiction. This chart shows the failure of interdiction and the cutting in just about half of expenditures for interdiction, that is stopping drugs as they come from their source, before they reach our border, utilizing the Coast Guard, the military and other Federal resources to stop drugs cost effectively as they come from their source to our borders.

We can see the dramatic close-down of the war on drugs in 1993 and we can see the restart again under the new leadership of the House of Representatives under Republican control of the House. Again, we are back in 1999 to about where we were in 1992, and we have some very specific results for our efforts for those expenditures. We have seen not only a dramatic increase in the seizures of cocaine but also less cocaine on the streets in the United States. So we know that this interdiction works.

What is interesting is we know what does not work, and that is the policy of this past administration. We saw the charts with funds and efforts for our international programs to stop drugs cost effectively at their source and also to interdict drugs before they reach our borders. This is a very interesting chart. It shows from the 1980s, the late 1980s to 1992, this would be part of the Reagan and Bush era, and we can see a declining in 12th grade drug use. This would be lifetime annual in the red here, green is lifetime annual use and 30 day use.

So in all of these usages by 12th graders, we see a decline up until this change in the drug policy. Then we see, again, the change in Federal leadership, the attitude, the ''just say maybe,'' cutting the drug czar's office, cutting the programs as far as the supply, the incredible supply of illegal narcotics coming into the country, and then this upsurge. Then again in 1995, the Republicans took control, began instituting this policy and changing it, and now we see a decline and beginning of a reversal. Because we know that a multifaceted approach to illegal narcotics works.

First, we have to stop drugs cost effectively at their source, then we must interdict those illegal narcotics before they come in. And I might say, even to those legalizers, to those who have been in town, including Governor Johnson of New Mexico, promoting legalization of what are now illegal narcotics, even under their plan, it would still be a requirement for the United States to stop illegal narcotics at their source. They would be illegal, even if they were legalized in the United States; drugs through interdiction.

And, again, education, which I think Governor Johnson and others have been promoting along with legalization, does not work. We find the same thing that is very interesting in this administration's approach to tobacco. They have done everything they can to bring tobacco companies into lawsuits. They have expended incredible historic amounts in anti-narcotics advertising and have forced attention to the problem as far as education of young people. But what is interesting, even the most recent statistics that they show, even with all this effort, shows that we still have an upsurge in the use of tobacco products among our young people.

So it does not work by itself. Education is one of a number of elements that must be used. This is very interesting to show; that as the Federal efforts for interdiction and source country program eradication declined, and again a change in policy, we saw our young people using more illegal narcotics.

What is really sad is some of the statistics that have evolved from this situation. And I just received today the latest figures, which were released in August, published the last June of 1999, on the number of drug deaths in the United States. These are deaths from drug-induced causes.

My colleagues have heard me cite before on the floor of the House of Representatives over 14,000 drug deaths, and that was in 1996. The policy that we have seen promoted by this administration and this Congress now has us up to 15,973 deaths in 1997. These are drug-induced causes in the United States. That is a 7.6 percent increase.

I added up the statistics from this report just received today on the number of drug deaths since 1993, the beginning of this administration's policy, and it

is 72,232 deaths. I am sure that we will reach 100,000 before the end of this tenure. So we have still a continuing problem. We have more and more deaths caused by illegal narcotics.

Part of the problem, as I have explained before in these special orders, is that the cocaine and the heroin that we see on the streets today is not the cocaine or heroin that was on the streets in the 1970s or 1980s. In those years we saw cocaine and heroin of sometimes 4 to 10 percent in purity. Today, we are seeing on a very common basis a purity of 60 and 70 percent. We are seeing heroin and cocaine that is deadly in form. And many of these deaths are attributed to young people who are trying illegal narcotics, and do not recover in many instances from first-time use, or by combining those very potent and high purity illegal narcotics with other substances of abuse.

Again, we see record numbers of deaths from drug-induced causes in the latest statistics produced, I believe, by the Department of HHS. Again, these just came out.

Of course, we have the deaths that I cited that are very easy to identify, and then we have the deaths that I also report. And whether we legalize or decriminalize what are now illegal narcotics, we would still have situations like this. This was reported in this week's October 2 edition in Carnesville, Georgia, a lady by the name of Shannon Nicole Moss has been in jail since May for allegedly taking cocaine during her pregnancy and causing the death of her daughter. Ms. Moss, 21, gave birth to twins on April 21, but one child, Angel Hope Schneider, died shortly after birth. Franklin County Investigator Chad Bennett said Ms. Moss tested positive for both cocaine and methamphetamine. The child's death was consistent with cocaine use by the mother, said Bennett.

I do not know if this young baby's death will be counted in these statistics. I doubt it. But as I have cited, there are thousands of other deaths that are related to illegal narcotics.

In this week's Christian Science Monitor we see another example of drug use and abuse among our population. This particular story focuses on Plano, Texas. It says, ''With its gated communities, leafy parks, and Fortune 500 jobs, Plano is not the sort of town to have a big city drug problem. At least that is what most residents thought. Then, in 1997, some of the young people of Plano discovered the latest craze, heroin, and started overdosing at the rate of one a month. The youngest victim was a 7th grader, Victor Garcia. The oldest and most famous was former Dallas Cowboy, Mark Tuinei. The string of deaths, 18 in Plano, along with half a dozen from nearby towns, does not appear to be over.''

We have cited Plano as an example of a very prosperous community, just like the one I come from in Central Florida, north of Orlando, which is my district. We have had over 60 drug-related deaths. Deaths by drugs and drug overdoses now exceed homicides in our central Florida communities. So we see a tremendous impact of illegal narcotics on our communities. I am not sure what difference legalization would make in people overdosing, and particularly young people, on these illegal narcotics.

If it was not bad enough that we had cocaine and heroin, we have on the scene and coming from primarily Mexico, also an international import and again a Federal responsibility to control this type of activity, a report of methamphetamines spiraling out of control in some of our communities. This is a report that appeared in this week's news media and it is date lined Tulsa, Oklahoma. ''The number of methamphetamine labs in Oklahoma is exploding. State records show that officials have discovered 60 times the number of clandestine laboratories making methamphetamines than they had found just 5 years ago. State officials call problems with the highly-addictive drug epidemic. And they said the meteoric rise in the drug's popularity has to do in how easy it is to make.''

This is not a harmless illegal narcotic, and it is illegal. ''Oklahoma Highway Patrol Trooper David 'Rocky' Eales,'' the story went on to say, ''was killed in an attempt to serve methamphetamine-related warrants on September 25. Another trooper was wounded.''

It is also interesting to note, and I have some information that we received in one of the hearings that we conducted on legalization of what are now illegal narcotics, and we did try to conduct an open hearing on that subject, but we had a scientist who produced these images. I think I have shown these images one other time about methamphetamine, and this is one of the drugs that some folks would like to legalize. This particular photograph, and these images, demonstrate the long-lasting effects that methamphetamine has on the brain.

The brighter colors reflect greater dopamine-binding capacity. Dopamine function is critical to emotional regulation and it is involved in the normal experience of pleasure. It is also involved in controlling an individual's motor functions. The scan on the left is a nondrug user. The second scan is a chronic methamphetamine abuser who was drug free for 3 years prior to this image. The third scan is a chronic meth abuser who was drug free for 3 years prior to the image. The last brain is a scan of an individual newly diagnosed with Parkinson's Disease, a disease known to deplete dopamine.

□ 2245

So you see what methamphetamine, the so-called harmless, what is now an illegal narcotic that some would like to make legal, does to individuals. Drugs are dangerous. This is very clear scientific evidence produced again by a scientist, not by a congressional committee, about the effects of this particular illegal narcotic.

I wanted to also cite tonight again some of the comments that have been made in this national forum that talked about legalization or a new approach to illegal narcotics, and let me say that I am open to any reasonable approach that we can take to deal with this mounting problem. Our subcommittee has been open, we have held hearings on the question of legalization, of decriminalization, on the problems of incarceration, on enforcement, on interdiction, on the source countries, and we will be doing one in just a few weeks on our first anniversary of our national education program to review all of these programs' effectiveness and various approaches.

But the meeting that was conducted today and this week in Washington about new approaches featured, I guess, a new rage on the drug, national drug scene, and that is New Mexico Governor Gary Johnson. He again has said that the Nation's War on Drugs has been a multibillion-dollar failure and unjustifiably throwing thousands of people in prison and lying to children about the dangers of marijuana. I happened to catch some of that particular presentation of Governor Johnson, a Republican from New Mexico, and I wanted to respond to some of the points that he has raised.

Again, one of these is graphically illustrated by one of the substances that some proponents would like to legalize, and we can show similar graphic displays for other substances, and we have one, another one here we will just put up here. But we do have, in fact, scientific evidence that there is danger to the brain from cocaine, from heroin, from methamphetamine, and it is documented, and the Governor has said that the War on Drugs has been a multibillion-dollar failure. In fact, I think he stated that we went from 1 billion in the 1970s to $18 billion. I think if we look at the way the dollars have been spent, again there were dramatic decreases in a multi-faceted approach to combat illegal narcotics both at the source and through interdiction.

I have often showed the treatment dollars, and we do not have a chart of that tonight, but in fact the chart would show you that treatment dollars since 1992 have in fact doubled, and we are spending a great deal of that $18 billion on treatment programs. I would as much as anyone would like to see a reduction in those expenditures, but we find that if we take out one element, whether it is a source country, international programs, interdiction, law enforcement, education, treatment or prevention, then the efforts begin to crumble and the effect, as we have seen, is devastating particularly among our young people.

He made a rash statement, and I heard him say that soon we will be spending the entire national gross product on enforcement, and that just

is not correct. The Governor is incorrect, that of the $18 billion that we will be spending this year, a small percentage of that is on enforcement although that is Federal money and there are substantial dollars spent at the State and local level.

The question is:

Does a liberal policy work or does a tough enforcement policy work and are they cost effective?

Let me take these charts down and again cite one of the best examples that we have of a liberal policy, and I believe in a legalization or liberal policy we would have to look at some model where they have tried this.

And again we have to point to Baltimore. I do not have a whole lot of areas, although Washington, D.C., is now trying to emulate this program that they adopted in Baltimore with free needle exchanges and, again, a more liberal attitude.

But this is an interesting chart that was given to me by the head of our Drug Enforcement Agency in one of our hearings, and I will recite it.

In Baltimore we saw the population in 1950 at nearly a million drop to, it is around 600,000 now, not half, but on its way down. We saw a small number of heroin addicts, and this was the population of the heroin addicts, about 39,000 in 1996. The latest figures or unofficial figures are 60,000, and I cited a council person from Baltimore who said 1 in 8 citizens in Baltimore are now addicted to heroin.

Now this is a liberal policy, this needle exchange policy. We have seen that that policy, and again, if we had legalization, I do not know what would stop people from becoming addicted, but in fact we have 1 in 8 in this city as a heroin addict, which is absolutely astounding, a model I do not think any of us would want to copy.

I have also pointed out as a counter example New York City with Mayor Giuliani, and I bring this up again, a tough enforcement policy, and Governor Johnson said that we are spending too much money, and I think, if we look and go back and look at per capita expenses, dollar expenses, and we compared New York with Baltimore, we would see that there would probably be similar expenditures.

But this particular chart shows the narcotics arrests index and the crime index, and we see that crime is going down as the number of tough enforcement was undertaken in that city. Pretty dramatic figures in New York, and let me cite a few of them, if I may.

First of all, the total number of major felony crimes fell from 1993 to 1998 in New York City by 51 percent. Just from 1997 to 1998 with a zero tolerance policy there was 11 percent decrease in major felony crimes. In New York City murder and nonnegligent manslaughter also declined. There was a 67 percent decrease from 1993 to 1998, and in just one year, from 1997 to 1998, an 18 percent decrease in murder and nonnegligent manslaughter.

And what about some other crimes? Total felony and misdemeanor narcotics arrests in the city actually increased, and we went from less than 70,000 to 120 between 1993 and 1998, but in that period of time you saw the dramatic decrease in murders. In fact, in New York City in 1998 it was the lowest number of murders committed in New York in 36 years. The murders fell from approximately, this chart will show, from over 2,000 in this period, 1991 to somewhere in the 600 to 629 in 1998, dramatic decreases as there were some increase in narcotic offenses.

So the cost effectiveness of these programs, and I am sure if we looked at the social implications, the destruction of families, abuse in Baltimore, and we look at what has taken place in New York City, we would see that we have, in fact, a success, and again not a total success. We still have some dramatic problems not only in New York.

But what is amazing, if you look at this last chart again, as a result of Mayor Giuliani's zero tolerance policies that he established and based on what the murder rate was before he took office, over 3,500 people just in New York City are alive today who otherwise would be fatality statistics. That is a pretty dramatic figure.

The other misconception that Governor Johnson stated in his speech, and again I heard part of it today; he said that, and I think he was citing more in his State; he said there were arresting Mexican citizens coming across the border for $200, and he said if we looked at the profile of people arrested, you would find marijuana users selling a little bit of marijuana and crack users selling a little crack and going to jail for that. Those were some of his comments.

I did not take it down in shorthand, but there are many myths about people who are in prison for drug related offenses, and the most recent study that our subcommittee found was one that was conducted in New York State by that New York State Office of Justice, and it was a rather telling example of what is really taking place with those convicted of various offenses related to narcotics, and this was again in spring, very recent. We had testimony to this affect, that there are roughly 22,000 individuals serving time in New York State prison for drug offenses. Again this is very comprehensive study. Eighty-seven percent of them are actually serving time for selling drugs, 87 percent of them are there for selling drugs. Seventy percent of them have had one or more felony convictions on their record.

So these are not just these innocent little Mexicans crossing the border for $200 reward or some innocent marijuana users selling enough marijuana to supply his habit or some minor crack dealer. Seventy percent of these 22,000 individuals have one or more felony convictions on their record.

Of the people who are serving time for drug possession charges, 76 percent were actually arrested for sale or intent to sell charges that eventually pled down to possession. So there is a great myth about who is behind bars and why they are there and what offenses they have committed.

We also found from this study and in our hearing about New York drug offenses that the 1998 arrestee drug abuse monitoring program report issued by the National Institute of Justice documents an estimated 80 percent of persons arrested each year in New York City tested positive for drugs. So we have a situation where these people have, who are arrested also, have illegal narcotics in their system, and that is also part of the problem, and we do need to revisit our treatment programs both at State level and the Federal level.

□ 2300

But there is a great myth about who is serving time. This study was quite interesting, because it showed and documented very specifically that, at least in New York State, you really have to try, you have to commit a number of serious felonies and you have to be a dealer in very large quantities of hard illegal narcotics to make your way into prison. You had to work to get into prison in New York. We found that same pattern in other states. So the information that Governor Johnson used is not correct.

He also said half the arrests in the United States involved United States Hispanics selling marijuana. I do not know where he got that figure. I have never seen that figure.

We do know that the latest statistics that our subcommittee has received from DEA and HHS do indicate that one of the victims of illegal narcotics are teenage Hispanics and young Hispanics; that, in fact, with addiction, they have the highest percentage of increases.

What we also know from the most recent report that I have received is that the biggest problem with addiction among our young people, and I would think it would be alcohol, is not alcohol, but in fact is marijuana, another startling fact. Of course, many people do not want to deal with facts or reality on this subject. They want to deal with their own personal viewpoint.

The Governor also, I heard him say, Governor Johnson, that the war on drugs was 1,000 miles wide and a half inch thick. The war on drugs in fact is thousands and thousands of miles wide and, as you may have seen by what I illustrated, it was reduced down to an inch thick. But the war on drugs does not work when you have no resources in it, and they were eviscerated by this Congress back in 1993, 1994 and 1995 under this Democrat-controlled House of Representatives, Senate and the presidency. That approach did not work, and we had some very, again, well-documented results. That was not and is not today pleasing.

His final comment was ''stop arresting the entire country.'' Again, this is

Governor Johnson. I do not think any of us want to arrest anyone. We do know that individuals that have used illegal narcotics, probably marijuana is one of the most frequently. Maybe it does not have all of the effects of some of the other hard drugs that we cited, cocaine, heroin, methamphetamines. We have shown here we do know the levels of purity are much, much higher than that marijuana that was used in the seventies and eighties, and it also has an effect on the brain.

Again, we do know from facts that today our biggest problem with addiction among young people, again, I was even surprised by this, and these are statistics that are DEA and HHS documented, our biggest problem with addiction now is marijuana with our young people. Whether it gets to be a gateway drug or not is a question for debate, and we certainly had plenty of testimony that did point to the first use of that substance or other substance abuse and then on to harder drugs.

Legalization just has not been acceptable as an alternative, and neither has decriminalization, although we are looking very carefully at the programs we have for those incarcerated. We have also looked at the Arizona model, which is not a decriminalization, and had testimony from officials from Arizona who do take first-time drug offenders and give them alternatives before their final sentencing, but the sentencing is withheld pending their performance. The moment that they backslide or get back into the narcotics habit, which is a tremendous problem, recidivism with illegal narcotics use in these programs, those individuals do go on, are sentenced and serve time.

So, again, I think everyone wants to see that our prisons are free of so-called casual drug users. But, again, the people that end up there, unfortunately, commit felonies and crimes while under the influence of these illegal narcotics, were selling quantities of illegal narcotics which would be illegal under decriminalization or the legalization scheme that has been mentioned by anyone to date.

What is interesting is even with these efforts to liberalize national drug policy, even the latest surveys, and again the surveys can be subject to the way the questions are asked or framed, but the latest surveys that we have, this one is by the Melman Group and it was a survey by telephone of 800 registered voters at the beginning of September, found some of these topics on the public's mind.

Voters want education, Social Security and drug trafficking to be top priorities of the Congress and the President. HMO restrictions and illegal drugs are top worries for the largest number of voters. We have heard most of the special orders tonight on the topic of HMOs. I am the soul one on the second subject, illegal drugs.

Women and minorities are more likely to think that drug issues should be a top national priority. The poll also found that Americans want cracking down on drug smuggling to be Washington's highest priority. Preventing drugs from entering the United States, reducing the supply, is the most important effective way to deal with the problem. Again, this poll of 800 Americans showed three-fourths of Americans favor increasing funding for interdiction. Even with the $2 billion price tag, the majority still favor increasing funding for interdiction. By more than two to one, voters favor additional dollars on interdiction over anti-drug advertising.

As I said, our subcommittee continues to monitor the reinstitution of our national and international efforts on interdiction and source country programs. We will be carefully reviewing our $200 million with private donations, probably half a billion dollar total expenditures for an anti-drug advertising program, the first year of which will have been concluded this past week, and we will do a hearing on that and review an examination of those expenditures and the effectiveness of that program.

Congressional Democrats, the poll finally says, enjoy an advantage over Republicans on almost every issue except keeping illegal drugs out of the U.S. I am not sure what that means for Republicans, being a Republican, but at least hopefully I am on the right side of one issue.

The rest of the special order that I wanted to do tonight really would get away from the topic of legalization, decriminalization or liberalization, as Governor Johnson of New Mexico has advocated, and talk about again one of our responsibilities, which is stopping illegal narcotics that are coming into the United States.

Again, under any of these schemes, no matter how wild they may be for liberalization or decriminalization or legalization, one of the responsibilities of this Congress, of any administration, will be to stop these hard drugs from coming in to the United States.

□ 2310

The source of more than 50 percent or probably in the 60 or 70 percent of all illegal antibiotics, we could start with marijuana, go on to cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, the source of all the hard narcotics and even, again, the soft narcotic, if you want to call it that, marijuana, coming into the United States is through Mexico. Most of the cocaine and heroin is now produced in Colombia, but they have melded forces with corrupt officials in Mexico and corrupt dealers in Mexico, and these gangs are now filtering and transiting illegal narcotics through Mexico.

Mexico is our big problem on an international level, and will continue to be. That is in spite of the fact that our trade with Mexico has been at an all-time high. We have given Mexico, as I have cited, incredible trade advantages, both with NAFTA, and we have underwritten Mexico in its financially difficult times.

The United States' exports to Mexico now surpass U.S. exports to Japan, making Mexico our second most important export partner. However, with NAFTA, exports to the United States, from the United States to Mexico, were $71 billion in 1998. Imports to the United States from Mexico were $87 billion. We experienced in 1998 a $15.7 billion trade deficit, so we are good partners, we have given them help. We are good neighbors, good allies. We have given them a trade advantage that is now hurting us economically.

The U.S.-Mexican border is 2,000 miles long and 60 miles deep on either side of the border, consisting of four U.S. States, California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, all on the borders, of course. They border six Mexican States. We have 45 border crossings with an estimated 278 to 351 million persons legally crossing the border from Mexico to the United States in 1998.

The INS, at great expense, apprehended 1.5 million undocumented immigrants on the southwest border in fiscal year 1998. According to DEA, almost all of the estimated six tons of heroin produced in Mexico in 1998 will reach the United States markets. Mexico remains a major source country for marijuana and heroin sold in the United States.

The DEA estimates that the majority of methamphetamine available in the United States is either produced and transported to the United States or is manufactured in the United States now by Mexican drug traffickers.

According to the United States Department of State, Mexico continues to be the primary haven for money laundering in all of Latin America. This of course has had incredible consequences in Mexico. The Baja Peninsula along this end is completely controlled by drug traffickers. In fact, this chart shows Mexico-based drug trafficking. The Yucatan Peninsula is controlled by drug traffickers, and different states and such regions of Mexico are almost totally controlled by drug traffickers.

I cited methamphetamine, a new phenomenon. It is incredible, but 90 percent of the methamphetamine seized in Iowa this year came from Mexico. That is from the U.S. Attorney's office in Iowa's northern district. About 85 percent of the methamphetamine in Minnesota, all the way up, it is not even on this chart, in Minnesota is smuggled from Mexico. The source is the Minneapolis Star Tribune, in an investigation that was conducted there.

Most of the methamphetamine available in the upper Midwest is trafficked by Mexican-controlled criminal organizations connected to sources of supply in California and Mexico that were based in smaller midwestern cities with existing Mexican-American populations. The source of that is the Drug Enforcement Administration, in a 1996 report.

Unfortunately, even with all this activity, with the trade benefits, financial benefits, pledges of cooperation with Mexico, drug seizures are dramatically down. The amount of heroin seized from 1997 to 1998 dropped 56 percent. The amount of cocaine dropped some 35 percent in the same year. The number of vehicles seized from 1997 at sea went from 135 to 96, a 9 percent decrease.

We have asked for maritime cooperation. We have not gotten it. We have asked for seizure cooperation. We have not gotten it. We have also asked for extradition of Mexicans who have been involved in illegal narcotics.

Tonight let me display a couple of folks we are looking for and describe them. To date we have not had a single Mexican major drug trafficker extradited.

This individual is Lewis Ignacio Amezcua-Contreras, and this individual is one of the chief producers of methamphetamine in really the world. Recently, despite overwhelming evidence, all Mexican drug charges have been dismissed. We are hoping that this individual will be extradited to the United States.

Again, our requests, this Congress passed a resolution, the House of Representatives several years ago, asking for cooperation in extradition of major drug traffickers. To date, we have not had one Mexican major drug kingpin extradited.

We have another star tonight in our array of requests for extradition. This is another individual that we have asked for. This is Vincent Carrillo Fuentes. He is a major cocaine trafficker. He has not been arrested. We think he is at large in Mexico. He is a United States fugitive. This is another individual.

There are 45 of these major drug traffickers we would like extradited to stand trial, it is the thing they fear most, in the United States. I would say for both of these individuals, I believe there are some substantial rewards in the million dollar range, so if anyone would like to turn these individuals in, I am sure they would also like to receive the reward that is available.

United States officials testified before my subcommittee that there are 275 extradition requests that are pending with Mexico. Mexico has only approved 45 extradition requests since 1996, and as I said, not one major Mexican drug kingpin. Only 20 of the extradition requests that Mexico has approved have been drug-related, and only one of those has been a Mexican citizen. But again, there have been no major drug kingpins.

On November 13, 1997, the United States and Mexico signed a protocol to the current extradition treaty. I think that treaty goes back to 1978. The protocol is basically the way the extradition would operate, and all the details.

The protocol has been ratified by United States Senate, the other body, and is currently being delayed in Mexico's Senate. To date they still have not resolved or approved an extradition protocol with the United States.

Additionally, this Congress several years ago asked Mexico for cooperation in enforcing the laws on the books. It was not a tough request: extradition, maritime cooperation. The United States customs agency ran an undercover operation called Operation Casablanca. This undercover operation was the largest money laundering sting in the history of the United States, absolutely incredible money laundering.

Members will not be able to see this chart too well. Maybe they can focus for a few minutes. Let me talk a little about this. Forty Mexican and Venezuelan bankers, businessmen, and suspected drug cartel members were arrested, and 70 others were indicted as fugitives.

The United States informed Mexican counterparts of the operation, but they did not tell them all the details because they feared Mexican corruption would or could endanger the lives of some of our agents.

□ 2320

And as we know from history, one of our agents, Kiki Camarena, was brutally murdered in Mexico and even today some of his murderers and those involved in his horrible death have not been brought to justice.

Operation Casablanca involved three of Mexico's most prominent banks, Bancomer, Banca Serfin, and Confia, and all of these three major banks were implicated in the investigations. A former senior United States Customs agent who led the Casablanca probe declared that the corruption reached the highest levels of the Zedillo government when he implicated the defense minister in this event.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we can have justice prevail in this situation and next week we will continue the rest of the story as it relates to corruption in the Mexican Government and Mexican drug trafficking.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for before 5:00 p.m. today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. LAHOOD (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending the funeral of Bishop Edward O'Rourke.

Mr. HILL of Montana (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THUNE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, October 12.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1255. An act to protect consumers and promote electronic commerce by amending certain trademark infringement, dilution, and counterfeiting laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 6, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4649. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Modification of Procedures for Limiting the Volume of Small Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV99–905–4 IFR] received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4650. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Increase in Fees and Charges for Egg, Poultry, and Rabbit Grading [Docket No. PY–99–004] (RIN: 0581–AB54) received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4651. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tobacco Inspection; Subpart B-

Regulations [Docket No. TB–99–07] received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4652. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Safety Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Addition of Mexico to the List of Countries Elligible to Export Poultry Products into the United States [Docket No. 97–006F] (RIN: 0583–AC33) received September 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4653. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for emergency funds for the Department of Defense to be used to meet the critical readiness and sustainability needs that emerged from operations in Kosovo; (H. Doc. No. 106–140); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4654. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4655. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA–7300] received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4656. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules to Provide For Greater Use of Spread Spectrum Communications [WT Docket No. 97–12 RM–8737] received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4657. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau 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 (Manson, Iowa) [MM Docket No. 99–91 RM–9529] (Rudd, Iowa) [MM Docket No. 99–92 RM–9530] (Pleasantville, Iowa) [MM Docket No. 99–93 RM–9531] (Dunkerton, Iowa) [MM Docket No. 99–95 RM–9533] (Manville, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 99–97 RM–9535] received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4658. A letter from the Associate Chief, Policy and Program Planning Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [CC Docket No. 96–115] Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Customer Propriety Network Information and Other Customer Information; Implentation of the Non-Accounting Safeguards of the Communications Act of 1934, As Amended [CC Docket No. 96–149] received September 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4659. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: (VSC–24) Revision (RIN: 3150–AG36) received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4660. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541; (H. Doc. No. 106–139); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4661. A letter from the Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Reexports to Libya of Foreign Registered Aircraft Subject to the Export Administration [Docket No. 990827238–9238–01] (RIN: 0694–AB94) received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4662. A letter from the Director, Office of the Procurement and Property Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Agriculture Acquisition Regulation; Part 415 Reorganization; Contracting by Negotiation [AGAR Case 96–04] (RIN: 0599–AA07) received October 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4663. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Coastal Zone Consistency Review of Exploration Plans and Development and Production Plans (RIN: 1010–AC42) received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4664. A letter from the Acting Regulations Officer, Office of Process and Innovation Management, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Administrative Review Process; Prehearing Proceedings and Decisions by Attorney Advisors; Extension of Expiration Dates (RIN: 0960–AF07) received October 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TALENT: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 1497. A bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to the women's business center program; with an amendment (Rept. 106–365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 323. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2990) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals greater access to health insurance through a health care tax deduction, a long-term care deduction, and other health-related tax incentives, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide access to and choice in health care through association health plans, to amend the Public Health Service Act to create new pooling opportunities for small employers to obtain greater access to health coverage through HealthMarts, and for other purposes, and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2723) to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage (Rept. 106–366). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 452. An act for the relief of Belinda McGregor (Rept. 106–364). Referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. BLUNT):

H.R. 3011. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to improve the disclosure of information concerning telephone charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. KASICH):

H.R. 3012. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to protect Social Security trust funds and save Social Security surpluses for Social Security; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3013. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to allow shareholder common stock to be transferred to adopted Alaska Native children and their descendants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. OSE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 3014. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with regard to prison commissaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 3015. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage a strong community-based banking system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. DEMINT):

H.R. 3016. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 301 Main Street in Eastover, South Carolina, as the ''Layford R. JOHNSON Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

H.R. 3017. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 78 Sycamore Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the ''Richard E. Fields Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

H.R. 3018. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 557 East Bay Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the ''Marybelle H. Howe Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

H.R. 3019. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 4026 Lamar Street in (the Eau Claire community of) Columbia, South Carolina, as the ''Mamie G. Floyd Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LARSON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. HOEFFEL):

H.R. 3020. A bill to make illegal the sale of guns, ammunition, or explosives between private individuals over the Internet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3021. A bill to extend the authority of the THOMAS Paine National Historical Association to establish a memorial to THOMAS Paine in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 3022. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to improve the disclosure of information concerning telephone charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PASTOR:

H.R. 3023. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to convey property to the Greater Yuma Port Authority of Yuma County, Arizona, for use as an international port of entry; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3024. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to restrict the transmission of unsolicited electronic mail messages; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. MCINTOSH):

H.R. 3025. A bill to establish a national clearinghouse for youth entrepreneurship education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 3026. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to complete construction of the Hubbard Expressway in the vicinity of Youngstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. COX, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. DICKS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. REYES, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 3027. A bill to propose principles governing the provision of International Monetary Fund assistance to Russia; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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. COX:

H.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution providing for expedited emergency humanitarian assistance, disaster relief assistance, and medical assistance to the people of Taiwan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. STRICKLAND:

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding support for nongovernmental organizations participating in honor guard details at funerals of veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

255. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 27 memorializing Congress to call on the Government of Japan to issue a formal apology and reparations to the victims of its war crimes during World War II; to the Committee on International Relations.

256. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution 15 memorializing the President and Congress to take action necessary to honor our country's moral obligation to provide these Filipino veterans with the military benefits that they deserve, including, but not limited to, holding related hearings, and acting favorably on legislation pertaining to granting full veterans benefits to Filipino veterans of the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

257. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7 memorializing the Congress of the United States to index the AMT exemption and tax brackets for inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

258. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 23 memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to evaluate the problems caused by relocating film industry business to Canada and other foreign nations, to evaluate the current state and federal tax incentives provided to the film industry and to promote trade-related legislation that will persuade the film industry to remain in California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 82: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 123: Mr. EWING.

H.R. 142: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 271: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 303: Mr. LEACH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 354: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 460: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 531: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 534: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 654: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 728: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 783: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 784: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 860: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 976: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 979: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 1032: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1046: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1082: Mr. HALL of Ohio and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1093: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 1168: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1176: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1221: Mr. HAYES and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1248: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1274: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1294: Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 1322: Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 1325: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 1329: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1422: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SANDLIN, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1445: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. WISE, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1505: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1592: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 1593: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1621: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1644: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1686: Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1728: Mr. HOEFFEL and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1987: Mr. CANNON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BONILLA, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2053: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 2059: Mr. COYNE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 2121: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2240: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 2241: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VENTO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2252: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2287: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2420: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2492: Mr. FROST and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2498: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 2544: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. MCINNIS, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 2551: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 2594: Mr. HORN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2640: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 2673: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2706: Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2711: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 2720: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 2723: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 2726: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 2733: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2738: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2784: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 2807: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 2819: Mr. EVANS and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 2824: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 2837: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2901: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 2902: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. EVANS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VENTO, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2959: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2973: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 2982: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 2990: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 3006: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 132: Ms. STABENOW.

H. Con. Res. 186: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TALENT, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. FOLEY.

H. Con. Res. 189: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. BEREUTER.

H. Con. Res. 190: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. COOK.

H. Res. 298: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. SABO.

H. Res. 303: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. THUNE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

59. The SPEAKER presented a petition of South Amboy City Council, relative to Resolution No. 199–99 petitioning the members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives to oppose any budgetary cuts inimical to the Community Block Grant funding and HUD's budget; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

60. Also, a petition of Cleveland City Council, relative to Resolution No. 1587–99 petitioning for a Congressional investigation into HUD's handling of Longwood and Rainbow Apartments; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

61. Also, a petition of the City Council of Orange Township, relative to a resolution petitioning Congress to enact H.R. 1168; jointly to the Committees on Science and Transportation and Infrastructure.